INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again – beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-4904

LaFAYETTE, Bernard, Jr., 1940-

PEDAGOGY FOR PEACE AND NONVIOLENCE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF PEACE AND NON-VIOLENCE STUDIES PROGRAMS ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES IN THE NORTHEASTERN U.S.A.

Harvard University, Ed.D., 1974
Education, administration

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1974

BERNARD LAFAYETTE, JR.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

"PEDAGOGY FOR PEACE AND NONVIOLENCE:

A Critical Analysis of Peace and Non-Violence Studies Programs on College Campuses in the Northeastern U.S.A."

Bernard LaFayette, Jr.

A thesis presented to the faculty
of the Graduate School of Education
of Harvard University in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Education

1974

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express deep appreciation to Dr. Adam Curle whose generous insights stimulated this study. I owe special gratitude to Dr. Don Oliver and Professor Kenneth Haskins, my advisors, for their consistant encouragement during the various stages of this dissertation. I would like to express my indebtedness to Dr. Charles Smith who gave many hours of editorial assistance and moral support. I am most appreciative to Dr. John Schlien and Dr. Frank Duhey whose steady support over the years inspired me. Special thanks to Dr. Chester M. Pierce whose challenging ideas gave me confidence and motivation. I would like to express my thanks to A. Michael Washburn, Neil Katz, Dr. Tom Stonier, Dr. Joseph Fahey and Dr. Alan Geyer for their generous assistance. I owe a profound debt to the many typists who transcribed and put these ideas into print in the course of many hours and days. Thanks to Dr. Lawrence Kohlberg and Dr. Harvey Cox for serving on my thesis committee and for their encouraging me to pursue this topic.

I wish to pay a special tribute to the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. whose philosophy of nonviolence gave direction to my life; and Mr. Bernard LaFayette, Sr. and Mrs. Verdell LaFayette, my parents, who gave me the foundation for my philosophy.

Finally, a very special tribute to Kate LaFayette, my wife, for her patience, devotion, love and editorial assistance, without which this dissertation would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Abstract

Problem of Definition. i

Introduction. 1

Overview 11

The Civil Rights and Peace Movement: Catalyst for Peace Studies 15

I. Colgate University Peace Studies Program

A. The University 17

B. The Beginning of Peace Studies at Colgate 23

C. The Purpose of the Program 25

D. The First Course, Problems of War and Peace . . . 27

E. The Curriculum 30

F. The Ralph Bunche House 33

G. The Students in the Program 35

H. The Peace Studies Faculty at Colgate 42

I. The Colgate Peace Studies Director 44

J. The Grading System 46

K. The Program Today 48

II. The Syracuse Non-Violence Sutdies Program

A. Background 51

B. The First Year 55

C. The Move to Rescue the Program 65

D. The Second Year 67

E. Syracuse Non-Violence Studies Program Today . . . 72

F. The Location of the Courses in the Administrative Structure 80

III. Manhattan College Peace Studies Program

A. Manhattan College Background 82

B. The Origin of the Program 86

C. The Program 100

D. Peace Studies Students. 103

Summary 108

IV. Comparative Analysis

Orientation and Style 119

Response to Cambodia 120

Administrative and Faculty Support 121

Impact on the Institutions 124

Community Action 125

Funding 128

Decision Making 129

The Curriculum 131

Critical Analysis 134

V. Conclusion

Survival Issues 145

Relation of Differential Process to Content. 152

Recommendations on the Process for Establishing Peace Studies Programs. 155

Appendices

Appendix 1 170
Appendix 2 173
Appendix 3 175
Appendix 4 178
Appendix 5 179
Appendix 6 180
Appendix 7 182
Appendix 8 184
Appendix 9 185
Appendix 10 186
Appendix 11 187
Appendix 12 189
Appendix 13 192
Appendix 14 198
Appendix 15 201
Appendix 16 217
Appendix 17 226

ABSTRACT

This dissertation is entitled, "PEDAGOGY FOR PEACE AND NONVIOLENCE: A Critical Analysis of Peace and Nonviolence Studies Programs on College Campuses in the Northeastern U.S.A."

This study was undertaken in the hope of providing data, analysis and recommendations which will be valuable to administrators, students, faculty, and others involved in peace and nonviolence studies programs. It will be of particular value to those who anticipate establishing such programs on college campuses.

It is important for educators to become more aware of the role schools and colleges play in perpetuating and reenforcing violence, especially military, in our society. It is also important for educators to reexamine the role of education and its potential for providing peaceful alternative solutions to our world and domestic problems.

While other institutions in our society condone and encourage violence in subtle ways, our educational institutions play a direct role through their articulation of the centrality of that violence which permeates the fabric of society.

This study is addressed to higher education programs devoted to developing that body of knowledge relevant to the understanding and teaching of nonviolent and peaceful alternatives to human problems. Some United States colleges and universities have responded by establishing Peace Studies Programs on their campuses. While some have begun to offer a few courses, others have set up degree-granting programs. A small but significant number of intellectuals have tackled the problems involved in developing

"a pedagogy for peace." Meanwhile, universities are witnessing a rapid proliferation of these programs. This phenomenon has given rise to several important academic questions which were explored in this study.

The programs which have been selected for this study have in common a teaching orientation as opposed to a focus primarily on research or action, but they differ notably in genesis. The program at Syracuse grew out of student demands; that at Colgate was a result of student, faculty, and administrative direction: while that at Manhattan was primarily the product of a faculty group. These different generative stimuli led to different curricula development, teaching methods, and administrative problems.

This dissertation draws upon two types of information. The first consists of three case studies of peace studies programs in institutions of higher learning: Syracuse University, Colgate College, and Manhattan College. Each program is described from materials and information gained through extensive interviews and from written materials which describe and which were developed for each program. An inductive approach allows the development of three distinguishable models flowing from the case studies. Following the development of these models, they are analyzed not only against each other, but more importantly, by using the writer's personal experience from some fifteen years of activity in the civil rights and peace movement.

Also included is reference material in the form of course descriptions, peace studies proposals and organizations involved in the development of peace studies. The writer has developed a draft on the theory of "Non-violence on the Interpersonal Level in Extreme Situations." This material appears in the appendices.

The three models which grew out of this study are the following: (1) The student protest model (Syracuse University); (2) the Faculty developmental model (Manhattan College); (3) The faculty, student and administration collaborative model (Colgate University).

THE PROBLEM OF DEFINITION

The emergence of peace and non-violence studies has brought with it a refreshing air of human knowledge from the Piagetian concept of the origin of intelligence, to the transnational organization research of men like Joseph Nye at Harvard and Chadwick Alger at Ohio State.

Because peace studies is a steadily growing movement it has not taken definite form. It can involve the subject matter of conflict resolution, world order, futuristic studies, non-violent direct action training, international affairs and a number of other related areas of study.

It has not been possible to give peace and non-violence studies a satisfactory definition. Nevertheless, some attempts have been made to articulate what peace studies might involve.

Thornton B. Monez*, for example, states the following:

> Peace education involves a comprehensive and systematic study of relationships between man and his total environment. Recent interpretations of interdependent phenomena seen from an ecological viewpoint have developed as a way

---

*Monez is professor of Education and Coordinator of the Sixth Year Program in Supervision and Administration, Richmond College of the City University of New York.

> of approaching scientific and social problems which are regarded as legitimate concerns in many disciplines. There is a need for the development of an "ecology" for peace education which takes into account all the issues and studies involved in building an adequate conception of a peaceful world order, as opposed to the war system. Such an approach would involve the humanities, as well as the physical and social sciences. It would examine war-peace ideologies as they have been glorified and represented in the myths and histories of every nation; it would examine also the literature, art, dance form, and music of diverse cultures in an attempt to understand the cultural bases for the celebration of war and counter yearnings for peace among social, political, and national groups.

Monez goes on to elucidate his views of Peace Education emphasizing his ecological orientation toward the subject:

> Viewed from the standpoint of ecology, peace education becomes the study of the mutual interdependence of systems of man. As noted earlier, the problems of war, poverty, racial tension, and environment deterioration are related, as are the systems of nationalism, imperialism, and other self-serving forces. Common factors are interwined at the roots of both problems and systems, which means that viable proposals for peace education must include techniques for understanding and handling a multitude of changing interactive forces of extraordinary complexity.
>
> The point to be made is that peace is not a static state, and an ecological conception encourages a focus on the revolving set of relationships among a number of forces and systems. Further, many of these forces have harmonious relationships in common, and many more carry a potential for developping such relationships.
>
> For example, Anthony Judge has posited four different kinds of ecology which carry identifiable "harmonious evolving interrelationships" upon which to build:
>
> Organizational ecology, i.e., the harmonious evolving interrelationships between organizational units.

Conceptual ecology, i.e., the harmonious evolving interrelationships between theoretical formulations, value and belief systems.

Problem ecology, i.e., the harmonious evolving interrelationships between problems.

Psycho-ecology or psycho-dynamics, i.e., the harmonious evolving interrelationships within a person's psyche.

*Alan Geyer states that:

> Peace Studies is a transdisciplinary approach to peacemaking and peacekeeping in trans-national affairs. It is not one academic discipline among disciplines. But these two statements are less a matter of imperial pretense than of extreme dependency on every side. Peace Studies would do well not to attempt to become a discipline in the traditional sense of special-ization, lest it prematurely forfeit the learning acquired through any pertinent discipline. In principle, Peace Studies should remain open to the special contributions of all the social sciences, the natural sciences, and the humanities. There is no field of learning which has not, in recent years, made its own distinctive effort to come to terms with the struggle for peace.
>
> The openness of Peace Studies should not, however, be taken as a license to avoid defining the objectives and scope of the field as carefully as possible.

A. Michael Washburn*, in a popular War/Peace article

lists six approaches to Peace Studies:

1. The non-violence approach which deals directly with critical issues related to values as the basis for policy and individual action, the role of the individuals in the social change process, and the importance of justice in any conception of Peace.

---

*Dr. Alan Geyer, Dag Hammarskjold Professor of Peace Studies at Colgate College, takes an interdisciplinary approach to Peace Studies.

*A. Michael Whasburn, director of the World Law Funds' University Program.

2. The Conflict Resolution approach which focuses on conflict at all levels from interpersonal to international. This approach assumes that it is possible to identify causal relationships or patterns of events, conditions and behavior that produce violent conflict and that it is possible, therefore, to predict outbreaks of violence and devise strategies to prevent them.

3. The futuristic approach adds to the peace field a concreteness of vision and a sense of how much could be achieved in the next two or three decades.

4. The radical social science approach has as a basic thesis (for many) that fundamental change in American foreign policy, and thus in the international system itself, will first require major changes in our domestic institution and the redistribution of political power.

5. The counter-culture phenomenon, another influence on peace education, is a constellation of values, theories and education to politics to life-style.

6. Finally, there is the related movement for more participatory, action-oriented forms of education. Films, simulation games, independent study, field work, work study projects, group activities, and changes in grading, formal requirements and class size are some of the prominent ideas and issues. More important than any single one of these is student participation in decision-making about all of them.

As Washburn points out in the same article, Peace educators do not yet share a minimum understanding of what constitutes an exciting and responsible program.

I will not attempt to add to the confusion around the definition of Peace and Non-Violence Studies. However, I feel that this area of study should address the problems of conflict ranging from intra-personal to inter-personal and national to transnational.

Further, it should address itself to action strategies on various levels as well as use of the best research available to understand and solve problems that produce human conflict, exploitation and injustices.

In the final analysis peace and non-violence studies can only be defined by what the program actually does and not by what they propose.

The individuals involved in the program will give the orientation and direction to the various programs. In time we may come to see a common trend that will provide a basic definition of Peace and Non-Violence Studies.

FOOTNOTES ON DEFINITION

1. Monez, Thronton B., "Working for Peace; Implication for Education," Education for Peace-Focus on Mankind, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D. C., 1973, pp. 22-23.

2. Ibid p.33

3. Geyer, Alan, "What is Peace Studies," unpublished notes

4. ——Inaugural Address, Colgate University, May 6, 1972

5. Washburn, A. Michael, "Peace Education is Alive . . . But Unsure of Itself," War/Peace Report, World Law Fund, New York, New York, 1971, pp.16-17.

INTRODUCTION

The United States has achieved the greatest scientific and technological state of any nation. Yet it finds itself unable to deal with the problems of violence on an international and domestic level.

American and world history have been interpreted through our educational institutions and the communications media as stories of battles and victories, whether they be in the political or scientific realm. The overriding lesson is that violence, real or metaphoric (War on Poverty), is successful in dealing with conflict and in preserving and defending our nation's principles, ideals and institutions. Furthermore, violence is implied to be excusable as man's acceptable behavior. Not only have Americans been conditioned to accept the validity of violence as an appropriate problem-solving tool, but our formal educational processes have taught explicitly the efficacy of violence in group interaction, and implicitly the use of violence in personal relations. The advocacy system in law is characterized as battle (court battle). The term "task force," which grew out of military operations of World War II, is used in reference to groups looking at social problems. This goes to show what impact the military makes on our vocabulary.

Other institutions in our society condone and encourage violence while our educational institutions play a unique role through their articulation of the centrality of that

violence which subtly permeates the fabric of society. Structural and psychological violence are often the result of the unjust policies, both conscious and unconscious, which operate in our public and private institutions. For example, the welfare system for the poor in this country has a noble purpose, but the structure and inhuman policies in many cases do irreparable damage to recipients. Then, of course, there is welfare for the poor and on the other hand, welfare for the rich. Educational institutions in theory may be considered neutral forums for debate and discovery of society's values. In action, they become political instruments which transmit values. The views of history they present as well as their own administrative actions condone or condemn the use of violence. What does a child learn when he is told that the union of his nation was preserved by war, when he hears his president state that his bombing policy in Viet Nam was a key factor in bringing the war to an end, with no mention of the role of diplomatic negotiation, and when he observes that the peace in his school is best preserved by the presence of the armed policeman he encounters in the hallway on his way to class? Has he not been taught that violence is the acceptable solution to conflict when he has been exposed to nothing else? Rather than a means to solve problems, is not violence truly an admission of failure to solve the problem?

It seems that very little attention or resources have been devoted to exposure or exploration of nonviolent

solutions to conflict. This dissertation will address itself to higher education programs devoted to developing that body of knowledge relevant to the understanding and teaching of nonviolent alternatives to human problems.

There have been a variety of responses to the growing awareness of these problems as manifested by the civil rights and peace movements in this country. We have seen thousands of people protesting in the streets against the violence perpetrated against those seeking their rights as citizens. Our TV screens have projected demonstrations protesting the war in Southeast Asia.

The soaring number of homicides in our society joined with the horrors of the war in Viet Nam, domestic repression and the outbreak of counter violence in the streets of our cities and on our college campuses in recent years have caused many educators to reexamine the role of educational institutions in the context of war and other forms of violence in our society. The people who participate in the many acts against humanity in most cases have spent a good part of their first eighteen years in the public schools of our country. In many of our schools, military science is a required course for our young men, while there is no nonviolently oriented equivalent. Some United States colleges and universities have responded by establishing Peace Studies Programs on their campuses. While some have begun to offer a few courses, others have set up degree-granting programs. A

small but significant number of intellectuals have tackled the problems involved in developing "a pedagogy for peace." Meanwhile, universities are witnessing a rapid proliferation of these programs. This phenomenon has given rise to several important academic questions which will be explored in this study.

It is important for educators to become more aware of the role schools and colleges play in perpetuating and reenforcing violence in our society. It is also important for educators to reexamine the role of education and its potential for developing methods and skills for finding peaceful alternative solutions to our world and domestic problems.

Is it feasible that schools of education can also provide programs which will seek to improve professional qualifications of persons concerned with teaching or investigating various aspects of the creation and maintenance of a stable and peaceful world community? Is it feasible that undergraduate schools could have as one of their central foci the elimination of war and violence in our society?

How does one go about setting up a Peace/Nonviolence Studies Program on a college campus, and what might be the curricula content of such programs? This field is so new and so very little is known about it. Therefore, very little has been written about it. This fact makes this particular dissertation all the more significant.

The material that follows describes how three programs,

analysis of those programs and their problems will be offered and some of the critical issues that will determine the survival of those programs will be discussed.

To gain an in depth appreciation for the development of each of these three programs in this study, the writer visited each of the campuses at least twice, sat in on classes being taught in the programs, and talked at length with participants involved in the programs. Written materials and files on the three programs were made available for this study.

In addition, the writer interviewed a number of teachers, professors, students, administrators and program directors concerned with Nonviolence and Peace Studies. A select number of those interviews have been used in this study. Because the Nonviolence and Peace Studies movement has only recently developed on relatively few campuses, information and materials about this movement are limited and in many cases unavailable.

In order to gain a broader perspective of the Nonviolence and Peace Studies movement in the northeastern area of the United States, the writer interviewed professors, students, administrators and directors specifically involved in the three programs covered in this study; Colgate College at Hamilton, New York, Syracuse University at Syracuse, New York and Manhattan College at New York, New York.

The present study will provide data, analysis and recommendations which can be valuable to administrators,

students and faculty who are involved in nonviolence and peace studies programs. The study will also be of value to individuals who anticipate organizing nonviolence and peace studies programs on campuses.

The ultimate goal of the writer is to encourage educators on all levels to reexamine the role of education and its potential for providing peaceful alternative resolutions of our domestic and world problems.

Each of the programs selected in this study represents a different model on the spectrum of Nonviolence and Peace Studies programs. They differ not only in their genesis, but represent distinct approaches in the establishment of peace studies programs on college campuses. They range from semi-traditional to a highly flexible format.

The Syracuse University Program was selected because: unique developments and special problems occurred during the initial stage of the program; it is a large university located on a private nonsectarian campus which has graduate departments; the university experienced spontaneous massive student demonstrations in the Spring of 1970, immediately following the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State and Jackson State killings, and student demands during the demonstration included the establishment of a Nonviolence Studies Program; the program has offered an unusually wide range of courses; the program was begun without the normal process of faculty approval; the program started with a budget ($14,000)

which came directly from the university's core budget.

The Colgate College Program was selected because: the program is characterized by an evolutionary approach in the process of its development; it is located on a small private undergraduate campus; in 1969 the program started with a proposal from a single faculty member to teach a course entitled, Problems of War and Peace; later other faculty members came together to develop a more extensive program; the program is funded by an alumnus donor in the amount of $125,000 for a five-year period; the program provides for a professorial chair; one of the aims of the program is to develop an introductory course in Peace Studies as part of the core curriculum of the college.

The Manhattan College Program was selected because: a small group (32 members) of various religious persuasions, diverse academic specialities and differing political views decided to establish a Peace Studies Program after being inspired by Pope John XXIII's encyclical, "Pacem in Terris;" the program is on a Catholic campus (4,500 students) which offers an undergraduate major in Peace Studies; of an awareness that the military science program on the campus had a high status and the founding members set out to establish a Peace Studies Program of comparable status; the group developed an independent institute which solicits both public and private funds for its budget.

Part one consists of case studies of the three programs

and part two of this study is a comparative analysis of the three case studies, both parts addressing the following questions:

The Process. Who initiated the program? Who makes up the decision making group? Who funds the program? What is its orientation (research, teaching, or projects)? Has the effect of this budget changed since the program began? What is the extent of participation of students, faculty, and other sub-groups on the campus? What are the major factors which are likely to determine the continuation of the program? With what department is the program associated? Why? To what extent has the program been affected by the decrease of U. S. involvement in Southeast Asia?

The Curriculum. Who teaches the courses? Who initiates the courses? What is the status of those teaching the courses? Are the courses non-graded? Do the courses involve non-traditional teaching methods? Who approves the courses? Who evaluates the courses? What is the procedure for determining the scope and focus of the substantive content of the curriculum?

The Relationship Between Process and Curriculum. The programs which have been selected for this study have in common their teaching orientation as opposed to their being focused primarily on research or action, but differ notably in genesis. Syracuse grew out of student demands; Colgate was a result of student, faculty, and administrative direction; Manhattan was

primarily the product of a faculty group. These different generative stimuli led to different curricula development, teaching methods, and administrative problems.

Each program will be looked at from three points of view. One, the process of developing the program will be examined: what political, economic, social, and/or personality factors, forces, or considerations on the campus brought about the creation of the program? Two, the content of the curriculum will be reviewed: what is the orientation, scope, focus, and pedagogy for teaching peace? Three, why did the process lead to the particular form of content, if there is any connection between process and the subsequent curriculum content?

Each program will be described from materials and information gained through extensive interviews and from written materials which describe and which were developed for each program. An inductive approach will allow the development of three distinguishable models flowing from the case studies. Once these models have been developed, they will be analyzed not only against each other, but by using the writer's personal experience from some fifteen years of activity in the civil rights and peace movement.

The second type of data is personal to the writer. Following case study analyses, a model core curriculum for college and university peace and nonviolence studies will be proposed. As an example of one type of course material, the writer will

develop a draft chapter on the subject of "Nonviolence on the Interpersonal Level in Extreme Situations." In addition the writer will include a draft outline of a model curriculum. (This part of the study will appear in the appendix)

This material is meant to be illustrative of the various personal choices which students can make in their own lives, and the various approaches students might use in avoiding violence in the school environment and in the classroom.

AN OVERVIEW AND SCOPE OF PEACE STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES

The peace studies movement on or related to college campuses is growing at such a rapid pace that it is extremely difficult to keep up with the new additions in the area. The Peace Research Laboratory is directed by Theodore Lentz. It was established in 1946 and is a research laboratory oriented toward the technological requirements of peace research. It focuses on critical analysis of current peace research and peace studies, especially on the cause of war and lack of emphasis on the cause of peace.

Since 1948 there has been a Peace Studies Institute at Manchester College in North Manchester, Indiana. It offers a Bachelor of Arts degree in peace studies, an interdisciplinary study in the understanding of war and peace, social change, and conflict resolution.

There are also groups like the International Peace Academy which has as its purpose the transnational preparation of practitioners and leaders in the basic skills associated with the achievement of peace; conflict analysis; negotiation; mediation; the use of impartial third party presence to prevent or limit hostilities. It is also involved with peaceful action for human rights, projects designed to bring together the parties in the conflict and the third parties in a mutual search for possible peaceful solutions.

We have another kind of group such as the Long Island Committee on Peace Education, which was organized to promote the development of peace education on a regional level. Its members represent high school social studies organizations, several colleges, and a graduate school program of teacher education. This program has as its goals: to encourage individual institutions to develop their own programs of peace studies and to organize some institutes on peace education for Long Island. This group was established back in 1972. The peace studies program at Mankato State College in Minnesota offers a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree, which are nonteaching degrees. This program offers three four-credit courses; Conflict Resolution Among Nations; Conflict Resolutions Among Individuals; and Conflict Resolutions Among Cultures. Students can also minor in peace studies if they choose. This program was established in 1973.

There are also groups like the Institute for World Order which was established in 1962 with the purpose of providing a resource for developing world order and peace studies programs on college campuses, in high school courses curriculum, and to establish workshops and conferences for faculty and student training. This Institute has three basic programs: The University Program, the School Program, the World Order Models Project. The Institute is located in New York City.

There is another group, The Council For a Department of Peace, which grew out of the Peace Act Advisory Council.

It encourages citizen discussions of the long range peace-making and peace keeping capabilities of the government. Then there are certain area groups like the Conference on Peace Research and History, which grew from an Ad Hoc Committee to a recognized conference of the American Historical Association. The goal of this group is to encourage the development of peace research and education in the field of history. There are also groups like the Canadian Peace Research Institute, which publishes regularly the Peace Research Abstract journal, the Peace Research Review, and the Peace Research which is a monthly publication. Among foundations there is the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which is an operating foundation that conducts research, communication, publication, and training programs relevant to war and peace issues. The University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, offers a Ph.D. in peace science.

There are approximately 25 to 30 colleges and universities which offer degrees in Peace Studies, Peace Education or Conflict Studies. Most of these programs began in 1970 and grew out of the protest around the invasion of Cambodia, as a new wave of peace and non-violent studies courses generated on college campuses throughout the United States and Canada. Three years ago there were less than 100 courses existing on college campuses in the United States. Now there are estimates of as many as 800 campuses that offer peace studies and non-violence courses in their curriculum. The general pattern has

been for colleges to offer a few courses and increase the number of courses until they were able to offer a major, minor or concentration in peace studies. Last year five new programs came into being on college campuses in the United States.

The prospect for these courses and programs finding a permanent home in higher education depends in part on the growth and development of professional academic associations, such as the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development and technical resource groups such as the Institute for World Order, Inc.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS AND PEACE MOVEMENT: CATALYST FOR PEACE STUDIES

Contributions made by individuals like A. J. Muste, Martin Luther King, Jr., Cesar Chavez and Ralph D. Abernathy, Coretta Scott King, David Dellinger and Stewart Meachum to the Civil Rights and Peace movements provide meaningful content for the Non-Violence and Peace Studies curriculum today.

In the last eighteen years beginning with the Montgomery Bus Boycott in Alabama in 1955 and the Student Sit-In movement in 1960, the American public has become increasingly aware of the social problems with which our nation is plagued. But not only have the various movements brought attention to social problems, such as discrimination, poverty, housing, unemployment, poor education, and the ill effects of the war in Southeast Asia. In some instances, such as the Montgomery Boycott, Student Sit-In Movement, Voter Registration Campaign and the Grape Boycott, the movements have been successful in removing detrimental social barriers. These and other movements demonstrated the power of the Non-Violence and peaceful methods and their potential for social change. These movements called into question certain laws, policies and practices that were prohibitive to the pursuit of happiness for millions of Americans.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said:

> When the SCLC went into Birmingham in 1963, it intended to change that city. But the effect of its campaign was so extensive that President

> Kennedy was forced to conclude that national legislation was indispensible, and the first civil rights bill with substance was enacted in 1964. Non-Violent direct action had proved to be the most effective generation of change that the movement had seen, and by 1965 all civil rights organizations had embraced it as theirs.[1]

These movements provided a platform to examine the philosophy, methods and strategies of non-violent social change. The Peace and Non-Violence Studies programs that have recently emerged on college campuses were catalyzed by the various non-violent movements for social change. Many of the students now involved in Peace and Non-Violence Studies participated in these movements.

Thornton B. Monez agrees that:

> The students themselves began to challenge the meaning of their education as they tried to put the facts together and began to ask basic questions about national and educational priorities. Beginning in 1967, it was the students who refused to accept passively a continuing war in Viet Nam, the purpose of which they had difficulty understanding. They could no longer suppress their questions about the moral posture of a society that was spending 70 percent of its tax dollars on wars and their aftermath, along with the preparation for future wars.[2]

While peace education as a problem-centered field of study is not at all new (the first program on Peace Studies was organized at Manchester College, Manchester, Indiana, in 1948), the proliferation of peace-oriented curriculum offerings has been a consequence of concerns brought to the forefront of academic life by the Viet Nam war.

I. COLGATE UNIVERSITY PEACE STUDIES PROGRAM

A. The University

Colgate, founded in 1819, was established for the purpose of preparing young men for the Baptist Ministry. However as time passed, the character of the school began to change. In 1833, the school opened to qualified young men of every evangelical denomination. In 1839 the University opened to non-ministerial students. However, there was some concern that these non-ministerial students might interfere with the dedicated theological students studying at the University. Dr. Kendrick, a faculty member who strongly opposed the admission of non-ministerial students, foresaw that such a change "would be the opening wedge for reorienting the Institution's character and program."[3] He raised the question, "Can our young men, preparing for the ministry, in the incipient state of their peity, before their religious habits are formed, become companions of prayerless youth, to room and study, and lodge with them for a term of years, and not be retarded in the cultivation of their Christian Graces?"[4] The position calling for the change prevailed and now Colgate is one of the outstanding, undergraduate liberal arts universities in the country - offering the Bachelor of Arts degree and a Master of Arts degree in a small selected program.

The University is housed on a 1,400 acre stretch of land at the northern end of the Chenango Valley in upstate New york, southwest of Rochester, New York, and southeast

of Syracuse, New York, overlooking Hamilton - a little village of 2,000 people. The center of town is marked by the village green where all traffic is brought to a collision course. Small shops and eating places branch off from the square and stretch for a block or two in either direction from the square.

The campus divides naturally into two parts, with the older buildings occupying the more prominent positions at the top of the hills, and the newer buildings lacing the hillsides with their modern architecture.

Among the usual assortment of buildings and facilities on a small college campus, Colgate has an observatory which is located at one of the highest points on the campus. "South of the gymnasium is an open slope 2,300-foot ski run, and four ski trails. The area is equipped with a T-bar ski lift, snow-making machinery, and a ski house - which is operated by the Outing Club."[5] Colgate also has an "18-hole golf course, named for the ancestral home of the Colgate family in Kent, England."[6] Colgate's Case Library "houses in open stacks the University's growing collection of 282,000 volumes and 155,000 documents, 7,000 federal publications which the library receives annually, and another 1,550 periodicals, in addition to publications of learned societies and other institutions."[7]

One unique building that Colgate has is called Chapel House. Chapel House is a facility open to anyone who wishes to make a personal search for a deeper understanding of religion.

It has a chapel for personal devotion, a library and music room containing religious books and recordings, and facilities for overnight guests.

Colgate has a student enrollment of about 2,500. The students represent a diversity of talents and backgrounds. Colgate seeks not only the high academic achievers, but the creative and the artistic as well. Students come from most states of this country, and from a few foreign countries. Their academic accomplishments are annually recognized by graduate schools across the country, and by the sizable number of state and national fellowships which they are awarded. A substantial number of students continue their education with post-graduate studies.

Until 1970, Colgate was an all male school. Now one can see a thin population of female students on the campus, which offers another change in the character of Colgate University.

In looking at an early period in Colgate's history, we can see where another change in the student body influenced the present character of Colgate. This change took place in 1942 when Colgate inaugurated its ninth president, Everett Needham Chase. President Chase had graduated from Princeton and studied at Harvard University and Cambridge University and had been Assistant Dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration at Harvard in 1939. "The new president in his first address to faculty and students stressed Colgate's

obligation to see that the facilities were used with the greatest possible effectiveness in the war training program"[8]

"In fulfilling the responsibility of the University, it would not only contribute to military victory, but also keep itself alive. Its navy contracts were to prove most helpful in meeting basic operating costs."[9] Colgate had had a civilian flight training program in operation since 1940, but by 1942 it had turned into the war flight training program for enlisted navy cadets.

The composition of the student body had also changed. By 1944 there were only 77 civilian students out of over 873 army and navy enlisted cadets. The President was persistent in convincing the Washington officials of the University's ability and qualifications for training naval cadets. In a matter of a few years, Colgate University became a war academy, with its fraternity houses and dormitories converted to military training quarters and the faculty who once trained ministers now trained pilots and military personnel.

"This record is noteworthy when it is remembered that most of the Colgate faculty, unlike instructors at the engineering colleges in the program, had only limited backgrounds for teaching such subjects as navigation, mathematics, and physics. It successfully retooled in many demanding assignments. By September, 1944, the program had enrolled 2,808 navy cadets. Colgate had done an outstanding job in training the navy cadets, and as a result it established

a very close relationship between the College and navy personnel. This close relationship was not without great benefit to the College.

President Chase proved himself to be an excellent administrator and an efficient businessman. The school therefore received the benefits of millions of dollars in buildings and new programs which greatly improved the quality and standing of the school. After the war the fraternity houses were reestablished very quickly on the campus and in response to faculty and undergraduate pressure, the board of trustees took a stand in January of 1955 against membership clauses which discriminated on the basis of race, creed, or color - declaring them relics of the past and strongly endorsed their elimination.

The curriculum at Colgate University underwent a change to adapt to its postwar time needs. "Growing out of postwar time committee discussions came a statement on academic freedom, tenure, and promotions adopted by trustees and faculty in 1948-49."[10] For the first time, salaries for faculty members was raised to a ceiling more than $9,000.

It is reported that out of faculty and community discussions of the problem of the peace in 1943 came a series of annual summer conferences on this topic of 1944-1946 sponsored by the University and the New York State's Citizen Council, directed by Dr. Raymond O. Rockwood of the history department. So as we can see from this bit of history, the problem of peace was discussed at an earlier point in this University's

history. Out of these summer conferences grew the Foreign Policy Conference which was administered by Professor Charles Wilson, and each summer from 1949 to 1961 these conferences were held under the sponsorship of the history department at Colgate University. Colgate today is very much oriented toward foreign policy studies. The impact of such a dramatic change in the University during the war years is still evident in the University's curriculum and academic offerings.

In recent years Colgate University has added to its academic offerings with the introduction of the Peace Studies Program and a concentration in Peace Studies.

B. The Beginning of the Peace Studies Program at Colgate

Many institutions of higher learning involved in peace studies programs today can look back into their histories and identify some earlier group or often an individual who demonstrated a concern that a course on the problems of war and peace be taught in their academic community. Although the bearers of such concern did not cause a ground swell at the time, in most cases, their colleagues do not fail to mention them when talking about how the programs got started on their campuses. Such is the case with Colgate University.

The recent study of war and peace in Colgate's regular curriculum, began in 1966 when Mr. Clarence W. Young, a psychology professor, started teaching a course on aggression in his department. At that time he expressed a strong view that everyone in undergraduate school should have an opportunity to examine the nature of aggression and the cause of violence. He taught his course for several semesters.

On April 2, 1969 Mr. Young proposed to the Committee on the College and World Affairs suggesting that the committee propose a course on the problems of war and peace.[11] An earlier course, World Affairs 490, had been eliminated from the college curriculum, thus greatly reducing the proportion of the general education program devoted to world affairs. When the committee met in 1967, it had recommended that when the course was revised it should deal with world affairs in some way.[12]

Proposing such a course in 1969 served two important functions. It reinstituted a course related to world affairs and it also satisfied the strong demand by students that their education be more relevant to their present lives. The essence of Mr. Young's proposal was that interested faculty members be supported in their effort to develop an interdisciplinary course of this nature, to be taught initially in University Studies.* The proposal suggested that the question of whether the core should be required or not, should be determined after the content of the course had been developed by the staff and at such a time when the evaluation of the general education program had been made.

Mr. Young saw the opportunity for a number of disciplines to contribute to the proposed course. He stated, "The problem of war in the context of modern weaponry has aroused the concern of individuals in many areas of study, and a 'peace research' movement has developed in a wide range of disciplines."[13] He felt that genuine interest on the part of the faculty and students was the key to a successful course.

*University Studies is an interdisciplinary non-traditional, non-departmental problem-oriented course of study where emphasis is placed upon individual values and awareness related to institutional demands and responsibilities.

C. The Purpose of the Program

The Committee states in its literature that their purpose is to engage students, faculty, and others in an active, vocational quest for a world community, liberated from man's organized violence and ordered by a just and viable system of peace. We believe this purpose should be central to the life and work of the community of scholars and should enlist the special contributions of every branch of learning.[14]

Ideally, universities and colleges should engage in vigorous study of the major issues and enterprises of their place and time. Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the growing emphasis on natural science and engineering served the accelerating growth of a technological civilization. Today, as a result of a veritable explosion of technological achievement, this civilization faces difficulties that demand radical changes in direction. The very survival of modern man requires that the special problems of a technological society be solved. Yet each one is intricately complex and baffling. We need to face these problems intelligently, with resources of objective scientific investigation and sensitive ethical reasoning that only our institution of higher learning can provide.[15]

By offering a program in peace studies, the college intends to prepare students to cope effectively with issues related to war and peace and offer leadership in a variety of careers. Some of those careers might include peace research,

peace education, peace movements, politics, government, international service, law, business, communications, religion and many other fields.[16]

D. The First Course, Problems of War and Peace

The rationale for the course was based on the premise that the development of new and highly technical weapons, capable of a magnitude of destruction never before imagined, had created a crisis; and further, that an understanding of the nature and ramification of the crisis should be worthy of academic study, especially if our young people are to gain an objective, critical and imaginative approach necessary to deal with the problem. Young suggested that faculty members from various departments could find scholarly and scientific materials of considerable sophistication in the literature of their own fields, which could be brought to bear on the development of a course in problems of war and peace.

The Committee on the College and World Affairs accepted the proposal and Dr. C. M. Hou, Chairman of the Committee and a professor of economics, wrote a memorandum to Professor William Skelton, Director of University Studies, on April 22, 1969, outlining the basic component of the Young proposal and soliciting the director's support to organize the faculty necessary to develop the course.[17]

From 1969-70, a group of faculty members, joined by the President, the Dean of Faculty, and students established a voluntary, non-credit seminar on problems of war and peace and made an effort to prepare the content for the course that was later to be developed. During the summer of 1970 a group of faculty and students, with financial support from the

Fund for Peace and the Institute of International Order, developed a course syllabus and a book of readings focused on the problems of war and peace.[18]

One student describes the faculty members who were involved in the initiation of the Peace Studies Program. "It was started interestingly enough not by a bunch of young radical faculty just straight out of grad school in the movement. It was started by middle-aged men of long standing pacifist, peace, or left oriented inclinations. A Quaker, a kind of radical liberal pacifist, an old time lefty, a liberal leaning psychiatrist-psychologist got the program started. They were the driving force, the energy, the push; the people who really stuck their necks out. They had a commitment, and the drive to put things together. In addition the good fortune to be the recipients of a substantial grant to set up an entire program and an established professorship..."[19] These faculty members represented the backbone of the faculty. They were established, full professors who were outstanding in each of their fields, and they carried the weight of the college behind them when they made the decision to establish a peace course and a peace studies program. Therefore, they got the necessary support and were able to get the program off the ground in a systematic, but also in the traditional way.

The course was finally prepared by the end of the summer and was offered as an elective both semesters of the 1970-71 school year. The popularity of the course among students

helped to assure its continuation. It is reported that the course enrolled about one-eighth of the student body during the two semesters.[20]

One administrator, Dr. Morris, describes the initiation of the peace studies program as "an off-shoot of concerns which grew out of the Viet Nam war."[21] Spirit was out-running reason and one way of dealing with potential chaos was to use academic reins of evaluation of problems that led us into the war and other wars.

That summer fifteen teachers and six students from twenty institutions participated in a workshop on new approaches to peace education curriculum. As a result of the successful course and workshop, an alumnus of the college pledged a grant of $25,000 annually for a period of five years to support a professorial chair in peace studies and to further develop a peace studies program at Colgate.[22]

In 1971, Colgate became the first undergraduate college to establish a peace studies chair. On the evening of May 6, 1972, Dr. Alan Geyer, political scientist, ethicist, and former editor of The Christian Century, was inaugurated as the first Dag Hammarskjold Professor of Peace Studies at Colgate University.[23]

E. The Curriculum

The Peace Studies Program at Colgate was established in 1970 as an interdisciplinary approach to peacemaking and peacekeeping in transnational affairs. It therefore depends on an in-depth and integrative contribution from a variety of fields. The College has had a tradition of team-taught courses for over 40 years. In such courses a number of faculty members share in the preparation and teaching of the course. The Peace Studies Program has offered team-taught courses from faculty in political science, philosophy, economics, history, geography, psychology, Russian studies, and other fields.[24]

There are only two required university studies team-taught courses for the peace studies concentrator. The first U. S. 211, Problems of War and Peace, presents the problems posed for our generation by war and modern weaponry in their historical, political, and moral dimensions. The course explores various methods of promoting peace, including world law, world government, disarmament, and non-violence defense. It concludes by exploring options open to the individual regarding war and military service, and how the individual can exert some influence over the course of events. A staff drawn from several departments introduces a wide variety of viewpoints through discussions, lectures by campus and off-campus speakers, and films open to all students.

The second interdisciplinary staff course, U. S. 212, Problems of World Community, focuses on the problems

of world community, including that of the growing awareness of the interlinking of those problems. It presents the facts and implications for peace, the uneven distributions of people, resources, environmental pressures, economic justice, and differences in cultural values. This leads to consideration of world order models and the problems related to the present nation-state system. This course will be conducted in much the same way as U. S. 211 - open to all students.

In addition, four electives drawn from a choice of forty courses are required. The forty-two courses related to the Peace Studies are selected from the following disciplines and areas: 1. University Studies (4 courses) 2. Political Science (10 courses) 3. Philosophy (2 courses) 4. Religion (6 courses) 5. History (9 courses) 6. Economics (6 courses) 7. Social Relations (3 courses) 8. Psychology (1 course) 9. English (1 course).[25]

Students also have the option of taking an approved Independent Study involving action-research. This course offers a wide range of possibilities. A student can simply choose a list of books she or he might want to read and report on; or develop a seminar involving his schoolmates or community people; or spend some time in a rural, suburban, or urban community studying a problem; or participate in action related to a conflict resolution situation or any other course of action approved by the student's advisor. Getting the advisors approval is half the battle. The

requirements for Independent Study are as strenuous as those of the traditional course. Reflecting on the original course, Problems of War and Peace, Dr. Morris described the course as being hard and involving a great deal of required reading. This course is not a core course, which is a course required for all students. In fact, peace studies courses have come at a time when Colgate is re-evaluating the strictly required courses. There are, however, five courses which make-up the core curriculum. They include two semesters of science, one semester of philosophy, one semester of developing countries, one semester of American ideal institutions. It is extremely difficult, it not impossible, for a student to finish Colgate without taking the core courses. With the growing number of courses in the peace studies electives, it is not likely that a student would complete four years of undergraduate study at Colgate without taking at least one of the peace studies courses as an elective.

F. The Ralph Bunche House

The Peace Studies Program at Colgate provides for its concentrators a rehabilitated fraternity house as a residence. It is located on campus and provides a convenient location for workshops, seminars, guest residence and faculty-student rap sessions. The house was named for Ralph Bunche, the former undersecretary of the United Nations, honors alumnus of Colgate and one of three black men to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. The residence can house thirty or more people and includes a resident advisor, who is usually a graduate of the Peace Studies Program and holds the title Peace Intern. Each year a senior is chosen to be the peace intern for a one year period following graduation.

Only about fifty percent of the concentrators have been living in the house and the other residents range from students who have taken a few courses in the Peace Studies Program to students who have taken none. There is no clear procedure as to how students get to be residents of the Ralph Bunche House. When the present residence advisor was asked how students get to be residents of the house, he replied:

> Well, the first year there was going to be a selection procedure, but it took the administration from February to May (1973) to provide the details as to how many rooms there were, what the eating arrangements would be, if indeed there was going to be a house.[26]

This delay and uncertainty on the part of the administration resulted in many of the students choosing alternative living

arrangements. Thus empty rooms were left in the house which were later filled by students who were not peace concentrators. The residents in the house do not represent a peace studies community, but rather a mixture of students who are peace concentrators and other students who have never taken a peace studies course.

"The house is not now and never has been ideologically homogenous at all."[27] At the outset there were no doubt students who thought the house would be something similar to a peace commune, where students would be able to live in a preferred community. But quite the opposite took place. "They (students) prefer to live off campus in apartments for financial reasons, or they want the independence of living outside the university housing, or they have roommates they prefer to stay with in dorms."[28]

The Ralph Bunche House is not a closed community in that the students in the Peace Studies Program experience a good deal of interaction with the other students on campus. "A lot of people in the house are very much connected with the student activities, so they see a lot of other students in different activities when they plan or go to meetings or run films or lectures or whatever."[29]

At the moment, there is little danger that the peace concentrators are ingrown or reenforcing their narrow thoughts without confronting different points of view and ideological challenges. Many of the students in the program are leaders of campus groups.

G. The Students in the Program

In the spring of '70, Colgate like most colleges around the U. S. had demonstrations against the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State killings. In the Fall of '70, Colgate offered its first peace studies course entitled, Problems of War and Peace. A large number of students enrolled in the course.

Now that the war in Viet Nam has de-escalated and U. S. troops have been withdrawn from Southeast Asia for the most part, enrollment in the course has decreased. However, this can be looked at in two different ways. One is that the course was offered the first time. Many students who took it were seniors and others enrolled in the course because they did not know whether they would have an opportunity to take it again.

The director of the program feels that the heavy enrollment was due in part to the emotional involvement in the war in Viet Nam on the part of the students. Also, the draft issues and problems that were facing many of the students at that particular time probably contributed to high enrollment. He feels now, however, that the students bring richer and more varied motives for taking the peace studies courses. He also feels that the program now offers a much more substantial and varied curriculum. He happily reports that not once has a course in the peace studies program had to be cancelled because of lack of enrollment.

At this point, the program at Colgate has graduated one student who is a concentrator in peace studies. There are fifteen students who are presently juniors or seniors who have indicated that peace studies is their concentration. The director advises the students who are concentrators to take another major along with peace studies. He feels that they would be better prepared for a job or for graduate studies after they leave Colgate. If they could, in addition to peace studies, acquire a background in history, religion, philosophy, or some other field that has a more secure and conventional identity than peace studies, they would have more attractive opportunities.

According to the director, most students who are in the program are attracted to law as a profession. Students in the various fields are interested in bringing about changes. The legal profession is a way of actually understanding the politics of change in order to bring about the policy changes that can affect our national and even perhaps affect transnational issues. However, a number of other students are interested in the teaching profession, social studies programs, and secondary schooling. Many other students are looking for some kind of organizational work, such as working in some large peace organizations, world affairs organizations, or in government service. There are a few others who are interested in the ministry or some other kind of aspect of church work.

Students at Colgate are not encouraged to think of some kind of new occupation or assume that they have to create some new occupation which does not exist. They are encouraged to go into the traditional vocations and take their background of peace studies with them. Whether they go into law, teaching, or business, or any number of other fields, their expertise in peace studies can offer leadership in those fields as well.

In an interview with the director, he reports that there are a variety of interests among students and sometimes the way the courses get taught represents a kind of compromise among different levels of interests among students. Within one course you might have students who have a life time commitment to non-violence. On the other hand you may have students who are seriously interested in the problems of war and peace but may be quite undecided about their stance on the question of violence and non-violence. In some cases students who may have been in the military service already, would have made the decision to be conscientious objectors had they had the opportunity. The challenge of the instructor is to find ways of keeping students with a variety of interests and different experiential levels functioning together in a course or in a seminar. In an effort to keep a high level of interest in a course, it is necessary to accommodate the different interests of the students.

Dr. Geyer reports, "Some of our students are disillusioned and cynical activists of several years ago. These

tend to be juniors and seniors now. But they felt, they marched, they protested against the war, they did their thing. They didn't have much effect, or at least not soon enough, and now Watergate and other things only confirm their notion that the whole system is rotten anyhow."[30] The Peace Studies Program tends to draw those students who consider themselves radicals. They bring to the course disillusionment with the University and many times with society in general. There are also those who are rather idealistic activists who really want to work on some constructive strategy for social change by either working within the system or against the system. The instructor has a very difficult job of balancing the course to meet the needs of a variety of interests of the various students. To a large extent students have some impact or influence on how the course is taught and many times the predominate subject matter of the course.

The activist students at Colgate had an influence on the establishment of the course. When the first course was offered, student involvement in the anti-war demonstration at Colgate was at an all-time high. About 120 students enrolled in the course entitled, Problems of War and Peace, both the Fall and Spring semesters of the 1970-71 school term. Last Fall (1974) only 21 students enrolled in the course.

Most of the students in the program tend to have a more activist orientation than those in the general student body.

They tend to be leaders in student organizations and campus social action campaigns. The campaign to increase the admission of women is chiefly led by students involved in the Peace Studies Program. One of the questions which must be raised has to do with the affect of the peace studies course content on student activist.

Steven Marshall, one of the activist students explains that, "...these courses have been useful to me in campus politics...we have some issues that I and my friends are involved in here (Colgate) and I found that I can use these subjects as a basis along which to develop some tactics in order to make some changes in things that are happening here."[31]

When the director was asked whether the Peace Studies Program has the potential of addressing itself to the problems of structural violence at Colgate, his response was, "Well, I would say that we not only have the potential, but we are doing this in some of our courses, but I would have to say that other courses in other fields have been doing this also... so it doesn't wholly depend on us, we don't have a monopoly on that subject matter and I'm personally glad that it's being dealt with in other fields as well as our own."[32]

Paul Harwick, the peace intern at Colgate, remembers when the first peace studies course was offered at Colgate. As he reflects on the activist nature of the course he said, "During the height of the anti-war movement, the peace studies

course(s) themselves did not allow for activism to be part of the course - though outside of the classroom, outside of that structure, the faculty and the students often found each other across the same table, figuring out the best way to plan a strike meeting, or deciding which congressman had the most crucial platform."[33] The faculty and students worked together to set up a peace center downtown. This center was completely separate from the University.

The student body has changed to some extent and there has been quite a turnover in faculty and staff positions. The senior faculty members who got the program started seemed to provide a clear-cut direction for the program, a direction which seemingly has not changed from the inception of the program. Harwick feels that, "the faculty doesn't support the students' efforts to generate anti-war activity on the campus. I am pretty sure they support the students' efforts to make Colgate treat women more fairly and equitable in admissions, but it is not their style to organize a rally, a sit-in or a leaflet."[34]

To a large extent the political mood of the college campus is changing back to what campuses looked like during the fifties. The increase of religious activities, fraternities and sororities, streaking, and emphasis on career has led the peace intern, Mark Landall, to say, "I find it next to impossible to get anti-war activities into the program because the activism today is not really peace studies oriented."[35]

While people in the program feel that there is some degree of unity between the women issue and peace studies, it is not directly related. However, there are students who feel that the courses in the Peace Studies Program give them the tools to attack social problems like the oppression of women.

H. The Peace Studies Faculty at Colgate

The faculty members involved in the program included Professor Clarence W. Young from the psychology department, Professor Robert Johnson from the political science department, Professor Charles S. Blighton from the history department, Professor Charles Naef from political science, Hunington Torell from philosophy, Theodore Herman from geography, and Mr. Mark Landall, peace intern. This group of faculty members also constituted a search committee which found the director of the Peace Studies Program at Colgate.

Approximately ten teachers are involved in teaching courses either on an individual basis or in team-taught courses at Colgate. There are another ten teachers who are involved in the program in various capacities, such as advising students and serving on committees.

The Peace Studies Program depends on the voluntary commitment of the individual faculty member. The director feels that his most difficult and challenging problem is in trying to entice faculty members from various disciplines in the University into believing that they have some special potential contribution to make in peace studies.

However there are other problems surrounding the selections and maintenance of peace studies faculty. The director reports:

> You run into some dismaying kinds of problems in trying to work that out. For example, we have a

> tenure system at Colgate under which there is suppose to be a rigid 55% quota for the tenured faculty. Temporarily it is up a little bit above that. But what this means is that some of the youngest and most creative members of the faculty who have the most to contribute to the Peace Studies Program lose their jobs after a short period on campus because there is no job available under the tenure program.[35]

The tenure quota has the effect of putting pressure on each young faculty member to spend more time working closely with their particular department, demonstrating their commitment to their particular field and doing the basic work of his own speciality without being too adventurous in getting involved in interdisciplinary work. The director further reports, "The whole tenure problem very much affects the teaching mix that you can develop in a peace studies program. I think that the tenure problem is a very special and serious one on this score. I hate to see some of our best people leave as they will at the end of this year and predictably some more next year."[36] Under these circumstances it is extremely difficult for the director to plan a curriculum with certain faculty members in mind for more than one year, especially those of course who are not tenured. There are some faculty members who have been with the program from the very beginning and continue to work closely with the program. One such person is Professor Theodore Herman, the first director of the Peace Studies Program at Colgate University, and one of the faculty members who participated in organizing the program and helped to develop the first course entitled, Problems of War and Peace.

I. The Colgate Peace Studies Director

Dr. Alan Geyer, an ethicist, a former journalist, and a political analyst, brings to the field of peace studies a rich background both in intellectual and spiritual depth. Richard Tedesco, a freshman reporter for the Colgate News in 1972 had this to say about the new peace studies professor as he reports on a speech Dr. Geyer made:

> Dr. Geyer's manner was unobtrusive and direct. He did not miss words and displayed no lack of wit. He approached his topic with the sobriety of a man who had spent much time and reflection on the subject of peace. The evening was impressive because it was not his intent to impress. Liberal emotionalism was not in evidence and praise the Lord he avoided the pitfall of attempting a stirring inspirational climax."[37]

Dr. Geyer feels that the Peace Studies Program endangers itself by relying too much on anti-war movement or fear of the draft.

In his opinion, the problem that the peace studies movement faces now is to establish stronger motivations and a stronger foundation and sentiments. In looking at the various approaches to peace studies and the many directions which peace studies programs can take at this particular time - one consideration has been given to conflict studies.

Dr. Geyer feels that conflict resolution and conflict studies is definitely a part of peace studies and can be related in some way but by no means should it be considered synonymous with peace studies. He feels that peace studies should not be a catch-all for all sorts of areas of study,

such as labor management conflict, race conflict, urban conflict, or sex conflict. He says, "that's too undisciplined a notion and too imperialistic a notion as to how broad peace studies ought to be."[38]

He is disappointed that the word peace has become a vulgar travesty as a result of a broad and undefined use of the term. He feels that it is very much commerically comparable to Coca-Cola. He points out that much of the sound and fury of the peace movement is a manifestation of just so much fadism among students in particular. In his opinion, international involvement and participation is a necessary aspect of the movement, but domestic justice is a required preference to the work of making peace.

Looking at the stern obligations of the task, he feels that peace-making requires a capacity to challenge ones own government, and thus a capacity to cope with conflict. He feels that the political power is the surest power for challenging a government and bringing about needed social changes that lead to peace.

While he works faithfully at nurturing the Peace Studies Program at Colgate University, he admits that he's unsure about the future of the program, although he remains optimistic about the outcome. With the present day financial crunch and faculty turnover due to the tenure system, it is uncertain as to the future of the Peace Studies Program at Colgate.

J. The Grading System in Colgate Peace Studies Program

In an interview with the director of the Colgate Peace Studies Program he explained the difficulties of grading in a team-taught course where you have three of four faculty members from different disciplines. The experience has been that each faculty member has its own idea of grading, and he generally applies his grading system to his particular discussion section of the team-taught course. The general policy has been to have each of the faculty members do his own grading of his own students according to his own methods.

There was a preliminary review among all the staff in an effort to work toward as much equity as possible without forcing the faculty member to give up his own individual habits. Generally the system works out fairly well, but occasionally a student will get caught in the gears of different practices among different faculty members.

Some faculty members have a reputation for being much tougher in their grading habits than others, so a student may get the word that if he is in Professor A's section, he'll have a tougher time pulling out a good grade than if he were in Mr. B's section.

The director, is faced with strong individualism on the part of the faculty as well as students. He finds it difficult to convince them to think, to learn, and to study and do research collegiately. He feels that a college is a place where people should learn to do intellectual work together.

It is reported that some of the same students who are most against the grading system are those who are most opposed to the kind of teaching and learning practices that might be unconventional and cause them to lose the opportunity to make a good record for themselves under the conventional grading system. Many students shy away from collective projects because they are afraid that their grades are going to be dragged down by someone else in the group. For the most part, not only the faculty members but also the students, tend to favor a more traditional approach in grading.

K. The Program Today

The Peace Studies Program at Colgate University has several foci. It concerns itself with international issues, national issues, and local issues. It gives some major attention to research of international issues with about half of the emphasis on action related to international issues; about half is devoted to future studies, political orientation of international issues. Some major attention is given to ecological, economic, historical, and racial issues on both the national and international level.

At the moment most of the decisions in the program are made by the director and the associated faculty members. There is some discussion going on at the moment as to whether this decision making group should be expanded, who should be involved in this decision making group, and the nature of the decisions that are to be made.

The funding for the program is mostly from an individual donor, some from school funds, none from government grants, a little from foundations, and none from program activities. Since the program started three years ago there has been no increase in the budget for the program. The present budget is slightly over $30,000 in direct budget, and some general support in faculty teaching, staff, services, and facilities.

The program had the experience of an increase in faculty participation since it started, and also an increase in student participation, and community involvement. There has

been a measurable decrease in administration involvement. There are approximately ten faculty members participating in the program in a teaching role, and about twenty others involved in various capacities such as counseling students and serving on committees.

There are approximately 300 students taking courses that are among the selected required courses for peace studies concentrators. There are six administrators who participate regularly in the program, but irregular participation on the part of community people. Most of the courses taught in the program are credit courses. There is however one non-credit seminar that is being offered in the program.

The Peace Studies Program at Colgate is associated with several departments. The director is in the political science department, and there are other teaching members in history, geography, social relations, psychology, philosophy and religion, and Russian studies. A predominate number of students are political science majors. The program offers a Bachelor of Arts degree, with a concentration in peace studies. However, each student who concentrates in peace studies is strongly encouraged by the faculty to take a traditional second major.

The effect of the de-escalation of the war in Viet Nam on the Peace Studies Program at Colgate has resulted in a decreasing interest in anti-war activity and the draft.

There is now more interest in long range problems of peace and world order.

The evaluation procedure used in the program involves student evaluation of all courses, reviewed by responsible administrators and an advisory committee. The director of the program feels that there are three key factors which will determine the continuation of the program - 1) funding potential; 2) student interests and enrollment; 3) tenure for associated faculty members. The program at Colgate is funded for five years and it is now into its third year. Therefore, the program is guaranteed for the next two years.

II. THE SYRACUSE NON-VIOLENCE STUDIES PROGRAM:

A. Background

In May of 1970 when the Cambodian invasion signaled an escalation of the war in Viet Nam, students and faculty at Syracuse University, as on many other campuses across the United States, responded with direct action protest demonstrations. Students carried signs expressing their outrage with the U. S. military involvement in Indochina and called for an immediate withdrawal of U. S. troops from Viet Nam.

The Syracuse students, realizing their University's involvement with the Reserve Officers Training Corp and Defense Department grants, also focused their protest on their University. Students went on strike. The University cancelled classes for the few weeks remaining in the semester. The students made demands on the government and the University. They circulated a petition asking students and faculty to support the idea of establishing non-violence workshop and discussion groups in the residential centers throughout the campus. These workshops focused on how the students might achieve their immediate goals through non-violent means and how to change Syracuse University into an institution to research and promote peace.

Charlie Walker, a non-violence trainer from Haverford College in Pennsylvania conducted workshops for the students and helped plan strategy for getting their demands met.

A committee of students and faculty was soon formed to

consider how non-violence studies might become a permanent feature of the University. Approximately sixty professors and over ninety per cent of the students remaining on the campus supported the idea of the University offering a non-violence course. The committee wrote a rough draft proposal for a non-violence program, a budget and a tentative course outline. This material along with the results from the petition was presented for consideration to the former dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, Dr. Prucha, (who is now vice-chancelor) by the committee, The dean agreed to consider the idea and in July the administration decided to support an experimental program of non-violence studies.

During the summer of 1970 the committee compiled information about non-violent programs at other universities. It sent out more than 100 letters, developed a bibliography and sent delegations to other campuses. Because of the summer vacation, only a few faculty and students were left on campus to plan the program. There was no official faculty committee involved in the planning and review of the newly developing program, because the Fall semester had not begun.

Jim Marti, a Ph. D. candidate in Political Science, at Stanford University, heard about the growing interest in non-violence studies at Syracuse University and wrote a letter to the Dean of Arts and Sciences inquiring about the program and stating that he would consider coordinating such a program. He was subsequently interviewed and hired for the job in

August. He was given the title, coordinator of Exploratory Studies in Non-Violence (ESIN) a lecturer at the University. He had the responsibility of teaching a non-violence course and developing and coordinating the new program.

The program was tentatively granted $20,000 in early September, 1970, by the administration to finance its (ESIN's) activities for the academic year, 1970-71. But by the time the program started in the Fall the amount was reduced to $14,500 due to budget problems.

Budget of ESIN

1970-71

Total Budget	$14,500
Expenditures:	
Personnel Salaries:	
James E. Marti (Coordinator, Ph. D. Candidate; Political Science)	10,500
Mary Menke (Part-time asst.)	2,150
Supplies and Materials	850
	$13,500
BUDGET REMAINING:	$1,000

Under the regulation of the University, the non-violence course had to be placed in some formal department or program, already existing in the University structure, as it was not possible to establish a new department without violating the formal procedures. Therefore, Dr. Sidney Thomas,

Chairman of the Department of Fine Arts, placed the course in his department until arrangements could be made to find a more appropriate home for the new course. The course was scheduled under Fine Arts as Humanities 480: A Seminar in Unstructured Inquiry, a designation available for an experimental, interdisciplinary course. The course was not developed in time to make the catalogue listings, therefore, publicity about the course had to be done by posted announcements and by word-of-mouth.

B. The First Year

Although students won their course demand in the Spring of 1970, some students were surprised to find that there was a non-violence program on the campus when they returned in the Fall. They were unaware that a small group of students and faculty who worked over the summer had made the necessary preparations for the course.

Several professors who had signed the petition during the Spring protest, agreed in the Fall to teach workshops which offered three hours credit. An impressive number of professors, students and community people put in requests either to give lectures or to conduct workshops in the non-violence program in the Fall of 1970. There was no problem getting people to teach courses in the program. No recruitment was necessary. They brought with them an assortment of personal concerns, strategies, academic interests and political theories to share with other interested parties. All of the workshops came under the title, Humanities 480: Seminar in Unstructured Inquiry.

The course was divided into twelve lectures and forty-one workshops (others were added later). Eight of the lectures were taught by professors from four different departments within the University. Three of the lectures were taught by Jim Marti, director of the Non-Violence Program and lecturer in Humanities, and there was one panel discussion. The first five lectures given in series were all focused on

the religious and ethical perspective of Non-Violence and the first three of them were given by professors in the Department of Religion and by a campus chaplain.

There is an interesting pattern to the order of the lecture series. The movement of the lecture suggests a careful design that follows a definite ideological trend. The trend moves from a World Religion frame of reference of non-violence to a national-Marxist critique of non-violence. The series starts out with a lecture entitled, "What Myth can tell us about Violence and Non-Violence," offered by David Miller, a professor in the Department of Religion and a noted writer of religious and non-violent literature and ends with the director giving a lecture entitled, "Non-Violent Change Here at Syracuse." The lectuures start on a theoretical plane and move toward practical action. Two other lectures were offered by Dr. Donald Meiklejohn, of the Department of Public Affairs, an outstanding scholar in his field, and Professor Robert Crane, director of South Asian Program, and the other lectures were by the program's director and distinguished professors from different departments on the Syracuse University campus.

The workshops were conducted by an even more diverse group of individuals. The instructors and workshop leaders posted topics and fixed a time and place for the meeting, and the workshops began. No one who desired to conduct a workshop was turned down. Among the instructors conducting the

workshops were undergraduate seniors, department chairmen, assistant professors from a variety of departments, a local lawyer and psychiatrist, a community organizer, local agency head, a student from LeMoyne (a local college) and other non-University people. More than twenty people volunteered to teach workshops without pay. (A list of selected workshops that were offered can be found in Appendix 8).

A cursory look at the courses listed in the appendix clearly indicates that there was a sense of freedom in approaching subject matter and topics which had not previously appeared as course titles. For the first time some students were able to have an entire course devoted to the discussion of ideas and concepts which were given very limited attention in the traditional courses. Not only could students discuss the ideas and concepts that were different from the norm, they were allowed to get course credit and in most cases a grade for participating in the course.

The other fact which can be picked up from the selected workshops which were offered at Syracuse University is the close interaction between the University and the community people. Community people no doubt attended affairs on campus on special occasions, and some perhaps visited classes and even spoke in a few. However, this appears to be the first time a community person was allowed to teach a University course that offered credit, without having presented the "proper credentials." The

course titles represented a broad spectrum of issues and problems but the one thing they all seemed to have in common is that they were all focused on a current problem.

The reading of course titles and course descriptions does not necessarily explain what the course contents will be, nor does it describe the teaching techniques to be employed. However, it is quite possible to gain a reasonable impression of what the focus of the course might be. This list of courses is to give the reader an indication of the broad range of courses offered in the Syracuse Program, the first semester. Each student, who anticipated receiving credit hours for taking a course, was expected to regularly attend a lecture and a workshop once a week.

There were no clear standards for any course or criteria established in advance for evaluation of the students' performance of instructors' performance. In many of the courses there were absolutely no requirements other than registering for the course. There was no way of determining what was actually happening in some of the courses. In some courses using a more structured approach and, involving required reading lists, specific topics for discussion, written assignments, and/or exams or final research papers, the students who did not fulfill the requirements risked failing the course. On the other hand, there were courses that represented a more permissive or counter-culture pedagogical style.

Many of the workshops were held off campus, sometimes in facilities donated by a community organization and sometimes in the homes of individuals. In some instances the

sessions moved from one place to another and students who were not in regular attendance experienced difficulty in finding their workshops since there was sometimes no communication with the program office once the course got started. It was extremely difficult to keep accurate records on the students enrolled in the various workshops, but the general attitude among the students indicated that something exciting was happening with their education.

During the first semester, there was a total of 400 students enrolled in 41 workshops and one course. Besides the coordinator, the budget provided for one graduate assistant, part-time secretarial help, office supplies, materials and funds for guest speakers. The structure for administering the program consisted of an advisory committee composed of workshop leaders. This committee met infrequently and its meetings were poorly attended. There appeared to be little coordination or supervision of the workshops which constituted the main emphasis of the program. In practice, the coordinator and his staff, comprised of graduate and undergraduate students and a volunteer from the Syracuse community, determined the policy and practices of the course. This pattern continued through the second year.

Before the end of its first semester, the Non-Violent program began to experience some difficulties. There were approxiamtely 400 students enrolled in the non-violent program. Many of these students represented the counter-culture

lifestyle and were therefore in conflict with traditional thinking and teaching methods. There were also some faculty members who clearly identified with the counter-culture lifestyle. Many others, however, especially the department heads and senior professors, evidenced more traditional lifestyles, and traditional thinking and methods of teaching.

It is reported that Dr. Donald Meiklejohn, a professor in the Department of Public Affairs at Syracuse University was scheduled to give a lecture entitled, "The Tradition of Non-Violence in America." Five minutes into his lecture, he realized that a large number of his sudience was smoking "pot." He walked out and did not return.

Criticism by the established faculty began to mount when they observed that student attendance at the lectures offered by the senior faculty members continually declined, while the unstructured workshops, especially those that were experimental in nature, were well attended. There are reports that the young people who organized the unstructured workshops and non-traditional lectures spent more time and energy on publicity than those organizing the traditional lecutres and workshops. This was one reason given for the difference in attendance. Or it could have been the "glamorous" titles of the workshops. It is believed by some that the administration of the program took a greater interest in publicizing the non-traditional workshops, showing little or

no support for the more sturctured courses.

There were reports that one workshop entitled "The Computer-Automated Disruption," was actually teaching students the process of jamming computers at the punch card level. There were other reports that students were being taught how to effectively disrupt the business community of Syracuse, how to organize boycotts and other forms of social dislocation. Some faculty members became gravely concerned for the program based on reports of students' behavior, contents of workshops and their personal experiences.

The program steadily lost senior faculty support while student support rapidly increased. There was a proliferation of radical courses titles in the listings. Courses were spread out all over the city and everybody was "doing his own thing."

In the report of the supervisory committee there is a recognition of this difficult period:

> The program became a subject of intense controversy. Many students and faculty, chiefly from outside the program, criticized the level of instruction, the system of grading, the subjects of workshops and the general deviation from the traditional liberal arts subjects, practices and standards. Others, most of whom were involved in the program, recognized many of the same shortcomings but ascribed most of them to the paucity of funds, the shortage of trained personnel, and the lack of sufficient staff and suitable office space.[39]

The faculty interpreted the conduct of the students as being an indication of their lack of seriousness about the program. Dr. Thomas, of Fine Arts, in an interview noted that

in some cases faculty who gave serious courses found students irregular in their attendance. However, there was a core of about twenty students who demonstrated a consistent commitment to the study of non-violence.

From the outset, there was a structure set-up to direct and give guidance to the program; it was felt that the proper structure was not used by the director of the program. The report points out that:

> Although an advisory committee consisting of the workshop leaders was formed, it met infrequently and was poorly attended. In practice the coordinator's staff, comprised of graduate and undergraduate students and a volunteer from the Syracuse community, determined the policy and practices of the course.[40]

But by the end of the first semester, the department heads and senior professors were visibly absent from the non-violent program. Many professors expressed deep disappointment in not being able to become a part of the program. Most of them quietly withdrew their participation while others expressed strong criticism of the students conduct and particularly that of the program's director.

It had seemed at first that Jim Marti was not only qualified and sincere but was capable of directing the non-violence program at Syracuse. His past experiences showed a commitment to non-violence studies, he had been actively involved in the peace and freedom movements, and he had done research at Lancaster University in England for his doctoral dissertation (to be entitled, "Non-Violent Re-

volution in America").

Several things apparently contributed to Jim Marti's catastrophe at Syracuse. To list a few, there did not seem to be a clear administrative structure into which the program as the director was placed. There were no clear lines of authority. Who was Jim Marti's supervisor and to whom did he report? This was a gross administrative error that probably should not be attributed to the director. There seemed to be an urgency to get a program started without the proper planning or guidelines that might have assured a sounder program from the start. The faculty as a group evidently failed to take a minimal interest in the program, but at least, setting normal standards for the program.

The director could have felt that the program came into existence as a result of student protest and student pressure, therefore, that it was a student program and that the program would continue on a student political power base. His behavior would seem to indicate that he ignored or was unaware of the power base of the faculty and administration. He did not attempt to or at least was not successful in gaining the support of the faculty. He rather relied on the support that came from the students, which required little or no effort on his part.

There were other factors. There seemed to be little or no coordination between the lectures that faculty members gave and the workshops that were offered. There was no

apparent integration of subjects and topics within the program. A supportive and involved group of faculty members possibly would have been able to help with such a problem.

C. The Move to Rescue the Program

Dr. Thomas, a professor who played a key role in developing the course and gaining acceptance for the course, recognizing that the program was in jeopardy, took the initiative in proposing an investigation of the program in hopes of putting the program back in good stead with the faculty and administration of the faculty. This happened in March of 1971. As one who was openly sympathetic to the program, he felt a responsibility to help save the program. He felt that there was still time to structure a credible program in non-violent studies. It was felt that the program had run into problems particularly within the workshops. Dr. Thomas felt that the workshops had to be more carefully supervised, if they were to be continued.

In April, 1971, during the course's second semester, an evaluation committee was appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. It consisted of four faculty members, a graduate student, and the Assistant Dean, Dr. Harry W. Peter, as chairman, In June, after an intensive investigation, the committee submitted a seven-page report in which it described the background, goals, organization, content, leadership, grading, and students of the program. It pointed out many inadequacies but concluded that "the philosophy, history, and practice of non-violence is a legitimate and worthwhile area of study for students enrolled at Syracuse University." The committee recommended that the course be continued but

placed outside the Arts and Sciences under the "New College"* for experimental programs, where it could receive adequate supervision and resources. It also recommended that the enrollment be limited in proportion to the available funds and talent to insure that "respectable academic standards are upheld," and it suggested the formation of a formal advisory council to determine the essentials of the program and provide supervision.

Although it was not then possible to transfer the program to a "New College," the committee's recommendations were followed in that non-violence studies was continued and a formal advisory council was constituted. The nonviolence course was taken from Humanities and designated for the fall semester as Public Affairs 307/607 with three hours credit. Within this course students enrolled in one of five sections, which were in the form of lectures or seminars. Two of the sections divided into several workshops. As so constituted, the course attracted 256 students. Marti continued as coordinator, the offices remained in Chapel House, and the budget was again limited to $14,500.

* New College is an interdisciplinary, experimental college that is planned at Syracuse University.

D. Second Year

In the Fall of 1971, the program continued with the same budget. The director had put in a request for an increase in his program budget, but it was denied by the University administration on the grounds that the funds were limited. The program continued with five courses, forty-three workshops and a student enrollment of 256. By this time there were only a few professors involved in the program. The cirticism of the counter-culture lifestyle represented in the workshops continued through the second year. (See a list of workshops offered during fall semester: Appendix 9)

The budget request and proposal for the second year called for an expansion of program and additional staff. Although the University had not made a commitment to increase the budget the following year, it was hoped, on the part of the director, that the University would recognize the natural growth in the program and respond to the growing needs of the administrator and the program.

In many cases the topics that students were interested in were topics those faculty members were not prepared to teach. The courses listed in the appendix were courses which could only be taught by those committed to the ideas and concepts. This naturally fell upon the students. The program experienced an increase in student involvement and a decrease in faculty involvement.

By the second semester, the program had picked up approximately 250 students involved in over 40 lectures and workshops. The courses were divided into six different sections. Section 1 focused on comparing various non-violent theories, section 2 was entitled, Search for Holistic Life Styles, section 3 was entitled, International Communities and Alternative Life Styles, section 4 was entitled, Comparative Non-Violent Social Movement: India and America, section 5 was entitled, The Good University, section 6 was entitled, Counter-cultural Media. A workshop was given entitled, "Applied Conservative Thought." The workshop was offered by a student, Neil Wallace, president of the campus chapter of the Young Americans for Freedom.

The guidelines for the courses are stated under general information (Appendix 10). The procedures for running the course were democratic and consensual. Students in consultation with lecture leaders and workshop leaders decided what materials would be read and discussed; how grades would be allocated; what work would be required in terms of readings, papers, journals, projects, and examinations. (Selected examples of workshops in the various sections can be found in Appendix 9)

These workshops were directed toward investigating new life styles through traditional institutions, art forms and rituals. Not only were the students interested in discovering new life styles, but as indicative in the second course, methods were also important.

Workshops:

Workshops concentrated on what the students planned to do after they left school. The workshops served as testing, learning and exploring ground for future alternatives. They were organized around industries, careers and lifestyles. For example, several artists formed one workshop to develop alternatives for artists. They, as well as those in all other workshops, found the place or places where they could live comfortably within the Culture of Life. Another workshop was the Print Media Workshop. Here several students interested in the writing, printing and distribution involved in the print media studied the alternative available to them. Focus was on pamphleting (writing, printing and distribution), country presses (several were visited) and other alternatives. Other workshops included Education, Legal Electric Media, Farming, Manual Labor, Medical, Free Stores, the Movement, Photography, Architecture, Psychology, Theater, Social Work, Small Business, Zookeeping, and on and on. Although the workshop titles may sound capitalistic, the course orientation was promised to be quite the opposite.

Workshops were to be selected at registration; they were chosen during the first week of the course. Students were expected to have a clear idea of what type of workshop they were interested in by the first meeting. Workshops meet as desired but at least two hours a week. Each workshop developed and completed one collective project during the semester. (See Let Freedom Reign - Appendix 11)

These courses were selected to point out that there was such a variety in form, subject matter and content, that it was difficult to make generalizations about the workshops. Some workshops were indeed open-ended and others were tightly structured with required readings and written assignments on the course materials. "The Good University" led by Ralph Ketcham and Paul Finkelman is a well-structured course, but it also was a popular course in the program which drew respect from other faculty as well as students.

During the school year a committee on nondepartmental courses and programs of the College of Arts and Sciences was set up as an important focal point for innovation and experimentation in the development of curriculum that did not fit well into the existing departmental framework of the college.

However, the location of the course was not the factor that engendered the controversy. The workshops drew the main focus of attention. In both the University and the community there was criticism of the workshop titles, the grading procedure, student attendance, the behavior of the students in workshop, such as pot-smoking, beer drinking and street language. The workshops were opened to the community residents without charge. For the first time there was the opportunity for community people to examine a university course.

In December of 1971, the coordinator of nonviolence studies was notified that he would not be rehired. But there was a strong sense that the program would still continue. The advisory committee began the search for a new director of the program.

E. Syracuse Non-Violence Studies Program Today

The search for a new director continued through the Spring and most of the summer. In August, the new director, Mr. Neil Katz, was hired to inherit the budget with the hopes of reshaping the program to fit the academic standards of the university. The director was hired with a two-year contract. He has in his budget provision for two part-time secretaries and one part-time assistant.

Having been hired only a few weeks before the semester began, the new director was unable to develop the new courses for the program and have them placed in the catalogue or registration information. The new director had to publicize his new courses through informal channels, as had the previous director. This may account for the comparatively small number of students who registered for the courses. It was actually the smallest registration since the program started in the Fall of 1970. There were five courses, seven workshops offered for the forty-three students who enrolled in the non-violence student courses.

The five courses were entitled, "Introduction to the Intellectual History of Non-Violence," "Non-Violent Change in America," "Introduction to Non-Violent Conflict Resolution," "Models of International Peace," "Introduction to the Socio-Political Theory of Non-Violence" and a seminar. It is interesting to note that each course title contains the word peace or non-violence. This was only somewhat true the first semester the program started in 1970. In one sense

it seemed as though the program was starting all over again. Mr. Katz felt the burden of attempting to save a dying program.

Mr. Katz feels that it is extremely important to establish stability and continuity in the program if it is going to gain respectability and confidence from the students and faculty. He admits that he has a difficult task in his efforts to change the image of the program and yet preserve some of the strengths of the program.

The five courses and seminar mentioned above will be offered over a two-year period under the title of Non-Violence Studies. Phase II would represent a further development of the interim organization and would be made possible by an increase in funds. Phase III would be the establishment of a Department of Non-Violence Studies.

The new procedure for individuals desiring to teach workshops involves being passed by a screening committee of faculty and students. Teachers are primarily judged on the bases of their personal characteristics and how well their course is outlined. Students desiring to teach a course must have their application accompanied by a recommendation from a faculty member.

The director states that his most difficult problem is getting faculty members involved in teaching courses in the program. At the moment, the Non-Violence Studies Program has been unable to organize a steering committee with faculty involvement. The faculty members on the steering committee

are not teachers in the program and consequently have no vested interest in the program. They function as overseers rather than faculty advocates of the program. He is convinced that if he can not gain more faculty support the program is not going to develop into a department. His most recent move to gain faculty support was to send out over 900 letters in the form of a questionnaire. (See Appendix 12-12b)

The program is undoubtedly affected by the recent changes in the administration. The former dean is now vice-chancelor of the University and has not expressed an interest in the program. The Acting Dean is in no position to make a commitment to the program, as his commitment may not be continued by the incoming Dean of Arts and Sciences.

However, the new director continues to work as if he sees the vision, while he reserves his doubts. (See the guidelines for the 1973 year in the Appendix 11)

The guidelines and listing of courses and workshops represent a decrease in the number of courses being offered. When questioned on this, the new director said that he was very much concerned about the quality of each course offered in the program and his concern was with establishing solid courses as opposed to a variety of courses.

He had as his main goal the task of getting faculty support for the program and continuing the program beyond the experimental period of three years. In addition to faculty support, there was a need for administration support.

From the point of view of the faculty, it is much more difficult to analyze, because while the behavior of the faculty is seemingly clear, it is not easy to determine the whys behind their actions. As was pointed out in a previous section of this paper, the faculty initially demonstrated a strong desire for the non-violence studies course and the program. Many faculty members signed the petition favoring the non-violent course during the spring protest. However, after the first semester, the majority of the faculty who taught courses the first semester pulled out of the program without offering clear explanation for their departure.

The present director, Neil Katz, apparently feels that most of the faculty members left the program because they were turned-off by controversial reports they heard related to conduct of students in other courses in the program and unacceptable behavior they themselves observed on the part of the students. Many of the traditional professors took umbrage when students rejected their traditional course content and many professors undoubtedly felt that they were not needed or appreciated. But on the other hand, if professors felt a commitment to the program, they would have treated the problem with an eye toward resolving it, rather than withdrawing from the program, which was only a way out for themselves and clearly not action helpful to the newly formed program.

But the students' rejection of traditional professors' teaching methods was not the only reason professors pulled

out of the program; this is an all too simple explanation for a more complicated situation. It must be pointed out here that no university professor was reimbursed for his services. Dr. Thomas reports that some faculty members lost enthusiasm because they did not believe the program was developing. In addition, their volunteer enthusiasm diminished after the first semester. Their department chairmen and others stimulated interest in other areas. Many professors who do not have tenure have to demonstrate their competence in their own field to the satisfaction of their department chairman and colleagues. They, therefore, could not afford to devote more time to the non-violent program, especially when they were under pressure to produce in their own departments.

It also appears that little or no effort was made to bring established professors into the program. They could have easily felt that their services were not wanted. The director could have gone on the assumption that since there was no need to recruit faculty members during the first semester, there was no need to recruit faculty for the second semester. Since the program was increasing in the number of people willing to teach courses, it may have been difficult to recognize that the program was facing some serious difficulty. We must also look to see if the director's perception contributed in any way to the problem of faculty withdrawal. Assuming that a large student political base was the source of power on the campus and realizing that student

protest helped to bring the program into being, it would be easy to assume that the students had the power to determine the direction of the program. The fact that no workshop was turned down by the program director and no criteria for workshops was set suggest that one of the goals was to allow as many students to get involved in the program as possible with little consideration of the subject matter being taught or learned.

While Dr. Thomas believes that education should be stimulating to students and teachers and that educators should seek innovation, he too questioned some of the workshops. He felt that too large a proportion of the workshops did not represent a sound academic program. They did whatever they wanted to do. The workshops were "far-out".

Most of the faculty and administrators interviewed did not object to students engaging in the kind of workshops where students planned protest activities, developed community service projects, or discussed their personal problems. However, most of those interviewed questioned whether the University should give three academic credit hours and a grade to students participating in an unlimited number of such workshops. Mr. Katz reported two important observations: 1) only five percent of the students enrolled in workshops attended the lectures; 2) ninety-two percent of the grades given at the end of the first year were A's. These reports drew further criticism from faculty members.

There was a feeling among some professors that maybe students should be allowed to take one such course for credit each semester, but that to allow these kinds of courses to represent the students course load was highly questionable from a sound academic point of view.

Acting Dean Ginsberg felt that the program should offer straightforward academic courses. This would offer the best means of survival for the program from a political standpoint. Students should be expected to do readings, demonstrate commitment to the area and engage in serious intellectual pursuits. The academic community had to be convinced that the program was serious. He questioned to what extent a university could become a community action program. There should be an opportunity for students to engage in field studies, and action, but this should take place in the context of academic research and intellectual exchange furthering knowledge. Ginsberg felt that while the program had had its problems, it nevertheless has made some impact on the university. One such impact was seen in the fact that other departments were beginning to offer comparable courses.

Department chairmen and senior faculty can demonstrate commitment by teaching a course in a separate peace or non-violent department or program.

It is also quite possible for department heads and senior faculty to encourage or discourage other faculty members in their concerns for teaching these courses. Giving time off for special preparation of peace or non-violent studies courses

or giving a faculty member a lesser course load to free him to teach such courses, are ways for department heads and senior faculty members to demonstrate their support for faculty members who are interested in contributing to peace and non-violent studies.

Finally it must be pointed out here that the faculty as a body was not involved with the program at Syracuse in the beginning. Their level of commitment was uncertain in the early stages. The program did not go through the normal channels of faculty review. When the faculty took its first action in regards to the program, it was to set controls for the future by establishing guidelines where none existed.

F. The Location of the Courses in the Administrative Structure

Where the courses are placed in the university or college structure may very well determine how the courses are viewed by the administration and faculty as well as their level of commitment to the courses. The area or department in which the courses are located can indicate which faculty takes the greatest interest in the courses or it might be an indication of future direction of the courses. The location of courses sometimes suggests the framework of the course as well as the contents. In any case, the location of the courses will determine how they are viewed by those in other disciplines.

Among those who agree that these courses belong on the campus, no one seems to be certain as to where Peace and Non-Violence courses belong in the campus curriculum. Guided by that uncertainty, many of these courses are found cradled in departments or programs of the peace enthusiast or in a non-department of the college or university. These sub-divisions of the university are sometimes designated as non-departmental programs, university studies or interdisciplinary programs. Many times these sub-divisions provide a more suitable structure for a non-violent/peace studies program, especially if it is a structure that offers more flexibility.

The Syracuse program was transferred from the Humanities departments to the Public Affairs Department. The Non-Violence Supervisory Committee of 1971-72 recommended that the department be placed in the New College, all university program,

once it is established. The program is considered to be a cross-disciplinary department that will eventually grant a degree in non-violence studies.

By placing the Non-Violence Studies department in New College, the program would have the freedom to initiate experiments in teaching techniques and offer the flexibility that such a program should offer.

III. MANHATTAN COLLEGE PEACE STUDIES PROGRAM

A. Manhattan College Background

Manhattan College is approximately 120 years old. It was founded in 1848 by four brothers of the Christian schools who were members of the St. John's Baptist de la Salle Teaching Congregation. When it was first organized it was called St. Vincent's Academy and was located on Canal Street in New York City. The school has had other moves and has had a name change twice. The school is now located along Manhattan College Parkway in New York near 242nd Street and Broadway, the Riverdale section of New York City. It is strategically located near the Henry Hudson Parkway with easy commuting distance between New Jersey, Long Island, West Chester, Rocklin Counties, and other communities which makes the college easily accessible by New York state's roadway.

In 1863 the school's enrollment was approximately 45 students. Now the college has more than 4,300 students coming from 14 states and 38 foreign countries. In 1921 the school had three buildings in the Riverdale section of New York, now the school has over twenty-five buildings erected on the Riverdale campus site. The school was organized primarily to train young men. According to the founders, the purpose of the school was to: "give to young men who possess the proper qualifications, the opportunity to broaden their intellectual horizon by increased culture, a refine-

ment of morals, mind, and taste, and in this way to prepare them in a suitable manner for the various professions."[41]

Because Manhattan College is a private independent, church related school, it is very much concerned with the moral, artistic, social and professional as well as the intellectual development of the student. The college proposed to offer to its students the opportunity to explore basic religious and philosophical questions; and to critically examine the relationship between religion and other facets of modern life as well as to freely investigate the meaning and implications of religious commitments.

In December of 1972 the Board of Trustees changed its policy from an all male school to a coeducational institution, and the admission of women began in September of 1973. However prior to this change of policy, the school had shared a close cooperative relationship with Mount St. Vincent, (a Catholic, women's college which is located a little over two miles from Manhattan College). In 1964 Manhattan College inaugurated a cooperative program with Mount St. Vincent which broadened the opportunities for students at both colleges, sharing the libraries, laboratories, offices, and even some professional faculties. The colleges began working in close cooperation with the biology, chemistry, classics, English, modern languages, and psychology departments at Manhattan. Students from Mount St. Vincent were allowed to register for courses at Manhattan College, and students from Manhattan

College were allowed to cross register for courses at Mount St. Vincent. This was particularly the case with courses in the schools of arts and science, and the school of teacher preparation.

Manhattan offers degrees in several programs including the school of arts and science were a student may get a degree in the liberal arts curriculum or the science curriculum. A student can earn a degree in the school of engineering, the school of business, the school of teacher preparation, physical education, or the school of general studies. Any of these majors lead to a Bachelors of Science in general studies, foreign business administration, or radiology and health sciences. In this particular curriculum an Associate of Arts degree in applied science is also offered in radiological sciences. The student can also continue in the upper division and receive a Bachelor of Arts degree in science, or in radiological and health sciences. Manhattan also has a graduate division which offers a Masters of Arts in science and education and engineering, environmental chemical engineering.

While Manhattan College is not a wealthy college, it offers scholarships and grant programs ranging from $300 to $2,000 a year. Tuition at Manhattan College runs a little over $1,000 including fees. In recent years Manhattan College has experienced a large number of minority and low income students - Chicanos and blacks mainly from the New York and

New Jersey area, thus signaling a clear change in the composition of the student body, from all white males to an increase of ethnic minority students and women. The spacious grounds and land scaping sets the campus off into a fairly isolated residential community, yet located rather close to public transportation. The school has a strong science program, physics, chemistry, biology, in addition to its liberal arts tradition. The introduction of the Peace Studies Program in Manhattan College offers a new dimension to its curriculum expansion.

B. The Origin of The Program

Whenever one tries to understand the origin of a program or a social action movement, it is necessary to go beyond the initiation period and understand that these programs do not grow out of a vacuum, but are a necessary part of a continuum. Therefore in order to put the origin of the particular program in its proper perspective, it is important to understand the kind of elements in the particular environment that created the forces leading to the establishment of the peace studies program on a college campus. An understanding of that earlier environment will be useful in understanding the evolutionary links between the genesis of the program and its actual initiation.

To understand the development of the Peace Studies Program at Manhattan College, it is necessary for one to review a series of events which predated the eventual establishment of the peace studies program. The original idea was drawn from the Pacem in Terris encyclical promulgated by Pope John XXIII and was given emphasis from the subsequent Pacem in Terris Convocation organized by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in February of 1965 in New York City.[42] Further reinforcement came when the Fund for the Republic took a public position recognizing that something conscious must be done in the area of peace.[43]

The Program at Manhattan College was partly inspired by

the well-established military science program at Manhattan College and the problems of war have long been accorded a place in the curriculum of the graduate courses. The military science program at Manhattan College is entitled Area Space Studies and has an established position in the undergraduate college. It is a financially attractive program in that all students enrolled in the four year program and those students applying for the two year program are eligible for Air Force ROTC college scholarships; cover full tuition, laboratory expenses, incidental fees, and an allowance for books. In addition to scholarships for some, junior and senior cadets receive a non-taxable stipend of $100 per month.

This attractive military science program in the undergraduate faculty in Manhattan College was not counter balanced by any kind of peace studies program or emphasis on peace courses. Some faculty members at Manhattan College were quite concerned about this disequilibrium.

In the Spring of 1966, about thirty-two Manhattan College faculty members founded the Pacem in Terris Institute. The founding members included members of the faculty from different academic specialties and various political persuasions, representing a broad political spectrum. The mission of the Pacem in Terris was to develop formal academic programs on the nature and problems of peace. The founding members felt that peace would be achieved when an entire generation could be

educated in such a discipline that taught the causes of war and the solutions to the problems of peace.

In their constitution they state the objectives and purpose of the Pacem in Terris Institute.

> The founding members of the Institute are aware that the study of military science and problems of war have long been accorded a place in the curriculum of undergraduate colleges, including Manhattan College, believe that it is both academically feasible and morally desirable to provide a place in the curriculum of the college for the study of the nature and the problems of peace. The Institute will seek to introduce into the curriculum of the college such course material related to the achievement and maintenance of a peaceful world as is deemed proper for normal studies. In addition, the Institute will promote the development of new insights and information by sponsoring research meetings, symposia, discussions, reports, and publications, and will further disseminate scientific and scholarly information by means of lectures and community programs.[44]

As we can see from the early stages of the Pacem in Terris Institute, there was a concern and desire to go beyond Manhattan College with the concept of peace education.

After the Institute was founded, the constitution was approved by the administration fo the College. A Board of Directors governs the Institute and an Executive Committee coordinates its day-to-day activities. Membership in the Institute is open to anyone interested in furthering the aims of the Institute as stated in the constitution. The Institute sees several tasks before it. One is to educate its faculty members and develop their resources and competencies in the area of peace education. The second task is to develop courses on peace and introduce them into the college curriculum.

The third and most significant task is to recruit additional faculty members and win over the administration support for the program.

The first peace studies course offered at Manhattan College was entitled, Anatomy of Peace. It was taught by Dr. Robert J. Christen, a faculty member from the history department and one of the Institute's founding members. Dr. Christen felt that the Pope's encyclical was important because of the man behind it and his feelings that it was possible to do something about the great problems of mankind. Professor Christen was well suited to teach the course because he was also the Vice Chairman of the Pacem in Terris Institute. When the course was first given in the Fall of the semester of 1966-67, it included twenty-five students and seven other instructors who gave from one to three lectures each during the semester.

This course was assigned to Professor Christen by his history department. Professor Christen takes a reflective view toward peace education. He feels that the faculty are still amateurs at developing peace studies courses and are still trying to find out if the class room could do anything in working toward peace.

In addition to the course taught by Dr. Christen, which primarily discussed problems related to war and peace, a number of other instructors experimented with materials in their particular courses. The Pacem in Terris encyclical was

introduced in a theology course taught by Professor Gargiulo of the theology department. Dr. Tom Stonier, who is a biology professor and an organizer of the Pacem in Terris Institute and the first chairman of the group, introduced the peace theme in his course entitled, Great Experiments in Biology, He devoted a better part of the lecture on radiation biology to discussing the effect of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

This concept of introducing peace materials into existing courses began to attract other faculty members and thereby gained some support for the Institute. In looking back at the early days, Joseph Fahey, the director, remembers that the first major problem they faced when they introduced the courses in the college was the courses' academic credibility. But he recalls that the courses were first introduced at the height of the civil rights anti-war movement. Some faculty feared that the course might just be a discussion group or it might just be a course on the anti-war activity or a course on how to organize demonstration. However, when the faculty members started introducing peace-oriented materials in their existing courses, the academic credibility of the program was strengthened.

As time went on, more courses were introduced. In the theology department Morality of Peace was offered to explore the religious perspectives of the problem of peace in the world. The philosophy department offered a course in

Philosophies of War and Peace, Utilizing an indepth consideration of the classical and contemporary philosophical literatures on the question of war and peace. The first peace course offered, Anatomy of Peace, was an interdisciplinary lecture course involving several departments exploring the theories of peace, conditions that stabalize peace, and the ways that nations historically have fallen into and out of peace.[45]

This was new for Manhattan College and some faculty and students simply did not understand the concept when it was first introduced. Manhattan College was not challenged by the pedagogical issues surrounding teaching the values, or by questions of whether values belong in the academic community as part of a course. Because Manhattan College is a religiously sponsored college, it is taken for granted that values belong.

The Peace Studies Program at Manhattan College not only introduces peace courses, but it also challenges traditional educational philosophy which fails to look at a central problem from many different disciplines. As a way of increasing the sophistication among the faculty members, symposia, research, luncheon discussions, reports, publications, and lectures were introduced as part of the program. The Institute began the publication of a newsletter for the purpose of facilitating communication among the members and friends of the Institute. The Manhattan College program saw itself becoming a national resource in peace education, and their

boundaries did not end at the borders of Manhattan College.

In the initial stage of the Institute, it was their goal and their hope to explore and experiment with different types of techniques for learning peace in the classrooms during the year, and hoping these attempts would provide the Institute with additional concrete experiences useful in their own activities and also to other education institutions.

The Institute had its first major convocation in April of 1967. The objectives of the Institute's Inaugural Convocation included the following:

1. To announce formally the establishment of the Institute to the academic, diplomatic, and intellectual community and agencies and to individuals interested in the cause of peace.

2. To develop an awareness in educators of the necessity of initiating a systematic and continuous wroughtly based program for the study of the problems of war and peace.

3. To review the available information in many disciplines and branches of knowledge that could be brought to bear on this problem.

4. To consider how the available knowledge could be incorporated into the formal academic programs offered by institutions of higher education at every level.

5. To create a community of peace scholars which would have as its primary professional concern the systematic study of the problems of war and peace.

6. To provide a basis for broadening and making more relevant the educational process.[46]

The major address on this occasion was delivered by Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations. It is

reported that over 1,000 people crowded into the college's auditorium for the Secretary General's address.

In addition to the panelists, which included more than sixty participants from many disciplines and nations with a variety of religions and philosophical beliefs, some 300 educators participated in the panel discussions. The Convocation received worldwide attention and Pope Paul VI sent a personal letter extending his support for the Convocation.[47]

The Pacem in Terris Institute saw this Convocation as a vehicle to bring together many people throughout the educational system who were concerned about the problems of peace and war, but who had not yet found the way, the techniques, and the methods to introduce them into classrooms. The Pacem in Terris Institute in effect felt that it did not have these answers, but that maybe together through communication, through discussions, through experiments and feedback between people involved in this field, the participants might in some way help to enlighten the peace oriented community throughout the educational system.

The other objective was to bring a large number of people together to generate the kind of publicity and attention for these programs and ideas and thus create a strong political influence that had to be recognized in the whole educational field.

The panels included physical, natural and social scientists, philosophers, theologians, lawyers, administrators,

military men, and political advisor. Among them were Herman Kahn, Director of the Hudson Institute for Policy Studies, John Courtney Murray, a Jesuit theologian, and Mihallo Markovic, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Belgrade.[48] The topics discussed by the panelists during the workshop and the various sessions included the nature of nuclear war, value systems in peaceful societies, and economic development.

In preparation for this inaugural or convocation, the Pacem in Terris Institute sponsored a consultant assembly to seek advice and assistance in planning the inauguration and improving the quality and scope of its activities. This assembly took place in May of 1966. The Institute felt that its responsibility meant more than discussions among faculty members involved in the Institute. They felt a responsibility to reach out and involve students and other organizations and groups on the campus.

As one way of arousing the interest in the problems of war and peace on Manhattan College campus, a number of campus activities were organized, the most important of which was the Pacem in Terris Week in November of 1966. The theme was "Building a Stable World Community," highlighted by two panel discussions, "Building a Stable Community at Home" and "Building a Stable Community Abroad."

The first panel focused on local community problems and involved community leaders and officials in the New York area

discussing the problems and concerns of their constituents. The second panel included representatives from the United Nations and from the soci-economic division of the Catholic Relief and well-known scholars and journalists concerned with international relations.

Pacem in Terris week involved students, faculty and community people discussing the grave problems of peace and war and the problems of violence in both international and national communities. Approximately 300 people attended the two panel discussions. It was considered a small but significant beginning.

It is important to note that this week did not go by without some reaction showing the extent of some of the problems that peace studies programs must overcome. For example, the Quadrangal, which is the local campus newspaper, of November 16, 1966, had headlines on the front page which said - "Communist and Monsignor Confer on Peace Thursday Night." There were also significant articles in both the New York newspapers as well as the campus newspapers. This activity began to generate several articles and publications drawing attention to the problems of war and peace.

The Institute also sponsored a convocation on April 26, 1967, the anniversary of the Pacem in Terris encyclical. In March, 1968, it held its annual Pacem in Terris Week, this time it was directed toward the problems of internal strife in the city of New York. This was a smaller symposium and

convocation entitled "Racial Justice and Peace in New York." The meeting provided an opportunity for a frank exchange of views among people intimately concerned with the volatile, pressing issues of the New York area.

Governor Nelson Rockerfeller delivered the convocation address. After a day of discussions, honorary degrees were presented to Mr. Theodore W. Kheel, attorney and labor arbitrator, to Mr. Whitney M. Young, executive director of the National Urban League, and to the Honorable Nelson A. Rockerfeller, Governor of the State of New York.[49]

In August of 1968 the International Pax Romana Conference took place in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Pacem in Terris Institute had the opportunity to host an assembly of approximately 75 scholars from 40 different countries on their way home from the International Conference. This added to the Institute's impact on the Manhattan College campus and furthered the concept of peace and legitimacy of a peace studies program.

On April 18, 1970, Manhattan College cosponsored with the Student Forum on International Order and World Peace and the Student Peace Council at Manhattan College, a day long conference on "Education for Peace."

Approximately 65 people attended the meeting. There was intensive discussion centered around peace as a curriculum item in our education institutions. It focused on the practical aspect of education itself and ways of bringing

together a wide variety of people interested in the plan of peace courses. The purpose of the conference was to give the participants an opportunity to discuss common problems they were having in the whole field of peace education. Also, this was an opportunity to try out some ideas among the fellow participants and to work on the development of peace studies programs at various colleges from which they came.

In May of '69 the Institute was awarded the annual citation of the Riverdale Chapter of the United Nations Association in recognition of outstanding public service that supports the United Nations or ideas it stands for.[50] During the 1969 school year, the members of the Pacem in Terris Institute began intensive work on developing courses in peace studies that would be offered the following year. The Institute was able to get the Curriculum Committee to approve seven courses which would be added to the curriculum under the title of Peace Studies. Because this was an interdisciplinary set of courses, the Arts and Science Curriculum Committees had to make the final approvals. Once the proposal for the peace studies courses was approved, the Academic Vice President gave his final approval. This was accomplished by intensive consultation with various faculty members and administrators prior to a formal presentation of the proposal. An eighth course was added in the Spring of 1971 which gave the curriculum a total of eight courses.

While the members of the Institute had been working on developing courses in the area of peace studies, they had not formalized any plans to offer a major as such until Michael McFadden, a sophomore psychology major, approached them and asked why he could not minor in peace studies. McFadden had enrolled in his freshman year in physics but felt that after a short time the field was too technical for him. He wanted to get involved with helping the people in a very direct way, and he felt that the area of peace studies afforded him such an opportunity. The executive members of the Pacem in Terris Institute received Mike's suggestion with great enthusiasm, and Mike chose to spend the summer writing other institutions inquiring as to whether there were other institutions offering majors in peace studies.

Mike McFadden felt that the real test for the success of peace studies programs was the involvement of students and the seriousness of their approach to the issues and problems related to peace. He felt that the problems of peace and war could not be solved by enthusiasm alone or by yelling peace now. He felt that there was a need to develop a solid background on human conflict before one could achieve human peace.[51]

The peace studies major was officially offered beginning the academic year of 1971. During the summer of 1971, the Institute cosponsored workshops for high school teachers with a view toward stimulating education on the secondary level.

There were approximately forty teachers who attended the workshops and there is a program now underway to spread the idea throughout the school system.

C. The Program

In an attempt to get a comprehensive scope of the program at Manhattan College, one must take a look at the program from the point of view of its involvement in international, national and local issues and problems.

The Manhattan program concentrates a great deal on research of international issues. Action is a very high priority in their program. One area of the program is devoted to future studies and political aspects of international issues. Some time is given to ecological kind of problems. Very little attention is given to economic problems on the international level, but there is a high concentration on the history of international issues. Very little attention is given to racial issues on the international level.

On the national level, the program is involved in very little research. A small amount of the program's energy is devoted to action on national issues. Very little attention is given to future studies related to national issues. The program is oriented toward political and ecological issues. Again, a fair amount of the program's attention is focused on relationships relative to national economics. The program is oriented toward the historical aspect of national issues, and about the racial problems and issues.

The program devotes no time to research on local issues; about half on action related to local issues; very little to political issues on the local level; and about

half devoted to ecological problems on the local level. No attention devoted to the economic problems and historical problems, and about half the program relates to racial problems on a local level.

The decision-making body for the Manhattan program consists mostly of faculty members; about half students; very few community people; very few people in administration and no staff people.

The program gets very little of its funds from individual donors; most support comes from the school funds; none comes from government grants; and a little funds from private foundations; and none from program activities. The present budget of the program is $50,000.

Since the program started the budget has increased; the faculty involvement has increased; the student involvement has increased; the community involvement has increased; the administration involvement has remained the same. There are approximately thirty faculty members involved in the program, and about one thousand students, about eight community people, two administrators, and no staff people.

The program now offers eighteen courses for credit and about fourteen of those courses are graded courses. There are approximately ten faculty members teaching in the program, and about five advising and consulting with students.

The director anticipates that there is no end to the program. It is not limited by a certain time or period. He

felt that the major factors that will determine the successful continuation of the program would be student interest and faculty involvement. The program at Manhattan College is not associated with a particular department but is rather interdepartmental and interdisciplinary.

The de-escalation of the war in Southeast Asia has had no affect on the program, mainly because the program was not initiated in response to the Viet Nam war.

The program now offers a B.A. degree in peace studies and there are discussions underway about the possibility of offering a Master's degree in peace studies. The evaluation procedures used in this particular program involve students and faculty, and it's more self critical in its approach than having an outside evaluation.

D. Peace Studies Students at Manhattan College

In an effort to get an understanding of the students at Manhattan College, the author conducted several formal interviews with students involved in the Peace Studies Program. The essential questioning focused on the attitude towards the program and specifically the courses they had taken or were taking at the time. In an attempt to experiment with a new type of interviewing, the author interviewed some peace studies students while non-peace studies students were present. Not only were these students non-peace studies students, but these were students who had not heard of the peace studies program at Manhattan College before.

One of the students interviewed was Frank Handley, who is a peace studies major and also a psychology major at Manhattan College. He first heard of the program through an advertisement in a Washington D.C. newspaper. He also had the opportunity to look at some pamphlets which gave the course descriptions and a general critique of the courses that were being offered at Manhattan College. At the time he'd been out of school and was living in Washington D.C., but was planning to return to New York to live.

When he learned of the program at Manhattan College, he thought it was the most interesting work that he could do at that particular time. He decided that the program and the ideas presented corresponded with his thoughts at the time; so upon arriving in New York, he went over to further

investigate the Peace Studies Program at Manhattan College. In his own words he says,

> I could have gone to a few other places, but the program here seemed interesting, a bit more interesting. I mean there was something here that I think that I could become a part of rather than being in another place and just being a student attending classes and going my own way. This curriculum here, well it gave me more involvement in my own life, it was just more pleasing to me.[52]

Frank Handley felt that the program really satisfied his expectations because he went to the program with an open mind. He was unsure of how people would approach the courses or how they would be taught, but he felt in general that the program had strong appeal to him. He said,

> I have taken both Joe Fahey's courses, The Religious Dimensions of Peace, and Non-Violent Revolution, and those I really found pretty good for myself. One particular aspect of the non-violence was something that was new to me. It's something that you always hear about but that I never really truly understood. I had my own conception of it, but then through reading and talking about it I really found out a little bit more about what it is. And that had an impact on me. I mean that there are alternative methods to reaching a peaceful settlement.[53]

The author wanted to inquire as to the attitude of these students toward the courses they were taking, and how the courses compared with the other traditional courses they were taking. Questions dealing with whether or not they were difficult or easy courses, or whether courses inspired the students to do more outside reading beyond the regular assigned work, and generally what sort of impact these courses were making on the lives of students are questions which

help to give insight to students' attitudes towards the courses.

In talking to Frank Handley his response was this, "I think you work as hard. I guess the difference in this particular program is that students really want to work. In other words there is more a sense of input, you know. You want to get out as much as you put in, so there is a lot more interaction."[54] In some cases Frank Handley felt that he was putting more into peace studies courses because the peace studies courses were offered within other departments. He gives an example in his own case,

> Like the first peace studies course I took was Anatomy of Peace, which was also a history course, which is my other major. So in other words, I was actually putting more into the course because I was getting two different things out of it - the historical perspective which was on the idea of a lasting peace after World War I, and also the peace studies viewpoint.[55]

So Frank feels that there is more intrinsic value in the courses because there is an attempt to look at the course from different points of view; therefore it causes the whole experience to be much more challenging and intellectually stimulating. He also felt that there were some very important kinds of things that came out of the seminar, which was interdisciplinary in nature. For him it was a place where students and teachers in the Peace Studies Program could discuss different issues, all of which had relationship to the different things the students were learning in their courses. This

particular seminar is focused on the philosophy of the peace studies program and is the place where all of the ideas and subject matter and information can get some central focus.

Frank, a senior who will be graduating in May, 1974, feels that he would like to continue on to graduate school, perhaps in peace studies or international affairs. He feels that while the courses which he is taking in the peace studies program have not changed him, they have given him a better background in peace. In his own words,

> I feel more confident, more prepared now with the specific things I have learned in the courses. It's a concentration for me. I've always been interested in like the international point of view, the history; and what peace studies does is bring that view into the perspective. But I really took full advantage of that, so I guess I focused on what I wanted to do.[56]

Kevin Aspell, a Manhattan peace studies major who also has a major in sociology, felt that in some cases the courses in the Peace Studies Program were different because in a sense they did require less hours compared to some of the other courses. For example, in some of the science courses students are required to put in twenty-five hours including lab for eighteen hours of credit or sometimes fifteen hours of credit; as compared with some of the peace studies courses and others, a student may attend class for two hours and get three hours credit. But he goes on to say, "If your work entails reading a novel or reading a book and discussing it

and putting an entry into a journal, someone who has no interest or is only in the course because the school requires him or her to be there, they can read a paragraph or three paragraphs and make a statement regarding those three and never get anything from it other than the grade that they needed."[57]

He goes on then to defend the criticisms that the peace studies courses are softer.

> You know people are in school for a lot of different reasons and it's just that my argument to anyone who says that a course is softer or easier, did you do what you were asked to? Because if you did, like I'm sure us peace studies majors did, you really got a lot out of it. I mean, the reading of everything required. I developed a whole new philosophy just from reading a little bit about Martin Luther King. I was always for non-violence, but I never really knew why, and that sort of enlightened a couple different aspects.[58]

Kevin strongly feels that a course can be as rigorous as the individual who is taking the course wants it to be. He feels that he would ask the question of anyone who says that a course is softer whether or not he applied himself and did he get what he wanted out of the course.

Kevin Aspell is a sociology major at Manhattan College and has the desire to work in detention. This is an example of how the peace studies program at Manhattan is attracting students with a variety of interests, with an orientation towards working within the existing structure.

SUMMARY

How a peace studies program is launched on a college campus has a great deal to do with the direction and potential support it will receive from the students, administration, and board of directors. The initial impression is usually a lasting one, and once that impression is made it is difficult to eradicate or to change. This is not to imply that a new, properly funded, strongly supported peace program would have lasting success. However, starting a program among faculty and administration who express doubts concerning the validity of studying "peace" can have a negative effect on its future. It can also determine whether or not such a program will have the opportunity and the needed time to develop like the more familiar college departments.

The three programs in the study had the following experiences in their beginning stages: Colgate University and Manhattan College peace studies programs from the outset had strong faculty support. The programs were started by faculty members who took the initiative in developing proposals necessary to solidify the concepts. The Syracuse program was brought on by student protest.

In the case of Colgate University, a small nucleus of the faculty began to generate the idea and developed a proposal to start one course as a beginning to the peace studies program. From the outset the course was looked upon as an experimental interdisciplinary course which would be the

derivation for determining the content for a well-developed course. Such a course was eventually the foundation course in the peace studies curriculum.

Manhattan College, on the other hand, started with a small group of faculty members who quickly recruited a larger number of faculty members. Some thirty-two were involved initially in the Pacem in Terris Institute. The peace studies program grew out of the Institute. In a short period of time there was strong institutional support for the Peace Studies Program at Manhattan College. By making contact with influential people in and out of the College, the Manhattan program was able to build a great deal of enthusiasm and win acceptance and respect for the concept of peace studies as an academic discipline on the college campus.

Syracuse University's program was basically started as a result of student protest. In a short time the program gained substantial student support for the establishment of a non-violence studies program on Syracuse College campus. Student support waned over the Summer months of 1970 simply because a large number of students were not on the college campus during the Summer. A few students took up the task along with a few dedicated faculty members and began to develop a proposal. It was submitted to the administration. Once the Fall term started, a course was begun. A director was hired in the late Summer leaving little preparatory time for planning the beginnings of the program.

During the campaign of the 1970's, during the Spring period, a large number of faculty members signed a petition that was circulated stating that they would support a peace studies program and they would be willing to teach a course in such a program if it were established at the University. During the Fall term the faculty members who had supported the program taught courses or gave lectures. But immediately after the first semester of the program at Syracuse University faculty involvement declined. This was in contrast to Manhattan's and Colgate's programs. At these colleges key faculty members initiated the programs and their commitment and concern continued to develop as the programs continued to grow.

In the Syracuse program it was the student interest and student involvement that gave birth to the program. In the Colgate and Manhattan College programs the faculty was the first to introduce the program and student interest came as a result of faculty inspiration and initiative. One might look at the two approaches based on the impact and influence on the administration, since the administration is the key to support for a new program developing on a college campus.

During the height of the campaign on the Syracuse College campus, the administration agreed, based on student demand, to fund the non-violence studies program on an experimental basis for a period of three years. The administration has followed through on that commitment for the last

three years, but has not increased the budget or attempted to expand the program. Although there has been a change in the administrative staff, the commitment has been continuous. The administration at Colgate is very receptive to the idea of the Peace Studies Program and has given strong support to that program. In fact, there was a personal commitment from the former Dean of the Faculty at Colgate University.

Likewise Manhattan College in a short time obtained a strong commitment on the part of the administration to support the program, not only the administration of the college, but the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. Since Manhattan College is a Catholic College, substantial financial support comes from the Church.

The initiators of the program at Manhattan College clearly state that the inspiration of the program came from the Pope's encyclical, thus giving strong credit to the Church's influence on the establishment of the program.

From the outset of the program at Colgate University there was a very clear intent to establish a strong, academic program with emphasis on the academic quality and standards for any kind of courses offered in the program. This was a primary emphasis. It also served the purpose of bringing an interdisciplinary approach to the subject. A good deal of time was spent on the planning and developing of the program at Colgate with intensive faculty seminar involvement.

The program at Syracuse established workshops and lecture courses for the students in addition to having a strong community component. This involvement went to the extent of inviting in community people to teach courses and to run workshops within the program, and it also opened its courses to people from the community. This was not the case at Colgate University. At Syracuse University there were workshops held in offices of neighborhood organizations and in the homes of people in the community.

At Manhattan College there was a strong interest in community involvement, but from a different point of view. Emphasis was placed on bringing leaders or established groups from the community on the campus to give lectures and talks, and to focus attention on community problems in the New York area. Peace Studies was seen as a mission from the beginning on the part of Manhattan College that went beyond the boundary of the particular college and even beyond the New York area. There was an intent on the part of Manhattan College to establish peace studies programs on other college campuses and to make a contribution to that movement across the United States.

The Manhattan program assumed that if peace studies were going to survive on the Manhattan College campus then it would have to become a legitimate academic area of study on many other college campuses. Thus, one of their primary purposes was to foster a peace studies movement in higher

education. To this extent it can be distinguished from the programs at Colgate and Syracuse University which were largely confined to those college campuses. The program at Manhattan College took a strong political thrust by contacting and involving politicians such as Governor Rockerfeller. A telegram from the Pope in support of the program was received. They managed to get a substantial amount of publicity, not only in the United States but worldwide.

When the Manhattan program had its first convocation, representatives from the United Nations were involved. It is clear that the program lobbied for support beyond the faculty and the administration at Manhattan College. The program at Manhattan College carried on a continuous seminar in an effort to involve more faculty members and to solicit more course offerings from different departments within the college. Colgate's program, on the other hand, stayed within a limited group of faculty members. These faculty members were committed and continued to work in an intensive way to develop the carefully defined peace studies program which was described in the initial proposal.

Syracuse University after its second year had the problem of reestablishing itself. The faculty and administration were faced with salvaging whatever strength the program had, in addition to experiencing a turnover in the directorship of the program. It is difficult to anticipate what would have happened had the first director stayed with the program.

The reality of how the program began had some bearing on the fact that the survival of the program was threatened after its first year.

Approval of the program at Colgate University went through a carefully established traditional process, and every precaution was taken to ensure the acceptance of the program by appropriate faculty committees, and finally the entire faculty. The Manhattan College program was successful in getting approval through the faculty committees and the administration. The program at Syracuse University did not go through the normal process for approval because it was established over the Summer months. To begin the program that September, many decisions had to be made during the Summer months. Courses had to be decided upon for the Fall semester which meant that they could not use the traditional procedure for course approval. Therefore, the director for the program was approved by the administration and the first courses offered were treated as an experimental program. There were no clear guidelines for the program and it was not definite with which department the program was to be identified. As a result, the program was shifted between two or three different departments. Since the program had no clear departmental identity, problems developed in relation to arriving at a clear understanding and definition of the program.

The program at Colgate University did not represent any substantial change in the offerings. The program was similar

enough to the existing one to fit into the whole traditional framework for courses and programs at Colgate University. There was, in effect, no departure from the traditions already existing at Colgate. Colgate has a strong tradition for international studies and a fair number of their graduates pursue graduate work in diplomacy and political science or in international relations. The focus of the peace studies courses was not a sharp departure from this kind of traditional orientation. The peace studies program can be seen as an appendage or a component of the political science department. Many of the students involved in the program are political science majors.

The program at Syracuse however is unique and nontraditional. From the very beginning the nontraditional process and methods by which the program operated posed such a serious threat to the traditional standards of the University, that the program threatened its own existence. There was a great deal more opposition on the part of the faculty against the non-violence studies program at Syracuse than at Colgate or Manhattan College. The counter-culture-style titles of the courses in the Syracuse program gave rise to a great deal of suspicion on the part of the faculty members. There was also a substantial amount of forceful criticism in the way the courses were conducted. The fact that the courses were taught by community people with no credentials as well as by undergraduate students added an unorthodox approach for

further faculty concern. This raised questions of academic standards for the faculty.

The Syracuse program was not traditional in the sense that the normal faculty approval for staff and other faculty members teaching courses did not take place in the non-violence studies program. The faculty for the different courses simply gained the approval of the director.

At Manhattan College no new staff was brought in to administer the program and to teach or offer new courses. The staff and faculty members who were already at Manhattan College took on the responsibility of teaching courses in the existing departments and in the peace studies program. While outside people were used in the program as lecturers or even to give short presentations, community people or outside people did not teach courses in that program as they did in the Syracuse program.

Colgate University brought in an outside director who became a regular member of the faculty to teach courses at this University in the peace studies program; but also in a very specific department, the political science department. For the most part the program at Colgate University did not involve outside people from the community. In some instances people were invited to give lectures or to run workshops for a short period of time, but not to teach for a semester. This is not to say that the Syracuse program was the only program that came under criticism from the faculty.

In Manhattan College there were faculty members who questioned the standards for the peace studies courses, and even the issue of whether or not such a course belonged in the University, in the academic community, or whether or not that was a course that belonged somewhere else in the community. There were those in all the colleges who felt that such courses could be offered on the college campus, but it should not be offered for credit, if offered as a course at all. In many cases faculty members felt that it was more or less an outside activity or extracurricular activity in which students could get involved. So the initial battle in all cases was to establish the legitimacy of peace studies on the college campus.

There was less criticism on the part of faculty at Colgate University because the well respected faculty members carved out and carefully defined the kind of courses to be offered. The program at Colgate began with one course with a team teaching approach. The course was taught by faculty from more than one department, which gave it an interdisciplinary orientation or focus.

At Syracuse University approximately forty new workshops were offered within a one year period, indicating that the courses were very quickly established. This fact may explain why these courses were reported to have had very low requirements. In some instances no more than attendance was required, and in many cases class attendance was not

carefully recorded so there are even questions about that requirement.

The course offerings at Manhattan College were also quickly multiplied. They multiplied mainly in the sense that the peace studies components were integrated into the existing courses. In addition the professors decided to expand their courses by using peace modules or by raising questions until they were able to develop enough material and enough insight into the whole nature of the peace studies curriculum. After they began to accumulate much more material and investigate into the field, they then began to offer new courses.

IV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Orientation and Styles

The three programs have three distinct orientations. In looking at the Colgate University program, one might say it has an intellectual academic perspective. Initially, the program at Syracuse University had an activist, radical orientation, while the program at Manhattan College had a religious, missionary direction. What can be said of any organism is that in order for it to survive, it must be able to adapt to its environment, or it must have the influence to change that environment if the environment does not have the proclivity to accept it. Little or no changes were necessary for acceptance of the Peace Studies Program in the Colgate University situation because the program was conceived and developed by the strongest components in that environment. In fact, the senior faculty members fashioned that program after their own interdisciplinary team-taught tradition.

The same can be said of the Manhattan College program. The orientation and the emphasis grew out of a religious environment. Therefore the values were given from the outset and there was little need for institutional change to adapt the peace studies program there. However, in the Syracuse University situation, there was an active program existing on a campus with a progressive reputation. Syracuse is usually thought of as a politically liberal college campus especially in relationship to the student body. However

it needs to be said that the radical students and some of the more liberal programs at Syracuse coexist with rather conservative traditional programs. Syracuse has always had a strong military science program and a police science program.

Response to Cambodia

Student bodies on large university campuses are somewhat like weather vanes, in that they are influenced by the political winds of the time. Back in the early 1960's, it was reported that the student body at Syracuse University voted overwhelming for Goldwater in a student referendum taken on campus. However during the 60's it was a very active campus in terms of student radicalism and protest for progressive social change. The 1970 Cambodian invasion and the outburst of student activity marked a clear path into student activism on university campuses. This marked the beginning of the Syracuse program, while that same year was only a middlepoint for the program at Manhattan College which had been established three or four years earlier. Likewise with the Colgate University program which had gotten its initiation back in 1966.

Therefore, one might say that the Syracuse University program was established on the heels of a dying student campus movement. The program at Syracuse University was clearly established as a reaction to the Cambodian invasion and the

war in Viet Nam, while the program at Manhattan College and Colgate University had been established long before the students expressed publicly and intense outrage against the Viet Nam military campaigns. It would stand to reason that these two programs (Manhattan and Colgate) were unaffected by the de-escalation of the war in Southeast Asia in relation to student enrollment in courses, while the Syracuse program was directly affected by the wane in enthusiasm for the anti-Viet Nam war movement in the United States.

Administrative and Faculty Support

With the loss of student support and the lack of faculty support for the program at Syracuse University, a new director was hired with the understanding that a new program had to be established that would conform to the traditional academic approaches. This was done in order to gain the support of the faculty members and to establish credibility in the program, if the program was indeed going to be continued. The program at Manhattan College was not successful in getting large faculty participation until the program had won strong administrative support.

Once the administration demonstrated strong support for the program, many faculty members got behind the program, began to push for the program, and thus gave strong credibility to the program. The Syracuse program on the other hand did not have as strong administrative sanction,

and that fact may account for the nominal support on the part of the faculty members. It should be said that very little effort was made at Syracuse University to actually recruit faculty members and get them involved in the program in a meaningful way. This fact cannot be overlooked as one of the contributing factors to the lack of faculty involvement and support for the program. The majority of faculty members on all three campuses knew very little about peace studies and therefore did not feel qualified or confident to teach such courses. Therefore they shyed away from the program based on the fact that they felt that they had very little or nothing at all to contribute to such programs.

Another significant fact that must be mentioned is that any new program on a college campus necessarily competes with the existing programs. This would be one factor that would cause many faculty members in the traditional programs to question the existence of the peace studies program on the college campus. It competes not only in the numbers of students involved in the program, but it also competes in terms of budgetary priorities. Financial support for peace studies or non-violence studies programs on the college campus, necessarily means a reduction in the present budgets of existing programs or perhaps a lack of increase in the budgets of the existing programs. In addition to the budgetary and student competition, one of the strongest areas of competition would be faculty tenure. For example, at

Colgate University there is a rigid tenure quota of approximately 55 percent faculty, and it in effect means that offering tenure to faculty members in the peace studies program means denying tenure to faculty members in another department. So while there is strong faculty support for the program, ideas, and concepts of the peace studies program at Colgate, there is some question in the minds of faculty members as to whether the program should be continued. Just what form the program will take will certainly be influenced by the number of tenured faculty in the program. As in most other academic institutions, it would be extremely difficult to attract quality faculty without offering some kind of security, and tenure is usually held out as a basis for security among faculty people. While many of the faculty members at Manhattan College are tenured, there is a lesser degree of competition between the peace studies program and the other programs because the funding for the peace studies program is funded mainly by external funds. The support that the peace studies program brings to Manhattan College is supplementary to the existing budget. This factor makes it possible for the other faculty members in other disciplines to participate in the peace studies program without threatening support for their traditional programs. It also is non-threatening in the sense that the time which a faculty member spends teaching peace studies courses actually involves no more time than he would spend teaching a traditional

course. Because a large number of the peace studies courses are courses which are presently being taught, they are new only in the sense that they have a new emphasis and in some cases new sources which have been added to the existing material. The Peace Studies Program at Manhattan College has served to create much more interaction among faculty members and this has brought about a new kind of enthusiasm for teaching and learning and collegiate activities among the faculty members.

Impact on the Institutions

The Manhattan program has also attracted new students to the school, thus increasing the enrollment. There are also students from nearby schools who cross register to take peace studies courses at Manhattan College. It cannot be said that Syracuse University's non-violence studies program has had a comparable impact. There is no evidence that there has been an increase in enrollment of peace studies courses at Syracuse University or that many of the faculty members have adopted the peace components in their courses as a result of the non-violence studies program existing on the campus.

While the Peace Studies Program at Manhattan College had an influence on interdisciplinary studies, Colgate University interdisciplinary programs were going on long before the peace studies program came into existence. In fact

this may have made the peace studies program, with its interdisciplinary approach, easier to get established at Colgate University as compared to some other universities. In that sense, the Peace Studies Program at Colgate University has served to expand the concept of interdisciplinary studies.

The Peace Studies Program at Colgate has had some influence on the use of the multimedia approaches in the learning potentials. It also has introduced the possibilities of action-research and other experiential kinds of learning. To that extent we can say that the program at Colgate University had had some impact on the pedagogy at that institution. The Peace Studies Program at Colgate has also had some influence on the focus and content of the subject matter. The program has raised the whole subject of intercultural confrontation in a way that it had not been raised by international relations programs or foreign studies programs at Colgate. It also provided a setting where those questions could be raised.

Community Action

The peace studies programs at all three institutions seemed to have very little interaction with the community. There is little emphasis or orientation toward looking at local community problems in relationship to peace. While Syracuse University and Manhattan College might be more orientated toward social change, they are involved in very little social change on the domestic or international level. They

They all have the opportunity for students to engage in field work in various institutions. Some of those institutions include the United Nations, local community organizations, local high schools or elementary schools (to develop a peace studies course), or in some cases, students are putting some of their skills to practice problem-solving on their local college campuses.

However this represents very few of the students who are involved in the programs. Each of the programs is very conscious about getting involved in local issues on the college campuses because of the kind of threat or reaction that might come about as a result of this kind of involvement.

For example, there was a library workers strike at Syracuse University in April of 1974. This was a group of unorganized low paid library helpers who were striking for higher wages. Although the non-violence studies program had studied the campaigns of the 1960's, the strikes, the demonstrations, sit ins, the Cesar Chavez farm worker strike for better work conditions and higher pay; there was seemingly no transference from those studies to any kind of active support or help for the striking library workers from the students involved in the non-violence studies program at Syracuse University.

When the students in the non-violence studies program were asked about the possibility of helping the workers to become much more organized and taking the opportunity to apply the skills which they had learned in their courses, the

students only criticized the workers for not being more effective at their demonstrations, campaigns, and negotiations. However there was no indication of the students willingness to offer any assistance to the workers. There were, however, students from the University offering support and help to the workers, but they were not students involved in the non-violence studies program.

On the other hand, at Colgate University there is very little emphasis on action. However the students involved in the peace studies program are often the leaders of the Women's admissions issues at Colgate, and the peace issues at Colgate. They take leadership in other kind of student organizations. There seems to be much more active student leadership from the Peace Studies Program at Colgate University than at Syracuse University. There was no evidence of any campus leadership on the part of the students involved in the Manhattan College program, however there was evidence of a strong philosophical commitment to non-violence. This might be due to the size of the campus, but also might have something to do with the kind of students who are attracted by the programs at the different institutions. The programs at Colgate and Manhattan College tend to be much more developed in the sense of giving students the opportunity to get off the campus to acquire some field experience. For example, the Manhattan College program offers an internship at the United Nations and at many of the other institutions around New York. It has many more resources to draw upon since it is

located in a large metropolitan area. There are many international resources from which they can draw and many local organizations to which they can send their students to gain firsthand experience without having to spend a long period of time far away from the campus environment.

The Colgate University program, while it is fairly isolated from any average city, had a strong tradition of internships in New York and Washington D.C. and international study opportunities where students can travel abroad to work in a variety of multicultural settings. Colgate also has many graduates who are in substantial political positions in international affairs, international relations, and in domestic politics, making it easier to place students. The Syracuse University program is not as developed as the other two schools, and therefore such opportunities for students to be involved in internships in a comparable way are not yet available.

Funding

The program at Syracuse University is financed directly from the core budget of the University which is quite different from the other two programs. While the program at Syracuse has a very small budget, there are no restrictions to increasing that budget through outside fund raising and support. However, the program has not made any efforts in this direction, but has chose to use the core budget from the University to carry on the program. While at Colgate

University, the budget is provided primarily by a grant which comes from an alumni of the college which makes it possible for the program to be funded for a five-year period. There are some efforts on the part of Colgate to seek outside funding, but the budget is primarily made up of the large donation on the part of the alumni. In addition, the University itself provides some facilities and other kinds of fringe benefits to the program. The Manhattan College program is funded outside of the institution by private and foundation grants.

Decision Making

Who composes the decision making group? In the Manhattan College program several committees have been set up. The most important committee is the curriculum committee, which has a majority of students. The faculty feels that because the students are going to be taking the courses, they will be much more affected by what happens in the courses than any other group. Therefore students should have more input into how the courses are developed and what their content should be. The courses which are approved by the curriculum committee in the peace studies program are then submitted to the regular college faculty subcommittee on curriculum. Once approved, the courses go into the catalog.

At Syracuse University, there is a committee which is made up of faculty members with some student representation. This committee along with the director makes

the basic decisions for the program. At Colgate University at the time of this writing, it is unclear as to who makes the decisions for the program. The director is obviously involved in making some decisions for the program, but at the moment this whole subject is under discussion within the peace studies program at Colgate University.

Information related to decision-making in the three programs which were studied is very limited largely due to the fact that there is no clear policy developed on decision makings, therefore many of the decisions are made by the directors in terms of the day to day running of the programs: long range policy decisions are usually made by the program committee members. The long range decisions about the programs receive final approval by the administration.

As far as we can tell in the three programs studied, the administrations have a light hand in running the programs but seem to delegate a great deal of authority and responsibility to the program committees and the programs directors. Among the three programs studied, there is no evidence that community people are involved in the decision making process of the peace studies programs. Among the three programs there seem to be no strong distinguishable factors related to decision making. Perhaps one exception would be the large amount of student involvement and participation in the Manhattan program.

The Curriculum

The peace studies courses at Colgate University are somewhat limited in terms of orientation. They consist generally of international courses which have for the most part a world view and the type of courses which would be found in a political science curriculum such as history, government, and with some other courses in the philosophy and religion department.

The courses at Syracuse University are in the non-violent tradition with the historical approach as well as some courses dealing with action strategies and social change. The course offering at Manhattan College represents the widest range, from religion to political science courses, philosophy, non-violence action, literature courses, biology, chemistry, and the arts, and geography. In general it has been able to offer much more variety in the peace studies curriculum.

Because the program in Manhattan College has had more of a Catholic approach with the intent of influencing not only Manhattan College and New York but a larger area around the country, it has made a much more deliberate attempt to involve the various disciplines. Manhattan College has sponsored one of the largest peace studies conferences in the history of the United States. It managed to bring thousands of people together from many countries and therefore has been an important stimulus in the proliferation of peace studies programs around the country. The convocations and conferences which have been hosted at Manhattan College are

also sponsored by Manhattan College. They have served as a main source of inspiration for many people on different levels; on the elementary, grade school level, high school level, as well as the undergraduate and graduate level. These convocations have served as a source for developing curriculum content and resources both in materials, books, and pamphlets, as well as contacts with experts in particular area studies in the peace studies programs. The program at Manhattan College has been able to graduate about seven peace studies majors, some of whom have gone on to graduate school to continue as peace majors. For example, one major has gone to the University of Pennsylvania to work towards a Ph.D. in Peace Science. Plans are being made to develop a Masters in Peace Studies at Manhattan College.

In comparision, the program at Syracuse College offers a concentration in non-violent studies, but students are advised to also take a traditional concentration. There is no attempt at this moment to offer a graduate degree in non-violent studies at Syracuse University. In fact this is the last year for which the program has been funded. A new proposal has been presented to the administration and faculty, but the program is yet to be funded for the coming years.

The program at Colgate University has no plans to develop a Masters degree, but now offers a concentration in peace studies with strong advice for students majoring in peace studies to take a second major or a second concentration. Looking in general at the kind of courses that are

offered in the different programs, it is conceivable that students can take courses and concentrate in peace studies without having a separate peace studies program, but only a addition of a few other courses. In fact one student at Colgate did manage to put together different courses that were being offered in the general curriculum and successfully met the requirements for a peace studies major, without registering as a peace studies major. This therefore raised questions about whether there is the necessity of the peace studies programs as such.

Critical Analysis

In looking at the peace studies and non-violence courses in the three institutions of higher education, it is obvious that several aspects to a sound program are missing. There is the crucial omission of a cross section of students involved in the programs. The minority and low income students enrolled in the schools have not been attracted to these programs. In many cases the content of some of the courses are directly related to the soci-economic situation of the students enrolled in the universities. In some other courses there is a great emphasis on justice on the international level, particularly in third world countries, while there seems to be an absence of students from those third world countries or third world domestic communities involved in the programs. In each of these institutions studied, they have individually and collectively failed to attract nonwhite, middle or low income students. Perhaps it is in the content of the courses, the materials and description that fail to make the program attractive to nonwhite students. Perhaps the intent to recruit nonwhites is not in the minds or the sight of those recruiting or trying to attract students to the program. If these programs have anything at all to do with justice and social change or the search for a more peaceful world society, it must be recognized that many of the problems of social and economic inequality stems from the lack of involvement of those of those who are oppressed and underprivileged

in our domestic and world society. The irony in many of these programs is that a great deal of stress is placed on the lack of social justice, economic justice, and the lack of political involvement of the oppressed people, yet the programs themselves fail to involve third world and other minority groups in their decision making process at the developmental stages and inception of the programs. They also have failed to involve minority and nonwhite student enrollment in the courses or as majors in the programs. While indeed these programs are critical of many institutions and governments which perpetuate such practices, they neglect to look at their shortcomings in the peace studies programs.

If these programs and the new peace curricula are going to live up to their commitments, goals, and objectives, it is urgently necessary for them to reexamine the nature of their programs and understand why third world domestic students have not been attracted to those programs, if indeed there has been at attempt to attract them. If these programs fail to involve in a meaningful way minorities and third world people on the campuses and in the communities surrounding the universities and colleges, they will in fact continue to render themselves ineffective and irrelevant to the social needs of our times. When this question is raised with people involved in the peace studies programs that were examined, the complaint comes back that it is difficult to communicate with blacks. If it be impossible to communicate with blacks on the college campuses where these programs are in existence,

then how much more difficult would it be to communicate with those third world people with whom no culture identity is shared. If communications is a problem, then perhaps that should be an area of concentration, an area of study, a problem that deserves some immediate attention. Communications may very well be an important factor in creating more peaceful relations between individuals and nations. If this be the case, then the people involved in developing peace studies programs owe it to themselves to develop more effective skills and techniques for communication between different cultures in their immediate environment.

This leads to the next area which I would like to address. That is the area of peace and non-violent action. The writer would like to stress the notion that peace and non-violence studies while appropiately using the historical perspective should have some connection with peace and non-violent involvement. In examining the three programs in the study, there is little or no peace or non-violent involvement on the part of the students involved in the programs. The skills, techniques, knowledge, tools, and historical perspectives that students are acquiring in the various courses in which they are enrolled have very little meaning unless there is the awareness and consciousness level that relates to particular problems in their local communities, in their environment, and the world community. The realization that those skills and that knowledge can be immediately applied to problems existing in their present environment is the

key to the innovative concept of peace studies.

At Colgate University there is little or no interaction between the peace studies program and the community problems. From what can be observed, there is a deep chasm between "town and gown." At Syracuse University there are occasional sporadic demonstrations and movements for social change. These demonstrations may involve a number of students at the University, but very few students majoring are involved in the non-violence studies program at Syracuse University. Where there is an excellent opportunity for the program to address itself to the relevant problems of the urban area in Syracuse, students involved in the non-violent studies program have not availed themselves of the opportunity to gain firsthand experience at trying to understand and develop the necessary tools and skills required to address those problems.

This is not to say that there is no student involvement on the Syracuse University campus, for it can be quickly observed that many young people participated in helping the library workers engage in a labor strike at Syracuse University. However, these were students who were not involved in the non-violence studies program. This happens to be the case also at Manhattan College. Although the campus is somewhat isolated from the immediate geographic area of the urban community, nonetheless the accessibility to the urban area is fairly great. However the peace studies program at Manhattan College does not avail itself of the opportunity to work with

urban problems in the New York area. There are perhaps some field assignments in the local school system and at the United Nations and perhaps higher level governmental agencies, but there are no programs that are addressed to the myriad of problems that exist in a city area of Manhattan, where again there are many unpeaceful relations existing on the institutional level as well as the community level. A peace studies program or a non-violence studies program should have an international focus, but not only an international focus, it must equally have a strong domestic orientation as well. It is far too easy to concentrate on the resolution of problems abroad in the distant countries without any real responsibility or concern for problems in the immediate environment. In many of our cities we see a microcosm of those international problems and while they may be more complex on the international level, the roots of those same problems exist in the small urban communities.

The peace studies or non-violence studies programs which do not address themselves to social change and social justice in the context of peace has nothing new to offer to the universities curriculum. For indeed students can study the nature and cause of violence and the history of war in the present courses that are offered in the college or university without having a peace orientation. If the course offerings in the peace studies programs are so indistinguishable that students can by accident take the peace studies requirements and graduate by only taking one course or two, then we have to

seriously reexamine what the peace studies program is offering that is so different and unique from what is being offered already.

In one of the programs studied there was a student who, when reviewing the courses that he had finished, was able to meet the peace studies requirement as a concentrator without even having enrolled in the program; and therefore the student graduated as a peace concentrator simply by accident.

In too many cases only a few actual courses have been developed in the peace studies program, and then a large number of other courses that could have a peripheral relationship to peace are tacked on and are considered a part of the peace studies offering. In the writer's view, this is not a legitimate peace curriculum. Therefore, it is necessary to look at each course that would be considered a peace studies course and examine it, not to determine whether or not it deals with the relevant problems that might be related, but to determine whether it is, in an emphatic way, the focus of the course. Any course can perhaps be related in some way to peace studies with some degree or stretch of the imagination. In this case, this course would not be considered a peace studies course simply because it can be looked at from that particular angle, or that particular point of view. A peace studies course in that view must start off with a peace focus. The course must be developed for that purpose.

In the case where traditional courses are being offered as part of the peace curriculum, there must be a deliberate attempt to infuse in those courses, new materials, new issues, new questions that are so related to peace that it is without question that peace is the major focus of the courses. It is perhaps a serious mistake to expand the peace studies curriculum to include traditional courses simply to arrange a number of offerings and options to establish requirements for students who are minors or majors in peace studies. The quality of such a curriculum is highly questionable in terms of its contribution to the establishment of a professional discipline.

It is far better for a student to maintain a traditional major and take a few peace studies courses than to take a few peace studies courses plus the greater number of traditional courses and claim a peace major or concentration. The need to produce peace majors in order to establish the legitimacy as an academic discipline or area study in no way squares with the urgent need to establish a well founded and well developed major in peace studies. More important than placing a label on a number of courses and calling it a peace curriculum would be the ensurance that there are offerings of peace studies courses in each department or discipline on the undergraduate level.

The preparation of students who have a broad liberal arts undergraduate background would insure that students are prepared to undertake a peace studies major on the graduate

level. They would be able to bring with them the necessary skills in order to contribute to this new profession.

To establish peace studies majors on the undergraduate level offers very little to the development of the peace studies professionalism. An undergraduate major in pre-law curriculum or pre-med curriculum or English curriculum, social science curriculum, or political science, who has taken some courses related to peace in their particular departments, in their particular area of study indeed would be a stronger candidate for a peace education major on the graduate level.

The peace profession must not be an isolated profession simply because the very issues and problems which are addressed in the peace curriculum are the very problems which exist in many other fields of study. Students on the undergraduate level should have a strong liberal background with exposure to peace courses. Knowledge in the traditional professions can be better preparation to relate these traditional professions to a peace focus. A person with a strong background in education with a knowledge of the problems in education, with an exposure to peace, can on the graduate level begin to understand the relationship between peace and that profession. This process would enable such a person to bring a great deal of knowledge and skill to that professional area with a peace orientation.

One of the complaints in our whole educational system in recent years has been that the isolated areas of education

have been too narrow in their focus and too technical in their orientation, thus making it extremely difficult for professionals to integrate knowledge, from many of the fields, that can have an important influence on the thinking and direction of the various approaches to problems in their particular fields.

At the present time, peace studies, world order studies, future studies and ecological studies are very unclear as to their limits and dimensions. When a student says that he is a peace studies major or a peace studies graduate, there is no clear understanding as to what common body of knowledge a student would be exposed to from program to program. When a student says that he is a pre-med major or a pre-law major or an English major, there are some assumptions that can be made about the area of knowledge to which that student has been exposed. The whole area of peace studies is a new area of studies. In many cases it is imperialistic in its approach and encompasses all subjects, and in other cases it is so narrowly focused and so technical that it is beyond comprehension to the average person. In many cases it is difficult to see its relationship to any other relevant subject.

There is one program among those in this particular study which seems to make an attempt to offer in the peace studies curriculum courses which have been specifically developed as peace studies courses. For example, in the Manhattan Colleg curriculum there are courses in the history department which

deal with the anatomy of peace. In its very description, it indicates that the course will utilize the case history approach to World War II, the cold war, and the Viet Nam war to establish specific causes for the breakdown of peace and to suggest paths to long term peace keeping. In the biology department there is a course entitled Biology of Human Behavior, an inquiry into human behavior within the context of the evolutionary process. A consideration of the biological and psychological, sociological and socio-cultural determinants affecting primate and human behavior, in particular in relation to imprinting, learning, creativity, sexual behavior, altruism, heirarchy, territoriality, violence and war. There is a course in religious studies entitled, Religious Dimensions of Peace, another course entitled, Non-Violent Revolution, another course in world literature, War and Violence in Western Literature.

Too often a narrow political science approach to peace studies or a conflict resolution of sociological approach to peace studies limits the potentiality of the breadth of the whole field of peace studies. In too many cases there is no attempt to struggle with the hard problems of looking at the contributions of the sciences to the understanding and resolution of problems related to peace and war. The physicist, the biologist and the chemist make an invaluable contribution to the creation and maintenance of effective weapons for destruction. They are recruited, they are trained, and they are used effectively in their areas of study in

order to produce the instrument for war and destruction.

Any peace studies program that takes itself seriously must make an active attempt to engage faculty members in the hard sciences into challenging each other to find ways to relate the knowledge of their field to the creation, establishment, maintenance of a more peaceful world society. All too often those involved in peace studies bury themselves in some remote catacombs and disassociate themselves from the realities of a society engulfed in psychological paralysis, enveloped in economic trauma, drowing in spiritual deprivation. Peace studies must not be buried in the tradional academic remoteness. If so, the vision is lost.

In order to envision the potential for peace studies, it is necessary to take a second look at the kinds of programs which exist on undergraduate campuses today; and begin to see how those programs can best accomplish the goal which they profess to be accomplishing. They must find themselves facing up to the difficult problems which accompany the awareness of diminishing world resources. People involved in peace studies must find themselves in a position to smell poverty and hear the cries of hunger as well as the battle cries of the resisting oppressed.

V. CONCLUSION

A. Survival Issues

When we look at the major factors which will no doubt determine the continuation of these programs, the one most important factor is the future funding of the programs, especially in the case of Colgate University which is now receiving $25,000 each year from a single donor. The director has not been involved in outside fund raising programs in a major way. However, some proposals are in the process of being developed for funding from other outside foundations.

The Manhattan program seems to have less difficulty with future fund raising being the factor in its continuation. Because the Institute has successfully solicted funds from private foundations and individuals, it is not dependent on a single grant for its survival.

The Syracuse University program is unique in the sense that it gets its funds soley from the budget of the University. Although the budget is very nominal in that it does not exceed $20,000, it nevertheless represents a firm commitment on the part of the University. In spite of the stormy beginning for the non-violence program at Syracuse, the University administration continued its funding. However, the continuation of the program under the circumstances in part demonstrates strong administrative commitment during the experimental phase of the program.

When a new program is established it means that less funds, less space, facilities (perhaps), etc., are going to be available to existing departments and programs. With the present financial conditions faced by universities, a new program can expect to be met with competitive resistance in a subtle way if not overtly. A side question to consider is which or what part of an existing department is being replaced by a new program?

Related to this issue is that of scholarships and financial aid grants to students in existing programs. Students in a new program or department would undoubtedly share in the funding sources of other students. Admittedly, the strong departments, those with firm financial commitements, would be less affected by the entry of a new program or department. But there are a limited number of such departments on college and unversity campuses.

Another factor which would likely determine the survival of the programs would be the participation on the part of the faculty members. At Colgate University there appears to be an equally strong commitment on the part of key faculty members from the very beginning of the program. However, many of the faculty members involved in teaching courses and offering support to the program at this particular time happen to be some young faculty members who do not enjoy tenured positions. It is likely that some of these faculty members will not gain tenure and thus weaken the enthusiastic support for the program.

Syracuse University has a faculty which mainly consists

of graduate students with a few tenured and full professors teaching courses in the program. Since the first semester of the program, it has not been effective at recruiting or soliciting the support of a significant number of faculty members to teach courses within the program. The second director, Neil Katz, gives lectures in some of the other courses offered in the University, and some of the faculty members give lectures in the non-violent courses offered. Unfortunately the program only has a small number of tenured faculty members who teach non-violence studies courses. One solution to this problem is to hire additional staff to teach courses in the program which in effect would mean an essential increase in the present budget.

The program at Manhattan College is relatively free from these kinds of problems compared to the other institutions in the study in that the regular tenured full professors are taking on the responsibility of teaching peace studies courses and are modifying many of the existing courses to conform to a peace orientation. Therefore no additional staff is needed to either direct or take on the peace studies teaching role. Therefore the peace studies program at Manhattan College seems to be a permanent program at that institution. It appears to enjoy a prominent place in the college.

Student enrollment in the courses would have to be a significant factor that would determine the continuation of survival of the peace studies programs. As we look at

Manhattan College there has been an increase in the student enrollment in the courses offered and also an increase in the number of peace studies majors. This past year, 1973, the Manhattan College program graduated about seven peace majors and has approximately twenty others that have enrolled in the program.

While Manhattan College has enjoyed a substantial increase in the students majoring in peace studies, the programs at Syracuse and Colgate have experienced a slight increase in the number of students who are concentrating or are majoring in the peace studies programs.

Administrative support would have to be another key factor in determining the survival of the peace programs on the college campuses. In the case with Syracuse University, while the administration had been consistently living up to its commitment in the past, the present administration represents a change in administration. Because of the fact that there is a new administration, it is uncertain in the course of determining budgetary priorities as to whether the peace or the non-violence studies program at Syracuse University will be continued. A decision has been made however to the effect that the program will either be funded in a substantial way to ensure a strong non-violent studies program, or the program will be discontinued.

At Colgate University there has been some turnover in the university's administrative staff. While the basic commitment of financial support has come from the outside, it is not clear whether or not the University itself is

going to absorb the budget of the peace studies program once that commitment has been terminated.

One of the key factors in the Manhattan program is that there is strong commitment on the part of the faculty, which grows out of a common concern for peace studies, perhaps motivated by the Catholic religious beliefs that are common among the faculty members. Although all of the faculty members participating are not Catholic, (they come from a variety of religious beliefs), they nevertheless share a strong concern for peace studies. Therefore the concepts of peace have been integrated not only into the curriculum of the courses at Manhattan College but into the philosophy of those who are involved in the program. Once the concepts of peace have been made a part of the philosophy of the faculty members, they not only manifest these concerns into the courses, but into many of their other activities. Issues and concerns about peace are not only making a larger number of the courses in the traditional curriculum adopt, in some part, a peace orientation. This is perhaps one of the surest ways to guarantee a continuation of the program.

This type of common approach to the whole subject of peace does not exist in the Syracuse University program. Those involved in the program do not share a common religious belief, or a common philosophical position in relation to peace.

There is also a high turnover in the faculty members teaching the courses, because the courses are taught by graduate students who change by the year.

In the case with Colgate University, the basic faculty that teach the courses are still continuing. However the faculty members experience a great deal of change in their positions.

Another factor that will to some degree effect the program is student enrollment. In talking to admissions personnel at Colgate University, it was revealed that a significant number of students ask about the peace studies program at Colgate University and the indication is that they applied to the College based on their interest in the peace studies program. One admissions officer personally remembers about twelve students he talked to asked specifically about the peace studies program. He recalls that students frequently inquired about this program in the recruitment process.

The program at Manhattan College has had some negative experience in this particular area in that the key recruitment personnel does not show enthusiastic concern for the peace studies program at Manhattan College. This might be a factor in relationship to the potential number of students who would enroll in the peace studies program or would concentrate in the area of peace studies once they were enrolled.

In the Syracuse University program there was no evidence one way or another as to whether the admissions

personnel was mentioning the non-violence studies program at the recruitment stage. The director of the peace studies program at Syracuse University had not made an effort to approach the recruitment staff or admissions to advocate the non-violence studies program.

In all three of the programs studied, this would be a key factor in helping to ensure an increase in the student enrollment in the programs. Very little effort was made on the part of the peace studies staff of all three schools to take the opportunity to explain the program directly to recruitment personnel.

From the outset, there should be a clear definition of the process, a decision-making apparatus and reporting procedures that fit within the existing structure of the faculty and administration. I would advise that care be taken in deciding which department the program should be associated, if with one at all. Constant efforts should be made to gain confidence and respect for the program on the campus. It should not be taken for granted that Peace/Non-Violence is readily understood or accepted as a creditable academic discipline that deserves a place in the university program.

B. Relation of Differential Process to Content

It is not easy to look at the process and relate that process to the content of the curricula without taking into consideration the human personalities involved. Therefore when we discuss process in this context, to a large degree we are really referring to the aggregate behavior of the individuals involved, hence described as the group.

The Syracuse non-violence studies program reveals two distinct processes and curricula, the first and second year (1970-72) and the third and fourth year (1972-74). The first director created a program which reflected his understanding of the political process he found existing on the campus. The political process in this case was the student demonstrations which produced the demand for non-violence studies at Syracuse University. He also created a program which was consistent with his concept of non-violence studies. His appointment as director grew out of a crisis. The Summer of 1970 was nearly over and a proposal had been developed only after the administration had promised a program by the Fall term of 1970. The committee which had worked over the summer had produced some ideas but not a director. The director was the first person interviewed for the position and was quickly hired. His hiring, the approval of the demand for the non-violence studies program, both grew out of student pressure. Student power in the program was very much in evidence during the first phase of the program. The program was pretty much

run by the director and the students.

The process which was operative in the creation of the non-violence studies program at Syracuse produced the director and the curiculum. In this case one can see a direct relationship between the process and the curriculum which subsequently evolved.

The first phase ended when the faculty and administration decided that the program did not reflect their understanding as to what non-violence studies consist of. At that point, the program. The second phase of the program is characterized by a strong faculty committee which reflects the traditional approcach to deision making, course development and teaching . The curriculum in the second phase of the program clearly reflects the change in process. During the first phase courses reflected a counterculture emphasis in course titles, descriptions and contents. The second phase of the program brought changes in course titles, descriptions, and contents, which also represented the change in process.

In looking at the Colgate University peace studies program, one can recognize the strong internal orientation which guided the development of the program. The peace studies curriculum reflects an emphasis on developing students for work in the area of international affairs mainly within the government. The courses developed by the peace studies program have a strong orientation toward the international perspective.

The Colgate program derived its legitimacy and its motivation from within. The authority and inspiration for the program evolved from the internal independence of the self-contained faculty.

Manhattan Peace Studies Program on the other hand developed a professional publicity campaign to announce to the world that it was establishing the first peace studies major. Further research on the part of the Manhattan Program revealed that the first peace studies major had been established at Manchester College in Indiana in the 1948's. The Manhattan program became immediately concerned with the growth of peace studies programs at many other colleges and organized the largest peace studies convocation to this date. Manhattan's approach was the Catholic approach. It wanted the entire nation to recognize peace studies as a legitimate academic discipline. The curriculum at Manhattan represents the broadest offerings of peace studies on any college campus. There are more disciplines involved in peace studies than any other program. The curriculum in this case also reflects the process from which it evolved.

Not enough is known about this area. I recommend this issue for further study.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE PROCESS FOR ESTABLISHING PEACE STUDIES PROGRAMS

There are possibly five sources from which a peace studies program might emerge on a college campus. 1) The students. 2) Faculty. 3) Administration. 4) Community Organizations. 5) Private Institutes.

The one group among this assortment of sources that would without exception be more crucial to the development of a peace studies program on a college campus would be the faculty. Without the faculty to teach the courses there can be no successful program. Therefore it must be the aim of all the other groups to persuade faculty members to join the organizing effort. All things being equal, the deeper the commitment on the part of the faculty, more than likely the stronger the program will be.

Whoever attempts to start a peace studies program owes it to himself, and to the others expected to be involved, to gather as much information on existing programs as is available. This would be extremely important to understanding the various models which are operative and the various problems one might expect to encounter in the process of establishing a peace studies program. I suspect that this kind of information would tend to give one a scope of the field and the offerings, which would inform one's definition of peace studies.

It is important at an early stage to form a group of interested persons. This initial group should be carefully

chosen. They should be chosen based on the following criteria: 1) Faculty members who are either committed to the idea or demonstrate interest. 2) At least, but no more than, one faculty member who is not committed to the idea but is willing to offer honest criticism. 3) Administrators who are sympathetic to the idea and who also have power to make administrative decisions related to the program. 4) Students with commitment, organizing skills or influence with other students. Eventually the group should expand to include people from the community.

The purpose of the program should be clearly stated and periodically the purpose should be reiterated especially when making crucial decisions and planning programs. The committee or group should operate on a consenus bases. I recommend that the group develop plans with free thoughts, without giving consideration to funding sources. Too many unborn thoughts have died because people dare not think beyond their immediate financial circumstances. When planning, think about peace studies in a holistic way, keeping in mind that each discipline has a potential contribution to make to the study of peace.

Peace studies programs, like other programs, are limited based on limited human imagination. The ideal program should address problems of peace and conflict on a variety of levels, from the transnational to the intra-personal level.

In the process of establishing a program, it is important to seek and to involve people who have experiential learning as well as academic learning. One must keep in mind that truth, like a diamond, has many facets and that solid unity can be powerful enough to cut steel. A person with practical experience can be most valuable in planning and implementing programmatic strategies.

I recommend that each peace studies program have in its organizational structure at least three components: one a research component. This research component should have not only historical focus, but also a current focus which informs current group decisions and group action. Secondly, there should be a teaching component. This component should focus on content and pedagogical considerations for the study of peace. Thirdly, there should be an action component which is change oriented. These three components must not be seen as and must not operate as completely separate entities. There must be consistent integration of research, teaching and action. Equal value, appropiate resources, and attention must be given to all three components. Each component should reflect the composition of the organizing committee.

Successful and effective group development techniques should be employed to insure communication and cooperation between each component and group member. Considerable attention should be given to group process methods to prevent poor communication, confusion in decision making, misunderstanding of goals and objectives and distribution of responsibility. A carefully designed feedback mechanism and

an evaluation process should be established in the initial stage of the development.

Where possible the program should avoid an over identification with a single department. Every effort should be made to create an interdisciplinary program. Identification with one department fosters a limited perception of peace studies creating unnecessary problems of narrow interpretation.

A peace studies program must have as one of its goals consciousness raising and change within the institution where it is located. A program should have at least two objectives in this regard. First, there should be an interdisciplinary approach to peace studies not only in the structural sense, but established departments should develop to the point where their resources will be used within and beyond their respective departments to help promote and develop the peace studies program. Peace studies must become an integral part of each department. Second, there should be some attention given to analyzing the structure, organization and policies of the institution to determine whether there are institutional forms which are harmful to the development of peace. If there are, they ahould be carefully documented and analyzed and appropiate strategies should be devised to create change.

The obvious implication is that I strongly feel that Peace/Non-Violence Studies should have a change orientation.

A strong Peace/Non-Violence Studies should bring something new, refreshing and dynamic to the campus. The establishment of such a program in university should suggest that university is desirous of self-change and feels that it is necessary. This kind of program should be permitted to take a wholistic view of the university even as it should take a wholistic view of societies.

A peace studies program must not ignore institutional violence which exists on the campus where it is located. Confrontation must not be avoided simply because it might put the peace studies program in jeopardy. A peace studies program must be held accountable for putting into practice on campus the same principles that it advocates for community and the world. Peace must start from within. However, creative confrontation must have as its goal to educate and enlighten by creating a greater sense of awareness on the part of those who participate in harmful practices against their fellow human beings.

In addition the writer recommends that once a peace studies program has been established its existence should be known. Because the whole concept of peace studies and peace education programs and non-violence studies is new to the college campus, it is necessary for the directors and personnel involved in the peace studies programs to make every deliberate effort to inform key personnel in the school as to the purpose, objectives, and development of the program;

then and in continuing communication with the key personnel, the idea and knowledge of the program can become widespread. In each of the programs, there is a need to have advocates, not in the sense that basic information about the program is being given through the distribution of materials and through discussions which normally occur between people in the campus community. On many campuses where peace studies programs are located, a surprisingly large number of students are unaware of its existence. Therefore, it is incumbent upon those associated with the peace studies program to develop more effective means of communication within the campus community.

FOOTNOTES

1. King, Martin . L. Jr., "Where Do We Go From Here- Chaos or Community," Harper and Row, New York, 1967.

2. Monez, Thronton B., "Working for Peace., Implications for education," "Education for Peace- Focus on Mankind" Assoc. for Supervision and Curriculm Development, Washington, D.C., 1973, pp. 22-23.

3. William, Howard D., "A History of Colgate University, 1819-1969," Van Nostrand, Reinhold company, Chicago, Ill. 1969 p. 81.

4. Ibid. p. 81.

5. Colgate University Catalogue, 1973-1974, p. 12.

6. Ibid., p81.

7. Ibid., p. 9.

8. William, Howard D. "A History of Colgate University," p. 315.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid.

11. Appendix 1-A p. 1.

12. Appendix 1- p. 1.

13. Appendix 1- p. 1.

14. Appendix 7- p. 2.

15. Appendix 3- p. 2

16. Appendix 3- p. 2.

17. Appendix 2-

18. Appendix 3

19. Harwicks, Paul- Interview

20. Ibid.

21. Morris, John, Interview

22. Geyer, Alan- Interview

23. Whats News at Colgate Vol. VI, No. 12 May, 1972.

24. Geyer, Alan- Interview

25. Appendix 4 and 5

26. Harwicks

27. Harwicks

28. Harwicks Ibid.

29. Harwicks

30. Geyer- Interview

31. Marshall, Steven - Interview

32. Geyer- Interview

33. Harwicks- Interview

34. Harwicks

35. Geyer

36. Geyer

37. Colgate New Vol. V. No. 2 Sept. 22, 1972. p. 1.

38. Geyer

39. Report-- supervisory committee, 1971.

40. Ibid.

41. Manhattan College Catalogue 1973-74 p.8.

42. Origins of the Pacem In Terris Institute of Manhattan College.

43. Ibid.

44. Constitution, Pacem in Terris Institute Articule II Purpose p. 1. (undated and unpublished)

45. Origins of the Pacem I T I-- Structure and Activities p. 2.

46. Ibid .

47. Ibid.

48. Origin of the Pacem In Terris Institute (unpublished)

49. Sullivan, Bro. Stephen, F.S.C., "A Peace Studies Program at M-anhattan College," (a proposal dated August 8, 1972, p. 5.

50. Origin of the Pacem I. p. 5.

51. "Genesis of Peace Studies," Pacem in Terris, Newsletter, Manhattan College, June 1971, p. 5.

52. Interview with Frank Handley at Manhattan College, N.Y. February 6, 1974.

53. Ibid.

54.,Ibid.

55. Ibid.

56. Ibid.

57. Interview with Kevin Aspell (Ibid)

58. Ibid.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

1. Application for Grant for E.S.I.N. by Jim Marti (Fall 1970) p. 1-10

2. Report of Non-Violence Studies Supervisory Committee (January 12, 1972).

3. Humanities 480: Course Prospectus, (Fall 1970-71) p. 11-13

4. Humanities 480: Course Prospectus. (Spring 1970-71) p.14-24

5. Public Affairs 370 - 607 Course Description (Fall 1971-1972) p.25-30

6. Public Affairs 307- 607: Tentative Course Descriptions (Spring 1971-72) p. 31-32.

7. A proposal for a Department of Non-Violence Studies. p.33-52

8. Courses Beginning in the Fall of 1972 p. 53-62

9. Non-Violence Studies in the University: A Case Study by Neil Katz March 1973.

INTERVIEWS

1. Neil Katz - Director of Exploratory Studies in Non-Violence, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York (taken February 7, 1973).

2. Dr. Sidney Thomas - Chairman of Dept. of Fine Arts, Syracuse University, Syracuse New York (taken February 7, 1973).

3. Dr. Nathan Ginsburg - Acting Dean of Arts and Sciences (taken February 7, 1973).

4. Fran Murphy - A student Leader of the Syracuse University Strike, Spring of 1970. (taken February 7, 1973).

5. Art Fink - Staff member of the American Friends Service Committee, New England Region. (taken February).

6. Dr. Alan Geyer - Dag Hammasckold Professor of Peace Studies at Colgate College, Hamilton, New York (taken February 8,1973).

7. Dr. John Morris - Chairman of University Studies, Colgate College, Hamilton, New York (taken February 8, 1973).

8. Dr. Franklin Walin - Dean of the Faculty at Colgate College, Hamilton, New York (taken February 8, 1973).

9. Dr. Robert Freedman, Jr. - Professor of Economics, Colgate College, Hamilton, New York (taken February 8, 1973).

10. Dr. Theodore Herman - Professor of Geography, Colgate,College, Hamilton, New York (taken February 8, 1973).

11. Dr. Tom Stonier - A Plant Scientist and Director of the Peace Studies Program, Manhattan College, New York (taken January 26, 1973).

12. Steven Marshall - A student at Colgate University, Hamilton, New York (taken February 1974).

13. Paul Harwicks - Peace Intern at Colgate University, Hamilton, New York (taken February 1974).

14. John Hunt - A student at Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York (taken February 1974).

15. Alan Johnson - A student at Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York (taken February 1974).

Argyris, Chris. Intervention Theory and Method. Addison Westley Publishing Co. 1970.

Bennis, Warren G.. Interpersonal Dynamics. The Darsey Press Homewood, Illinois, 1964.

Berne, Eric. Games People Play.Random House, N.Y. 1964.

Bondurant, Joan V. Conquest of Violence, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1958.

Boulding, Kenneth E. Conflict and Violence. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1958.

Camara, dom Helder, The Church and Colonialism. Dimension Book, Inc. Dennitte, N.J. 1969.

Curle, Adam. Education for Liberation (unpublished manuscript), 1972.

Curle Adam. Making Peace, Travistock Publication Ltd. London, EC4 1971.

Curle Adam. Mystics and Miliants, Tavistock Publications Ltd., Great Britian, 1972.

Dellinger, Dave. Revolutionary Nonviolence, Doubleday and Company Inc., Garden City, New York, 1971.

Deming, Barbara. Revolution and Equilibrium. Grosman Pub., N.Y. 1971 .

Dolci, Danila. Report from Palermo. The Orion Press. N.Y. 1959.

Fromm, Kerich. The Revolution of Hope. Happer and Row, N.Y. 1968.

Graham, Hugh Davis and Gurr, Ted Robert, Violence In America, The American Library, New York, 1969.

Gregg, Richard. The Power of Non-Violence, Shocken Books, N.Y. 1966.

Hare Paul A. and Herbert H. Blumberg. Nonviolent Direct Action , Corpus Publications, Washington D.C. 1968.

Henderson, George. Education for Peace Focus on Mankind, Assoc. for Supervision and Curriculum development, Washington D.C., 1973.

Hentoff Nat. The Essays of A.J. Muste, Simon and Schuster, N.Y., 1967.

King, coretta Scott. My Life With Martin Luther King, Jr., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, N.Y., 1969.

King, Martin Luther, Where Do We Go From Here? Jarper and Row, 1963.

King, Martin Luther. Why We Can't Wait, Harper and Row, N.Y., 1963.

King, Martin Luther. Strength to Love, Harper and Row, N.Y, 1963.

Kumar, Satish. Non-Violence and Non-Existence, Christian Action Pub., London.

Laig, R.D.. Reason and Violence, Vintage, N.Y., 1971.

Lynd, Staughton. Non-Violence, in America; A Documentary History, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Mayer, Peter. The Pacifist Conscience, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, N.Y., 1966.

Monhandas, K.. Gandhi, An Autobiography, Beacon Press, Boston, 1971.

Moyer, William. Revolution: A Quaker Prescription for A Sick Society. (unpublished manscript), 1971.

McNeish, James. Fire Under the Ashes. Beacon Press, Boston, 1965.

Ng, Larry. "Alternatives to Violence." Time-Life Books. N.Y., 1968.

Oppenheimer, Martin. A Manual for Direct Action. Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1968.

Oppenheimer, Martin. The Urban Guerrilla. Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1969.

Richard, Henry c.. Behavior intervention in Human Problems. Pergamon Press, Inc. N.Y. 1971.

Rogers, Carl R.. On Becoming A Person, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1961.

Rogers, Carl R . Person to Person.: The Problem of Being Human. Real People Press, Layfayeette, Calif. 1967.

Schmuck, Richard. Organizational Development In schools. National Press Books, Palo Alto, Calif. 1971.

Sharp, Gene. Exploring Non-Violent Alternatives. Porter Sargent Pub., Boston, Mass. 1970.

Sharp, Gene. The Politics of Nonviolent Action. Porter Sargent Pub., Boston, Mass., 1973.

Sibley, Mulford. The Quiet Battle: Writings on the Theory and Practice OF Non-Violence Resistance. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Silberman, Charles E., Crisis in Black and White. Vintage Books, New York, 1964.

Silverzweig, Stanley. Your School Is On Fire. Ballantine Books, N.Y., 1971.

Sullivan, Harry s. The Psychaitric Interview. W.W. Norton and Co. Inc. N.Y. 1954.

Wallace, Anthony F.C. Culture and Personality. Random House, N.Y., 1967.

Weinberg, Arthur and Lila, Instead of Violence. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Westley, William A., Violence and the Policies, The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1970.

To: The Committee on the College and World Affairs

From: C. W. Young

Re: Proposal for a Core Course on Problems of War and Peace

The elimination of the old Core 490 has greatly reduced the proportion of the general education program devoted to world affairs. In the fall of 1967, our committee recommended that the revision of Core 490 should continue to deal with world affairs in some way. Since this recommendation has not been carried out; and, indeed, since no new core has been approved to take the place of the old Core 490, it seems appropriate for our committee to make further recommendations with regard to the representation of world affairs in the general education program.

I suggest that we propose a general education course on problems of war and peace. The unprecedented crisis in the affairs of mankind which has been brought about by the advent of weapons with a potentiality for devastation of an entirely different order of magnitude from anything that has existed in the past is too well known to need elaboration. If American society is to deal effectively with this problem, it is of the utmost importance that college students be set on the way toward an objective, critical, and imaginative approach to it. A course aimed at doing this will meet the students' demand for studies that are relevant to major issues of their lives; a demand which seems especially justified with respect to the general education curriculum.

I do not suggest that we recommend a "core course" that is universally required of all students, but rather that a group of faculty interested in developing a course in problems of war and peace be encouraged and strongly supported in working together to construct such a course and in teaching as many sections as the group can staff or as may be elected by a reasonable number of students. Genuine interest on the part of both faculty and students should be the major prerequisite to participation in the course.

The problem of war in the context of modern weaponry has aroused the concern of individuals in many areas of study, and a "peace research" movement has developed in a wide range of disciplines. Hence, individuals in many different departments can find scholarly and scientific materials of considerable sophistication in the literature of their own fields which may be brought to bear on the development of a course in problems of war and peace. Thus the Colgate system of allowing multi-departmental staffs to plan and organize general education courses with consequent mutual enlargement of knowledge and viewpoint, would be particularly appropriate for this core.

Any of the following disciplines would have something to contribute provided one or more members of the Colgate faculty in that discipline were interested in the problem:

physics	anthropology	economics
chemistry	sociology	political science
biology	psychology	history
geography	philosophy	

In listing these disciplines, I do not mean to suggest that the content of any one of them would necessarily constitute an important part of the course, but merely that individuals with the knowledge and viewpoint of any one of them might be capable of making important contributions to its development. A representative or representatives from the political science or history departments would probably be almost essential to the staff of such a course, but representation from other departments could depend upon the personal interest of individual faculty members.

The actual content of the course would necessarily be decided by the staff that developed it. But in general it should consist of reading in the literature describing the dangers posed by the new weapons and the strategic plans that have developed around them, together with considerably wider reading in the area of ideas about public policy and personal values relative to war and peace. Discussion of the reading featuring as much student participation as possible should be the basic order of the day in all classes.

The literature in the field is, of course, highly controversial, and most of it is open to both appreciation and criticism from many points of view. Because of this, I believe that panel discussions designed to bring out varying viewpoints and calling on members of the staff and invited persons from the Colgate faculty and from off the campus should be a frequent feature of the program. Most of these discussions should involve direct commentary on the reading of the course.

The above suggestions are not intended as mandates to the staff of the course, but merely as indications of the sort of thing I have in mind.

To sum up: A highly affective and educationally valuable way of studying world affairs as a part of general education would be a course designed to orient our students to the problem of war in our age of highly developed and rapidly advancing technology. Such a course would call for the application of knowledge and viewpoint from a whole spectrum of traditional disciplines. More importantly, it would challenge students to develop knowledge, understanding and concern in an area of crucial importance to the welfare, even the future existence of mankind. Colgate should move as rapidly as possible to find a staff from several departments composed of individuals interested in teaching the course, to arrange for them to include it in their teaching loads, and to give them summer assignments or released time to plan and organize it. The course should not be planned as a universal requirement, but should be a general education course in the sense of calling on faculty from several departments to develop a course dealing with an important problem of modern life.

Specific proposal:

I propose that committee send the following recommendation to the Director of the Division of University Studies.

The Committee on the College and World Affairs strongly recommends that, in view of the abandonment of the old Core 490, a new general education course be developed entitled Problems of War and Peace. This course should be a critical examination of the problems posed by modern weapons and the strategies associated with them, together with a wide variety of proposals for dealing with these problems. It should be staffed by faculty from a number of departments who feel an interest in developing and teaching the course. The course should not be made a universal requirement. As many sections should be offered as can be handled by a genuinely interested staff. Student election of the course should also set an upper limit on the number of sections. The committee recommends immediate action to discover interested faculty, to make arrangements with regard to their loads that will enable them to serve, and to provide summer work assignments or released time for them to plan and organize the course.

The Committee recommends that the fall of 1970 be set as the latest date for the full implementation of this plan, but that as many sections as possible be offered on a developmental basis in the fall of 1969 and the spring of 1970. The committee also recommends that the course be open to students in all classes.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY

HAMILTON, NEW YORK

Department of Economics

MEMORANDUM

To: Professor William Skelton
Director of University Studies

From: C. M. Hou Date: April 22, 1969

Re: A Proposed Core Course On
Problems Of War and Peace

Professor Clarence Young, a member of the Committee on College and World Affairs, has recently proposed a Core course on the problems of war and peace. His proposal has been discussed by the Committee; and I, as the Chairman of the Committee, would like to report to you the major reactions of the Committee on Mr. Young's proposal--a copy of which is herewith enclosed.

As you know, Clare feels strongly; and the Committee agrees that our students should have some knowledge of world affairs, and the best way to introduce them to this area is perhaps through a course dealing with war and peace--simply because this is a subject which has a great deal of appeal to the present generation of students. Also, any complete analysis of war and peace would probably require an interdisciplinary approach--an approach which has been an important feature of almost all of our Core courses.

The Committee was very sympathetic to Clare's proposal and, after considerable discussion, made the following suggestions:

(1) The proposed course would have to be intellectually exciting and should be a part of our general educational program. Whether it should be required of all students or whether it should be a Freshmen Core or a Senior Core would have to be decided later--depending in part on the result of the attempted evaluation of our general educational program and in part on the content of the course to be worked out by the staff.

(2) The proposed course should employ an interdisciplinary approach--again, the precise nature should be determined by the staff. It was felt, however, that for a course like this it would seem most necessary to have a political scientist, a historian and a social psychologist to serve on the staff. Other members of the staff may draw from almost any discipline.

(3) It was suggested that Clare should work closely with you to find a staff consisting of the above members. When this group is found, measures should be taken so that they may devote whatever time is necessary to develop the content of the course. If they conclude that the proposed course is both desirable and feasible and is intellectually exciting, then they may make appropriate recommendations as to its place in the entire Core curriculum and how it should be taught.

The Committee would appreciate your support of this proposal.

July 15, 1971

PEACE STUDIES AT COLGATE: BACKGROUND, PLANS, AND PURPOSE

Background

Colgate is a liberal arts college of about 2400 students. It has a strong tradition of interdisciplinary courses in foreign area studies, international affairs, and related fields. There are many arrangements for students to spend a semester or a year in study abroad or as governmental interns in Washington. During the past few years several faculty members have placed emphasis on problems of war and peace in such departmental courses as ethics and social psychology. Many individual students have taken special war/peace courses, and war/peace seminars and projects have been introduced in the January Studies program.

In the Spring of 1969, a faculty group from several departments of the University received approval for the development of an interdisciplinary course entitled Problems of War and Peace. Throughout the year 1969-70, a number of faculty members and students joined by the President and Dean of the Faculty, engaged in voluntary seminar work in preparation for the course. Financial help from the Fund for Peace and the Institute for International Order underwrote a working session of faculty and students during the summer of 1970 to produce a syllabus and book of readings. With continued help from the two foundations, the course was offered in both semesters of 1970-71. Although it was entirely elective, it enrolled about one-eighth of the student body during the two semesters. Students showed much interest and many were enthusiastic. Favorable evaluation by representatives of the World Law Fund led to further support from the Fund for Peace, the Institute for International Order, and the New York State Department of Education for a two week summer workshop led by the Colgate Faculty on New Approaches to World Order Education. Fifteen teachers and six students from 20 institutions attended.

Early in June, 1971, one of Colgate's alumni, attracted by the work done in the war/peace course, pledged $25,000 a year for a period of five years for a chair in peace studies and the development of a peace studies program.

The Plan

The success and encouragement thus far encountered has led Colgate to plan for a five-year experiment in an expanded program of peace education to be developed under the direction of the new Professor of Peace Studies. If this experiment is successful, the University plans to continue the program as a part of its regular curriculum. It also hopes that the Colgate program will serve as a stimulus to and model for a vigorous development of undergraduate peace study programs throughout the nation. The plan includes a search for funds to support faculty training for peace studies as well as additional workshops or conferences for faculty and students from other colleges.

The expanded educational program will involve the addition of new peace studies courses, some to be taught by the present faculty, some by the new Professor of Peace Studies. Increased opportunities for special peace studies projects for individual students will be offered both in the regular semesters and in the January period. This will add to the opportunities now eagerly sought by many Colgate students to engage in peace studies as a part of their education.

We are also planning a program of topical concentrations in peace studies. A concentration program will include peace studies courses together with departmental courses that are directly related to the central theme. Each student will be given the opportunity to work out a topical major in line with his special interests, but control will be exercised to assure both depth and integration. An undergraduate concentration in peace studies can prepare students for later work in peace research, peace education, leadership in peace movements or in political or administrative careers where intelligent orientation to the problems of war and peace can be of value. Many students who have taken our course in Problems of War and Peace are thinking about careers of this sort, and a fuller undergraduate offering is greatly needed. Of course, not all concentrators in peace studies will engage in a career directly related to their major, but there could be no better preparation for citizenship and no better organizing principle for liberal learning.

The Purpose of the Program

Ideally, universities and colleges should engage in vigorous study of the major issues and enterprises of their place and time. Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the growing emphasis on natural science and engineering served the accelerating growth of a technological civilization. Today, as a result of a veritable explosion of technological achievement, this civilization faces difficulties that demand radical changes in direction. The very survival of modern man requires that the special problems of a technological society be solved. Yet each one is intricately complex and baffling. We need to face these problems intelligently, with the resources of objective scientific investigation and sensitive ethical reasoning that only our institutions of higher learning can provide.

Our program is intended to furnish leadership in developing a direct, goal-oriented approach to the problems of war and peace. Its aim is to engage students in active search to find ways of:

1. Reducing the probability of war.
2. Ending war.
3. Designing a system of peace.

College students sense that their education is in large degree "irrelevant" because it does not deal directly enough with the dilemmas

of the age in which they live. Never before has there been a generation in which so many were groping for ways of dealing effectively with the great problems of human life and human society. Particularly among the most able and morally sensitive students there is a remarkable feeling of need for an education that will fit them for the tremendous task of building a civilization that modern technology cannot destroy. It is essential that they be given an opportunity to approach this task thoughtfully, realistically, and rationally and that they be encouraged in their search for effective action while learning the necessity for critical examination of their aims and methods.

Our purpose is to supply a liberal arts education that is oriented to the needs of modern civilization and to our students' desire to share in reshaping that civilization.

For further information, write to:

Professor Theodore Herman
Director of the Peace Studies Program
Colgate University
Hamilton, New York 13346

Proposed Revisions (Revised!) in Peace Studies Concentration Requirements

A. Geyer January 30, 1973

1. Two required University Studies courses:

   UNST 211 (Problems of War and Peace)
   UNST 212 (Problems of World Community)

2. One action or methods course:

   UNST 313 (Nonviolence and Conflict Resolution) or
   POSC 312 (Politics of Peacemaking in the U.S.) or
   An approved Independent Study involving action-research

3. One of the following courses in Philosophy and Religion:

   PHIL 314 (Social and Political Ethics)
   PHIL 315 (International Ethics)
   REL 361 (Religious Understanding and Social Ethics)

4. Two of the following courses in International Relations:

   POSC 213 (International Politics and American Foreign Policy)
   POSC 315 (International Organization and Law)
   POSC 316 (Arms Control and Disarmament)
   POSC 318 (Cross-Cultural Communication and International Politics)
   HIST 401 (European Diplomacy Since 1870)

5. Four approved electives from categories 2-4 above or from the Supplementary List of Approved Peace Studies Electives

COLGATE PEACE STUDIES PROGRAM January 30, 1973

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF APPROVED PEACE STUDIES ELECTIVES.

I. UNIVERSITY STUDIES

309 (General System Theory, Futures Orientation and Freedom)

II. ECONOMICS

316 (Econ. of Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and China)
351 (International Economics)
370 (Latin American Economics)
420 (Economics of Imperialism)
433 (Comparative Economic Systems)
434 (Economic Development)

III. HISTORY

308 (Twentieth Century America)
315 (American Foreign Relations)
368 (East Asia in Modern Times)
382 (Modern Africa)
401 (European Diplomacy Since 1870)
403 (Russian Foreign Policy)
486 (Seminar on Problems of World History)
4-- (Seminar on Problems of Military History)

IV. POLITICAL SCIENCE

222 (Eastern Europe Under Communism)
314 (The Soviet Union in World Affairs)
478 (Seminar in American Foreign Policy)
480 (Seminar on the Politics of Affluence, Complexity, & Violence)
488 (Seminar on American Foreign Policy & the Less Developed Countries)

V. SOCIAL RELATIONS

307 (Population Studies)
350 (Cultural Anthropology)
351 (Culture and Personality)

VI. PSYCHOLOGY

407 (Experimental Social Psychology)

VII. RELIGION

341 (Religious Beliefs & Practices of the Hindus)
342 (Religious Beliefs & Practices of the Buddhists)
343 (Religious Beliefs & Practices of Islam)
345 (Buddhist Thought in South Asia: India and Ceylon)
346 (Buddhist Thought in the Far East: China and Japan)

VIII. ENGLISH

251 (The Novel I)

Colgate University August 14, 1969

STATEMENT CONCERNING PROPOSED INTERDEPARTMENTAL
COURSE ON PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

This statement has been prepared for the information of members of the Colgate community who may be interested in a course in Problems of War and Peace to begin in September, 1970.

It will be an elective in the Division of University Studies open to all students. The possible position of the course in the Core program is being considered by the committee recently appointed to evaluate that program.

The course will aim at involving students and faculty together in the study of the problems of war and peace which have become so urgent in our time when the technological revolution has made international conflict a means to total destruction and revolutionary struggles may escalate to wars which involve the whole world. The course will explore the viewpoints that have arisen with regard to the nature of, as well as the solutions for, these problems and students will be challenged to develop well-considered viewpoints of their own.

It is assumed that faculty from all departments in the university may contribute effectively to the teaching of this course, and any faculty member who is interested is to be invited to participate. Already, faculty members from several departments have expressed an interest in serving on the staff, and other faculty who may not be able to teach in the course but who have a strong interest in the problems it deals with have indicated a willingness to participate in planning. Students who have special interests in these problems will also be involved in planning.

The following steps in preparation are planned:

(1) Faculty seminar on Problems of War and Peace will be organized for the fall semester for the prospective staff and others interested in the course. Individuals will share their own knowledge and experience and outside discussants may be brought in.

(2) Some of those who expect to teach in the course now have January projects in this field. Others may plan to do so, and a joint January course may be offered.

(3) Preparation for the course may be continued by participation in the Alpha Delta Phi seminar in Problems of War and Violence which is at least tentatively planned for the spring semester.

(4) The final and most essential preparation must be carried out in a six-week workshop in the summer of 1970. Funds for this will have to be secured from foundation or other sources.

CWY:jh

Appendix 7

WHAT IS "PEACE STUDIES"?

A Brief Comment on Definition and Purpose

Alan Geyer
Colgate University

Peace Studies is a transdisciplinary approach to peacemaking and peacekeeping among nations and peoples. It is not one academic discipline among disciplines. But these two statements are less a matter of imperial pretense than of extreme dependency on every side. Peace Studies would do well not to attempt to become a discipline in the traditional sense of specialization, lest it prematurely forfeit the learning acquired through any pertinent discipline. In principle, Peace Studies should remain open to the special contributions of all the social sciences, the natural sciences, and the humanities. There is no field of learning which has not, in recent years, made its own distinctive effort to come to terms with the scourge of war and the struggle for peace.

The openness of Peace Studies should not, however, be taken as a license to avoid defining the objectives and scope of the field as carefully as possible.

The general purpose of Peace Studies should be THE EMPOWERMENT OF STUDENTS, FACULTY, AND OTHERS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A WORLD COMMUNITY LIBERATED FROM MASS VIOLENCE AND ORDERED BY A JUST AND VIABLE SYSTEM OF PEACE.

We do not have such a world at present. Therefore, Peace Studies has an openly acknowledged bias toward significant change in the institutions and attitudes by which the peoples of Earth now live and die. For Peace Studies is founded upon the realities of historical conflict and human tragedy, not upon the abstract and arbitrary boundaries which typically separate scholarly guilds from one another. Peace Studies takes its purpose and scope, not so much from any reified view of the totality of knowledge and inquiry, as from the particular historical situation in which the human race finds itself: threatened by self-destruction. More positively, Peace Studies is the intellectual quest for those attitudinal and institutional changes which will humanize relationships now blighted by violence and injustice.

The general purpose of Peace Studies (stated above) may best be served, in undergraduate colleges and universities, by fulfilling the following six objectives:

1. Personal concern: encouraging a commitment to peacemaking through confrontation with the moral and technical issues involved in warfare and alternative approaches to international and social conflict.

2. Transnational perception: developing the capacity to perceive the oneness of human welfare across political and cultural boundaries, with special attention to patterns of interdependence and the interaction between local and transnational problems.

3. Political criticism: developing the capacity to analyze and challenge established policies and decision-making processes in matters of war/peace and related policy areas.

4. Alternative futures: developing a capacity to imagine and construct more desirable models for national and transnational institutions, especially those bearing most importantly upon war/peace affairs.

5. Action strategies: nurturing effective citizen participation in war/peace affairs through parties, publics, media, and movements, with particular attention to the possibilities and limitations of nonviolent action.

6. Ideological reconstruction: encouraging the creation of personal-social values and life-styles which make for a more peaceful human community.

These six objectives, as well as the general purpose of empowerment, should constantly be kept in mind in planning and evaluating Peace Studies curricula and special programs.

Appendix 8

A SELECTED LIST OF WORKSHOPS OFFERED THE FIRST YEAR AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

6. "Art and Social Action," by Dr. Sidney Thomas, Chairman,

Fine Arts Department. Course description - consideration of the theoretical, practical and histrocial problem in the relationship between artist, art, and society.

Dr. Thomas's comment on the course was, "In some cases faculty who gave serious courses found that students were irregular. I offered a course on Art and Social Action. When they found out that the course was going to be graded and they had to do some work, two of the five students immediately dropped out." But, Dr. Thomas felt that even if he had only three students in the workshop, they deserved to be taught if they wanted to learn. He describes the course as being quite successful and reports that the students who took the course really enjoyed it.

8. The Welfare Rights Movement

A general survey of the Welfare Rights Movement: discussion of strategies and tactics of special areas.
Kathy Sebesta, Student, LeMoyne College

18. Does Non-Violence Lead to Violence?

Through discussion, research and participant-observation, the response of antagonists to non-violence groups will be investigated.
Sol Ice, Director, Black Youth United in Syracuse

20. Non-Violent Learning Theory

An examination of how to develop new insights, skills and methods for teaching students to use suppressed hostilities for creative purposes.

22. Street Theater Workshop

Establishment of a working ensemble which will create street theater in the community and which will test its potential in developing political and social awareness.
John Urban and Neil Patterson, Seniors, Speech and Dramatic Arts

Appendix, 9

WORKSHOPS OFFERED FALL OF 1971 - SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Military System
Police and Security Systems
Judiciary
Congress
Executive
Regulatory Agencies
Corporations and Private Enterprise
Social Institutions: Family, Church, Socialization Institutions
Nonviolent Approaches to Legal Reform: the Judiciary
The Draft and Students
Nonviolent Approaches to Legal Reform: the Penal System
Corporations and Nonviolent Social Change
Corporate Responsibility

Corporations and Nonviolent Social Change: Free Enterprise
Civil Disobedience and Nonviolent Resistance
Nonviolent Approaches to Police Action
The Arts and Nonviolence--Musical Expressions
The Arts and Nonviolence--Poetical Expressions
Nonviolent Institutional Approaches to Urban Problems
Nonviolent Alternatives in the Counter-Culture
University Without Walls
Role of Alternative and Underground Media in Promoting Nonviolent Lifestyles

Nonviolent Interpersonal Crisis Intervention
Sex Roles
The Housing Co-op
The Food Co-op Model
Free Schools
Meditation and Practice
Unity Acres
Student Rights, On and Off Campus

The Role of Psychic Development in the Nonviolence Lifestyle
Writings in Nonviolent Socialism: An Historical Survey
To End War
Computers and Modern Man: What is a Nonviolent Technology?
Prison Reform
Nonviolent Direct Action: The Syracuse Peace Council
Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVW): A Case Study in Nonviolent Revolutionary Organizations
The United Farm Workers of America

Nonviolent Social Service: Assisting the Aged
Nonviolent Social Service: The Women's Self-Help Clinic
The Role of Students in the 1972 Presidential Elections

Appendix 10

22. Street Theater Workshop

Establishment of a working ensemble which will create street theater in the community and which will test its potential in developing political and social awareness.
John Urban and Neil Patterson, Seniors, Speech and Dramatic Arts

26. Women's Liberation

A discussion of women's role in present day society. For women only.
Dr. Marion Roth, Assistant Professor, Political Science

31. Revolution and Liberation of Africa

An examination of the kinds of "violence" being done in Africa today, followed by a discussion of the potential for revolutionary change in Africa in 1970's.
Ed Rube, Graduate Student, African Studies/ Political Science

35. Meditations, Explorations and Risk-Taking

Jonathan Freedman, Lecturer, Social Work:
Paul Hartley, Graduate Student, Political Science

12. The Computer-Automated Disruption

A survey of the problems in data processing resulting from a concentration of data, followed by a discussion of the physical and psychological effects which would result from the disruption of the computer.
Hamilton Armstrong, Jr., Computer Analyst

40. The Special Forces Doctrine and How Non-Violent Revolutionaries Can Learn from It

A critical examination of the purposes and techniques of the Special Forces Doctrine, how it may be used to suppress urban unrest in American cities, and how the non-violent groups can combat its effects and use its insights for developing non-violent mass movements.
Tom Adams, former Green Beret

Appendix 11

LET FREEDOM REIGN!

Section 5
Leaders: Ralph Ketcham, Paul Finkelman
Title: The Good University

A seminar in the philosophy and practice of higher education. We intend both a philosophic inquiry into the purposes, nature and structure of American universities, and an analysis of their actual operation, including curriculum, finance, teaching methods, governance, research activities, and the role of the university in the community. We will especially seek to identify the existing assumptions and value patterns. This will be a small seminar course rather than a lecture section.

Feb. 9: First introductory meeting
16: A University Case Study--read Hawkins
23: Paper due!
Mar. 2: Progressive Education--read Dewey
9: The Classical Response--read Hutchins
16: The New Progressives--read Goodman
23: Classicism Undated--read Tussman
30: Paper due!
Apr. 13: The Modern University--read Kerr and critics
20: The Case of Berkeley--role-playing
27: The Good University--teaching
May 4: The Good University--curriculum
11: The Good University--governance and community relations
18: The Good University--university's role in national life
FINAL PAPER

Partial bibliography

Hugh Hawkins, ed., The Emerging University and Industrial America
John Dewey, Education and Experience
Robert Hutchins, The Higher Learning in America

Appendix 11b

Paul Goodman, Compulsory Miseducation and the Community of Scholars

Joseph Tussman, Experiment at Berkeley
Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University
Various pamphlets from the Detroit Radical Education Department

5. Entrenched Media Harassment Workshop. An investigation will be made of the Syracuse media with the goal of uncovering any reluctance to cover stories of importance to minority and counterculture groups impartially. Also, an investigation of how to make these media more responsive will be conducted. Among the techniques being considered are:

a. Boycott
b. Anti-trust suit
c. Complaints to FCC (Radio/TV)
d. Petitions
e. Attempts to have licenses dropped (Radio/TV)
f. Initiating viable competition

6. Festival Workshop. This workshop will immerse itself in the creation of a Spring Festival for S. U. that will rival last year's, "America is Hard to Find Festival" at Cortland in support of Father Daniel Berrigan.

These courses were selected to point out that there was such a variety in form, subject matter and content, that it was difficult to make generalizations about the workshops. Some workshops were indeed open ended and others were tightly structured with required readings and written assignments on the course material. "The Good University," led by Ralph Ketcham and Paul Finkelman is a well-structured course, but it also was a popular course in the program. This course has continued to be offered in the program.

Appendix 12

NONVIOLENCE STUDIES PROGRAM Neil Katz, Director 476-5541 ex. 3870 4333,
Syracuse University 249 Physics Bldg., Syracuse, New York, 13210

Dear Colleague:

The Nonviolent Studies Program welcomes the opportunity to publicize itself as a resource for the entire University community. We believe the exploration of nonviolent change and creative conflict resolution is a necessary concern for all educators. In order that we may more effectively work towards these goals, we would appreciate you filling out and returning our questionnaire. It will be of great assistance to our program to have the opinions and comments of the faculty.

Please respond as soon as possible, or if you prefer, we can discuss this matter personally. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Neil Katz

Neil Katz, Director

NONVIOLENCE STUDIES PROGRAM Appendix 12a

Faculty Questionnaire

The new Nonviolence Studies Program, under the directorship of Neil Katz, consists of five lecture courses and workshop-seminars. This fully approved, new and integrated program within the College of Arts and Sciences permits flexibility and innovation while maintaining academic standards. The director of the program is accountable to the Nonviolence Studies Supervisory Committee and to the Committee on Non-departmental Courses and Programs.

This year's program has consisted of two of the approved lecture courses---Introduction to the Intellectual History of Nonviolence (NAS 205),and Nonviolent Change in America (NAS 326)---and several workshop-seminars (NAS 500). Fall semester NVS courses had an enrollment of 45 students; this semester the enrollment is approximately 150 students. The instructional staff of the NVS program (which presently consists of the director, one teaching assistant, and volunteer workshop leaders who are predominantly doctoral students) believe that they have exerted great effort to insure academic and scholarly quality in all courses without sacrificing the experimental and experiential nature of the program which a study of nonviolence necessarily entails.

Nonviolence Studies is presently defined as "the description, explanation, and resolution of human violence at all levels of interaction, from intra/ and interpersonal to international". The staff is currently working on a more comprehensive definition which will further clarify the content, goals, and methods of NVS and perhaps entail greater emphasis on creative conflict resolution rather than on nonviolence per se.

Although we remain flexible in our approach to Nonviolence Studies, those of us involved in the program adamantly believe that nonviolence and conflict resolution are legitimate academic concerns for the University community, and can be taught and experienced with scholarly standards of investigation. Through our experience in teaching and studying the history of proponents of, and means to, peace and creative conflict resolution, we have become increasingly convinced that nonviolence studies at Syracuse University should become a concern of the total University community. The examination, research, and building of alternatives to the phenomena of violence and destructive conflict cannot be adequately investigated by a one-member, full-time teaching staff. In an age where intra/, interpersonal, and international conflict are clearly increasing, it becomes a crucial necessity for University resources to work for creative, nonviolent means of conflict resolution. Each department and discipline have a contribution to make, and much to gain, from the exploration of more satisfying methods of conflict resolution.

NVS at Syracuse needs your help in adequately investigating these areas of concern, and we believe we might possibly contribute to your teaching and research interests particularly through our investigation of means-end parallel philosophy, value clarification, the role of personal responsibility in decision making, and the implementation of policy on all levels. NVS would then also be able to provide further insights into the increasingly important area of interdisciplinary and interdepartmental co-operation. We, therefore, would like you, the faculty, to answer the appropriate questions on this questionnaire so that we may further the dialogue on this matter.

Appendix 12b

QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME: _____

DEPARTMENT: _____

OFFICE NUMBER AND EXTENSION: _____

1. Are you now teaching, or will you be teaching next year, any courses that you think might relate to nonviolence studies, peace studies, or creative conflict resolution?

2. Do you have research interests in any of these areas?

3. Might you possibly be willing to help team-teach, deliver a lecture, or participate in any of the courses we will offer next year?

Proposed Course Titles for Next Year

Introduction to the Socio-Political Theory of Nonviolence
Introduction to Nonviolent Conflict Resolution
Models of International Peace
various workshop-seminars on nonviolence (on topics that relate to the above--one to three credit hours)

4. Would you be willing to be involved with Nonviolence Studies, either as a possible member of a steering committee or else as a friend we can visit to discuss and share our ideas about our program and our committment to explore means for creative conflict resolution?

5. Would you be willing to act as a consultant to Nonviolence Studies students who have particular interests in your teaching or research area?

6. Would you please state any comments or reactions that might be valuable for our program. For instance, do you have any opinions on our proposed change of emphasis from nonviolence studies to a center for creative conflict resolution, or any specific ideas on our role of workshop-seminars, or ways to arouse faculty interest and participation in our program?

Please return to the NVS office, Room 249 in the Physics Building.
All questionnaires will be restricted to use by the NVS staff. We greatly appreciate your time, effort, and interest in our program. Thank you.

Appendix 13

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE PEACE EDUCATION PROPOSAL

I. The Peace Education Concept

Gustavus Adolphus College has established a program of peace education. The program is innovative in that, rather than being a program of courses, it is a process by which the subject of peace becomes blended throughout the curriculum and life experience of the College as a whole as well as in several of its constituencies. It is significant in that, by the termination of the process, the College envisions that its life, its values, and its curriculum will have been considerably modified, and that the imperatives associated with the academic consideration of peace and with personal and institutional involvement in the making of peace, will have been widely exposed to the constituencies of the College.

The Gustavus Adolphus College Program of Peace Education is first of all, and unashamedly, built upon a set of values; it does not propose to seek a new set of values or in the conventional sense to be value free. The Program assumes that peace is a fundamental moral imperative for the individual and for society. Thus, the Program, from one point of view, seeks to raise the consciousness of a college toward this imperative.

Second, the Program is directed toward the renewal and strengthening of a liberal arts curriculum.

Peace education is a broad and developing emphasis in American higher education as well as in certain distinguished

American institutions primarily directed toward research. However, there has not as yet emerged a clear and limited definition of peace education along the lines of any traditional discipline of knowledge. Our assumption is that all of the liberal arts disciplines can and should make contributions to the study of peace and to the educational goals attached to peace. Peace education, as we see it, is not simply interdisciplinary in a programmatic sense, but is interdisciplinary in an essential sense. There is no peace education, in our view, unless it is set within an interdisciplinary context.

We assume that peace education must be understood positively so as to include personal and social harmony, concern for resolution of conflict and the creation of non-exploitative and non-violent relations among individuals, institutions and nations. We do not think of peace as merely the absence of war or of conflict. We think of it as the presence of active and vital quests for irenic living, and for non-violent resolution of conflict.

We assume, further, that ideally, peace education should begin with childhood -- indeed with early childhood -- and continue until the end of life. For this reason, we envision our peace education process to require the participation of many constituencies of the College: residents of the Riverbend area in our region of Minnesota, alumni of the College, members of supporting churches, other interested individuals, and other colleges. However, we recognize first, that the

process of peace education at Gustavus Adolphus College must be located primarily in St. Peter rather than moving throughout the region, and also that, whatever we are able to do, will not be more than a contribution to the discussion and affirmation of peace in the world. Even with outside help our means and resources are limited. But we are prepared to try to influence as many people as possible within the orbit of Gustavus Adolphus College, to increase their knowledge about, their concern for, and their commitment toward the making of peaceful human relationships both individually and in the world at large.

In order to fulfill all that we wish a peace education process at Gustavus Adolphus College to accomplish, we assume that it will be characterized as follows:

> Peace education will give systematic and sustained attention to the process of value clarification vis-a-vis personal and interpersonal, as well as institutional, peace, for faculty, students, and various members of the college's constituencies. It will begin with individuals and extend to the largest communities.
>
> Peace education will give systematic and sustained attention to the analysis of political and social systems, as well as their ecological and cultural environments, on the local, regional and global level. It will give serious attention and consideration to systematic analysis of problems and political action alternatives and methods of conflict resolution as appropriate to the various levels of its concern.
>
> Peace education will be informed by a sense of concern for all of learning and of human experience, with a non-dogmatic sense of openness to alternative ideas, with a commitment to such values as reverence for life, openness to the future and to change, respect for difference, honesty in reference both to abstract and objective truth, and also to personal

> relations, readiness to devote energy to clarification of thought, and uncompromising demand for intellectual rigor. Insofar as these values are appropriated by students in the program they will be applied to the teaching-learning process itself, and may be expected to produce tensions within and among individuals as well as changes within the learning process in the College.

Although we presume that peace education at Gustavus Adolphus College is necessarily interdisciplinary, we expect that peace education will be concerned with analysis appropriate to any discipline of learning. We only wish to guard ourselves against the possible appropriation of peace education by one or another discipline within the College.

II. The Peace Education Process

The process of peace education at Gustavus Adolphus College will turn upon four elements, and will require coordination of them.

First, a series of visiting lecturer/consultants will be invited to the campus. Each of these will be in some respect an authority in the field of peace studies. Some will be academicians, others civil servants, still others will come from the world of business or from the general public. Six will be invited during the second term of the school year 1973-74, and ten each for the following two school years.

Second, during each of the fall and spring terms of the school years 1974-75 and 1975-76, a visiting professor will be attracted to the campus on a full-time, one-term basis.

The visiting professors will teach one regular course within their discipline, conduct seminars for faculty and others, serve as resource persons, and engage in other appropriate activities.

Third, during each of the school years 1974-75 and 1975-76, three Gustavus Adolphus College faculty members (a total of six) -- or the equivalent of these -- will be provided full-time leaves in order to pursue studies in the field of peace, as appropriate to their disciplines and their interests.

Fourth, consultation conferences for members of other colleges in the region will be held in St. Peter. Each consultation will emphasize a different discipline and people from the different disciplines will be invited. They will be professors and other professionals in a particular field and they will be invited to share course materials, concepts, and programs of peace related activities in their area. For example, one such consultation will consist of music professors from the colleges and professional media programmers from radio and television stations and studios. (This does not preclude the involvement of persons from other fields who would have insight to offer. For example, a psychologist with an interest in the psychology of music would be a welcome guest to such a consultation. Because peace education has such broad implications for our society, our Peace Education Program has to take into consideration the impact such a program might make for a variety of careers and professions.)

The results of the visits of the lecturer/consultants, the visiting professors, and the faculty development activities represented by faculty leaves will be that a wide-ranging variety of peace education-related activities will modify the curriculum and the life of the college generally, not only during the active period of the program but during the years that follow.

The peace education process will be managed so as to encourage a fuller understanding of the implications of peace, broadly understood, for the academic program of the entire college and will encourage the faculty members to participate widely in the enrichment of their professional lives and departmental offerings.

Many courses already in the curriculum will be modified or enriched by elements of the peace education process.

Some new peace education courses will be introduced and interdisciplinary courses will be especially encouraged.

Faculty members of the College will be encouraged to engage in various kinds of research related to peace education and to attend such conferences, seminars, and institutes on peace as are appropriate to their respective disciplines.

In sum, Gustavus Adolphus College believes that the educational program of the college as a whole will be made more distinctive by the peace education program.

Appendix 14

RECOMMENDED COURSE OUTLINE
PEACE STUDIES (61)
Professor Tom T. Stonier, Director of the Program

Requirements: The student will be required to take seven courses, totaling twenty-one credits from among the Peace Studies (Irenology) courses listed below, plus six credits in Peace Studies 419-420, and at least three credits in Peace Studies 451-452. With the consent of the director certain courses may be substituted for the core program. In addition, a student with a special interest in government, history, sociology, or any other traditional discipline would be strongly advised to pursue a dual major.

Biology 215. Biology of Human Behavior. An inquiry into human behavior within the context of the evolutionary processes. A consideration of the biological, psychological, sociological and socio-cultural determinants affecting primate and human behavior, in particular in relation to imprinting, learning, creativity, sexual behavior, altruism, hierarchy, territoriality, violence and war.

Three credits

Economics 331. World Economic Geography. A study of the continental problems of particular zones and of individual countries, with special attention to landforms, climate, natural resources, agricultural and industrial production.

Three credits

Government 441. International Relations. Analysis of the political, social, economic, and psychological bases and methods by which states conduct their relations with one another.

Three credits

Government 442. International Organization. The development of the League of Nations and the United Nations system. A study of their structure, functions, operations, and politics.

Three credits

History 431. The Anatomy of Peace. Following an historical review of significant war-limiting and/or peace-maintaining systems employed prior to 1919, this course utilizes a case history approach to World War II, the Cold War, and Vietnam, to establish specific causes for the break-down of peace and to suggest paths to long-term peace-keeping.

Three credits

History 473. War. 3000 B.C.-1713 A.D. Naval and land-warfare, strategy, tactics, weapons, armour, goals, types of wars, and the social, economic and political aspects of wars. While a complete survey will be presented, the main accent will be placed on the wars of Greece and Rome and those of Europe from 1300-1713.

Three credits

History 474. The Art of War Since 1713. The changing forms of war; special reference to the strategic thought of nineteenth and twentieth century military authorities such as Karl von Clausewitz and B. H. Liddell Hart.
Three credits

History 479. The Cold War and After. An examination of East-West confrontation in the nuclear era. Attention is given to the ideological and economic bases of international conflict after 1945; to such episodes as Korea, the Hungarian Revolution, the Congo crisis, and Vietnam; and to such phenomena as McCarthyism in America, de-Stalinization in Russia, and the emergence of a captialist-Communist detente.
Three credits

Philosophy 413. Philosophies of War and Peace. A consideration in depth of the classical and contemporary philosophical literature on the questions of war and peace.
Three credits

Psychology 340. The Psychology of Social Problems. Selected contemporary social problems will be studied from the viewpoint of the social psychologist. Violence, urban and campus disorders, the social psychology of war and peace; social psychological, psychoanalytic and behavioral approaches to crime and juvenile delinquency; the social psychology of overpopulation.
Three credits

Religious Studies 433. Religious Dimensions of Peace. A theological and ethical inquiry into the major Judaeo-Christian responses to war: pacifism, just war and crusade. Various religious anthropologies are considered with a view to selecting an ethical basis for peace in today's world. Contemporary relevance of Reinhold Niebuhr, Mohandas K. Gandhi, Martin Luther King and Cesar Chavez.
Three credits

Religious Studies 434. Non-Violent Revolution. A study of the theory and practice of non-violence as found in select contemporary leaders: Mohandas K. Gandhi, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Cesar Chavez, Vinoba Bhave, Danilo Dolce, and Helder Camara. An examination of the theological and ethical foundations of non-violent revolution with special emphasis on its practicality for modern society.
Prerequisite: Religious Studies 433. Three credits

Sociology 301. Social Problems Seminar. Major sociological studies of social problems and concrete case studies. Social change and cultural lag as the essential element in social problems. Juniors and seniors only.
Three credits

Sociology 302. Minorities in American Society. A study of the major ethnic groups in America, their cultural contributions and conflicts and the origins of prejudice and discrimination. Theories, concepts, and research findings drawn from sociology and other social sciences as they relate to Negro-White relations as well as to other minority group conditions.

Three credits

World Literature 307. War and Violence in Western Literature. A thematic study of peace and war in Western literature. Man's evolving response to war, and the human and cultural values, underlying this response, will be examined in the major works of writers ranging from Homer and Euripides to Wilfred Owen and Jaroslav Hasek.

Three credits

Peace Studies 419-420. Seminar in Peace Studies. Group discussions with the team of instructors participating in peace studies courses and with other experts. Limited to and required of all Peace Studies majors.

Six credits

Peace Studies 421-422. Independent Studies in Peace Studies.

Six credits

Peace Studies 451-452. Peace Studies Field Project.

Six credits

Appendix 15

A DRAFT ON THE THEORY OF NON-VIOLENCE ON THE INTERPERSONAL LEVEL IN EXTREME SITUATIONS

We as human beings have made far-reaching success in our technological development, but we have not advanced very far in the area of human development. We have consistently devoted our attention and energy in the direction of developing technological competence, but have been unaware of the impact of the emotional or feeling aspect in our interpersonal relationships.

> How often have we heard, after he or she has injured or killed someone for whom there was affection, "I didn't mean to do it . . . I didn't know what else to do."

This is an example of how we have neglected this vital aspect of our human lives. We fail ourselves and others when we make no effort to find new ways of coping with interpersonal problems in extreme situations. Over and over again we observe our social immaturity and feel helpless as to what we can do about it. The reason for our helplessness lies in the very fact that we are unaware of our underdeveloped internal resources. Fear, apathy, and conformity are the factors which block openness, free choice, internal commitment, the flow of valid information and the development of creative responses.

Fear, apathy, and conformity, in the broader definition, are forms of violence in that they threaten to destroy certain qualities of human life. The writer assumes that there is general agreement that life is much more than the mere sensation of breathing.

Appendix 15a

Fear, apathy and conformity not only cause a person to participate in perpetrating violence, but allows a person to invite violence against himself. Some examples of this point will be illustrated in this paper.

Adam Curle says of human nature,

> "We can never say that men and women are irredeemably bad. They may perform violent, cruel, selfish, vicious and wanton acts, but every human action results from a combination of what is outside and what is inside a person. Thus the bad behavior of someone towards myself derives in part (though that part may be very small) from my impact on him." (from an unpublished manuscript)*

The implication of his statement supports the view that the victim to some extent contributes to the violence which is perpetrated against himself. A person, therefore, must take some responsibility for the misbehavior of others. If we are "weaved together in a single garment of destiny," and if what affects one man directly or indirectly affects us all, then not only do we bear the burden for our own behavior, but for our collective behavior.

The focus of this paper is on suggestions to alternative behavior in extreme situations. By examining the behavior of individuals in extreme situations, we hope to extrapolate principles that are applicable and helpful to those attempting to perform teaching, counseling, and administrative functions

*Education for Liberation, Adam Curle (unpublished manuscript) p.92

in our urban schools, prisons and other institutions that experience extreme conflict situations. The violence in our schools and prisons mirrors the violence in our society. There has been a substantial increase of violence in our schools in past years, especially in our urban high schools. If the schools still have any kind of educative function in our society, the schools must take a greater burden of responsibility for the violence which the citizens have been taught and practicing as well. If we are not prepared to accept the fact that our schools teach violence, then we must admit that our schools strongly encourage, condone and reinforce violent behavior in our children.

From our textbooks to the intermural hockey games we can find consistent approval and reinforcement for violent actions and violent reactions. Violence is successively presented as a way of handling social and political problems in everyday life. Our schools therefore must share the responsibility for helping people to discover the resources in themselves and in others to cope with violence without the use of violence.

The purpose of this draft is to define the theory of non-violence offense and its application in an interpersonal level. The first step will be to examine the variety of behavioral responses available to individuals when they are confronted with violence in extreme situations. The violent proneness in our present society has increased our potential for exposure to unproductive conflict and unanticipated victimization. This subject

therefore deserves more serious investigation, if for no other reason than, to heighten our level of awareness of the non-violent options when confronted with violence in extreme situations.

The Models

Public institutions and many other societal forces offer, repeatedly, the traditional models for behavior in extreme situations. A reexamination of the traditional models immediately reveals their limitations in altering violent situations.

The models which are commonly observed in extreme situations include the following:

(A) The escape model. This model demonstrates the inability or refusal to cope with the situation on a physiological or psychological level. This model takes a variety of forms, which include, panicing running away, fainting or ignoring the situation. This model is usually accompanied with uncontrolable fear which is immediately observable by the potential attacker, thus stimulating the attack or the pursuit.

(B) The defense model. This model is generally encouraged by our society. Fighting back for self defense in an extreme situation is recognized as legitimate and expected behavior. This behavior is considered to be honorable, provided the potential victim does not use unreasonable force in defending him or herself. For an example in a rape case it is necessary for the victim to show some form of resistence to establish a case against an accused rapist in a court of law. A person who does not defend him or herself is generally looked upon as a weakling or a person who lacks courage. A time lapse of a defensive reaction is generally described as retaliation.

(C) The innocent model. This model is characterized by the potential victim attempting to convince the potential attacker that he or she is not guilty of any wrong doing; or that he or she is the wrong person; or

that if he or she did commit an error, it was an innocent error. This behavior can take a variety of forms, including rapid verbal attempts of persuasion or undignified pleading for mercy. The last form of this model is usually considered to be a demoralizing posture on the part of an individual. It is looked upon by our society with disdain. The only possible exception to that image is when the individual is thought to be completely disable or in an extremely weak position of power.

(D) The protective reaction model. This model is predicated on the curious adage which advocates that "the best defense is a strong offense." "Hit first and ask questions later" is the popular version of this adage. This posture is usually justified on the basis that there is good reason to suspect an attack from the opposition, therefore, offensive action on the potential victim disables the potential attacker. The problem with this position is that the potential victim becomes in fact the attacker using inverted reasoning to justify his or her behavior.

These models have been used at various times by various groups and individuals. All of these models are inadequate to solving the problems of violence in our society. The only reason these postures are taken by people is because they have been taught to them, either by adult models, history or their contemporaries. I suggest that we examine a new model, nonviolent offense.

We have seen this new model applied on a limited scale in mass movements for social change. With some refining the principles can be applied in extreme situations on an interpersonal level. This paper is only an attempt to introduce the concept. Much more work will have to be done to refine and clearly articulate the principles.

Appendix 15f

THE THEORY:

By displaying unusual but genuine behavior in an extreme situation, one can confront in a non-threatening way. This action consequently has the potential to breakdown old stereotypes and perceptions, thus establishing communication based on the new image and perception.

If one can control himself in an extreme situation, his chances of controlling the situation increases. However, if one loses self-control his chances of controlling the situation decreases. By self-control the writer does not mean that one should suppress his feelings or become regimented in his behavior, but rather remain open to creative spontaneity. True self-mastery can only come about when one understands the importance of having a rational explanation of one's own behavior and attempt to understand the behavior of others. If one cannot understand, his behavior or the behavior of others on a rational level, he must admit that fact. Therefore, it is perfectly natural to ask a person why he is behaving in irrational manner.

Anger sometimes comes about when one observes deviant behavior on the part of another person. He asks himself why the person is behaving in such a manner and is unable to come up with a satisfactory answer. The more satisfactory our minds resolve questions for us, the more our tempers and defensive behavior is put into check. It is when we cannot find an answer that we lose our heads. When one stops trying to under-

stand deviant behavior, he gives up and sometimes gives way to irrational behavior himself.

Self-control that comes about by developing a management system over one's own behavior, is the self-control that leads to creative responses in extreme situations and successful resolution of conflict. Self-control can be increased by practice and discipline and by growing experiences. Every experience does not help one to grow. Some experiences in fact stop growth on the part of the individual. Experience alone teaches us nothing. Experiences can be a basis from which one can grow. Experiences cannot teach us unless we are able to draw from them certain rules or principles that are applicable to life. Our interpretation of an experience probably has more value than the experience itself. One cannot learn from another's experience per se, he can only learn from his interpretation of another's experience whether the experience is observed firsthand or relayed secondhand.

An understanding of the behavior of others directly contributes to an understanding of one's own behavior. To understand one's own behavior leads to self-mastery.

What must we try to understand about people who are behaving in a violent manner? The first thing we must understand is that people are taught violence and they learn well. Violence can be defined as aggressive or passive destructiveness and injury to people and property. But just as man is taught and there-

fore learns violence, he can learn nonviolent offense. For the time being let us define nonviolent offense as powerful verbal or non-verbal expressions or actions which are nonviolent in their motives, methods, and goals.

The writer believes that there is a direct correlation between the degree of violence that one can commit against another and the degree of humanism that is seen in the person against whom the violence is committed. The less humanism that is perceived in victim by the assailant, the easier it is for the violent act to be committed and the more mechanically he behaves. The degree to which he reduces the humanism in another person corresponds to the degree to which he reduces the humanism in himself.

The writer hypothesizes that an assailant can insult and assault a victim who he perceives to have some degree of humanism, but in order for a person to purposely kill another human being, it is necessary for him to reduce, in his own mind, his victim to an inhuman object. The assailant has to deny that his victim is human even if only for a moment. This is a precondition for the killer to kill his victim. He has to attribute some unjustifiable act to his victim. We then hear expressions like "He's in the way," "he's a dog," "kill the pig," even when the killer wants to justify his action against his victims.

A person who is a potential victim in an extreme situation can intervene on his own behalf. Victim-interventionist, would describe such a person.

Appendix 15i

Kenneth Boulding, in his book entitled, Conflict and Defense, makes a classification distinguishing twelve elements in seven ideologies. For example in Chapter 14 (page 300-301) he lists:

Element 4. Nature of Ultimate Reality (God)

Christian, orthodox -	Spiritual, purposive, interventionist, undetermined, anthropomorphic.
Christian, liberal -	Spiritual, purposive, bound by law's of nature, doubtfully interventionist and anthropomorphic.

Element 5. Nature of Man.

Christian, orthodox -	Predisposed to corruption because of a historic fall; redeemable by a catastrophic intervention of divine grace.
Christian, liberal -	Predisposed to goodness but liable to error; capable of improvement through education.

Just from these two ideologies of two elements we can see how some behavior can be predicted.

This would be a clear example of using the forces in B.F. Skinner's book "Beyond Freedom and Dignity" may have some relevance here, especially at the point where he says, "By manipulating environmental contingencies, one makes changes which are said to indicate a change of mind, but if there is any effect it is on behavior. The control is inconspicuous and not very effective, and some control therefore seems to be retained by the person whose mind changes," (page 92). Skinner believes that man can control man's behavior by learning to control the

contigencies of reinforcement in man's environment. Be that as it may, a man certainly is able to arrest the conscience of another man by behaving in such an unusual manner as to effect "psychological Jujisu." "Psychological Jujisu," is an art form that may some day be used in psychotherapy. The concept is taken from the Japanese Martial Art, Judo. By transposing the principles of Jujisu to applied psychology, one is able to see immediately how a trained practitioner can learn how to move with the strengths of the client for the purpose of helping the client to regain balance. Jujitsu and Judo teaches the student how to throw his opponent off balance by using the strength of the opponent. The psychotherapist can be taught the science of helping the client gain balance. A theory that is closely associated to the concept is Carl Roger's theory of Client-Centered Therapy. Roger's approach is not to work in an indirect way to get the patient to adapt the therapist's perception, but rather to work in a non-directive way to help the client to reexamine his own perceptions and determine for himself, whether his perceptions square with his own sense of reality.

Taking a more indepth look at the intra-personal dynamics, a person's interpretation is the key to behavior. Carl Rogers puts forth several propositions related to his theory of Personality and Behavior:

> "The organism reacts to the field as it is experienced and perceived. This perceptual field is the individual "reality". A person does not react to absolute reality but to his perception of reality."

Agreeing with Rogers, the writer adds one additional step

in this process.

Perception is consciousness, awareness of objects or other data through the senses. Knowledge gained by perceiving.

Interpretation:

To explain the meaning, clarify, translate, to have one's own understanding, "he interprets the silence as contempt." To give one's own conception of, a belief.

The writer believes that the organism reacts to a concatenation of experience perception and interpretation. Interpretation is the interlocatory step between perception and reaction. A reaction from the organism is therefore directly preceeded by an interpretation of that which is perceived. I feel that Carl Rogers left out an important step in the process. Let me illustrate this point by using an illustration that Rogers makes use of in the eleventh chapter of his book "Client-oriented Therapy." Rogers uses an example by Snygg and Combs to illustrate his point.

Two men driving at night on a western road: "An object looms up in the middle of the road ahead. One of the men sees a large boulder, and reacts with fright. The other, a native of the country, sees a tumble weed and reacts with nonchalance. Each reacts to the reality as perceived."

While they both perceived the same object, their perceptions were different. The one man who perceived the

object as a boulder, the writer contends that his perception of the object as a boulder was not the factor that caused him to react with fright, but rather the man's interpretation of the total situation. The man could have perceived that the object was a boulder and not have reacted with fear. On the other hand, both men could have perceived the object as a boulder and only one man experience fear. It is the writer's belief that it was the one man's interpretation of what he perceived that caused the reaction. It was what the man felt about what he perceived that caused the reaction. He had to have felt that the boulder which he perceived was going to endanger his life. He had to have interpreted the situation as being out of control, even if only for t at moment. He had to have lost confidence in the driver of the car. He had to have, not only perceived the object as a boulder, but he also had to have felt that the boulder meant danger to him. The writer contends that two men may go through the same experience at the same time and have the same perception, yet react differently, because of the difference in their interpretation of what they perceive and not a difference in what is perceived by them.

Therefore, the ultimate objective of this model is to change behavior by changing perception which will hopefully lead to a change in interpretation of the image of the potential victim.

The new models must be set by education administrators and teachers. Young people, I would venture to say, select

their role models, in part, from some teacher or principal who inspired them during their early years of development. Chances are educators, especially teachers, get to be observed more closely by young people than any other professionals simply because of the opportunity for more frequent contact. Outside of home, the professions in the schools represent the adult model for young people more so than any other place in the community.

Young people do not respect cowardice nor do they appreciate tyrants or dictators. They can come to respect and appreciate a teacher or administrator who can act with courage, understanding, concern and one who can deal in crisis in a human and loving fashion. This kind of model can easily be adopted by young people, simply because as I believe, it is much more in accord with the nature of human beings. Besides, it is a more socially creative kind of behavior for interaction with others in extreme situations.

Appendix 15n

CONCLUSION

This random sample of interviews points out the hypothesis that people are not comfortable with the present models for dealing in extreme situations. Our mass media, sports, homes, not even our schools have moved in the direction of creating new models to deal effectively with violence. We are losing ourselves in the outdated models. More hand guns have been sold to our citizenry in the past ten years than we even realize. The rate of homocide is steadily increasing, with the highest rate among family members and friends. We have taken the weapons that have been handed to us by our friends and family.

The schools have a more challenging responsibility to combat violence, because the consistant violence in not only the inner city school, but also our suburban school, makes learning impossible.

Then of course the schools have a borader responsibility to help our society to survive.

I believe it was Dr. Martin Luther King who once said, "We will have to learn to live together as brothers or die together as fools."

If educators can develop the ability to teach and act in extreme situations setting forth a new and different way to approach and deal in extreme situations, we will have fulfilled our task for the twentieth century. If we can

develop the art of seeing the climactic moment of a crisis, as an opportunity to innovate we will be taking a giant step on the road to fulfilling that task.

Norman Hearn could not be more in agreement, when he says:

> "Strikes, student confrontation, social conflicts, and other emotion-laden crises are not generally regarded as the proper setting for innovation. But often, during such times, changes must be made. At crucial points in all crises the climate is right for a major innovation. If it is the right proposal for the right time and people, substantial progress can be made in the system. The reason may be that as strain continues, most parties to the strife are anxious for a plausible solution. It is true, of course, that innovating during a crisis calls for the kind of coolness found under fire in battle. Most of us lack the talent. But crises should be considered as times of opportunity as well as trial. Making constructive use of them is probably the highest art of superintending."

One of my hopes is that school administrators and teachers when faced with extreme or crisis situations, would strongly consider the possibility of intervening in such situations in an innovative and creative way (such as the one suggested in this paper), as opposed to invoking the traditional measures of extreme force, punishment and reprimand, merely to bring the situation under control.

In the context of extreme situations, all too often, policy is formed. Most often, more repressive policies flow from intense, emotional and extreme situations, simply because, the context of the extreme situations force extreme limita-

tions on types of actions that can be taken. Decision-makers have available to themsleves only examples or models that were previously used in similar situations. It is not uncommon to find education decision-makers in extreme situations, involving students, experiencing a great deal of internal conflict and discomfort when they are called upon to use physical force in order to bring an extreme situation under control.

The unfortunate aspect is the fact that these decision-makers generally have two questions upper most in mind when presented with extreme situations. The first is how to quickly end it. The second is how will I be perceived if I take this or that course of action. Of course, there is always concern about bodily injuries that might possible take place. Even when there is sufficient warning of these situations, not too often will you find decision-makers considering the positive educational value that can come out of a medium such as violent confrontation.

When we take a serious look at the conflict and violence that is constantly taking place in our schools today, this problem can not be ignored. We must come to a decision to either allow the situation to continue to deteriorate, train our administrators to become police commanders, social firemen, or competant peaceful interventionists with trained staffs.

CONSORTIUM ON PEACE RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT

COS[illegible]
April - [illegible]

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Edward W. Barrett, Director
Communications Institute
680 5th Avenue
New York, New York 10019

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE
Ron Young, Peace Education Division
160 North 15th Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

AMERICAN ORTHOPSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION
Israel Charny
Marion F. Langer, Executive Director
1775 Broadway
New York, New York 10019

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
Louis Kriesberg
Otto N. Larsen, Executive Officer
1722 N. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

ASSOCIATED MENNONITE BIBLICAL SEMINARIES
John H. Yoder
3003 Benham Avenue
Elkhart, Indiana 46514

BELOIT COLLEGE
Milton Feder, Chairman
Committee on the Cullister Center for International Studies
Beloit, Wisconsin 53511

BETHEL COLLEGE
Duane K. Fri[illegible]
Director of Peace Studies
North Newton, Kansas 67117

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH
Albert E. Gollin & Albert D. Biderman
1990 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
Robert W. Refo[illegible], Executive Director
31 Wellesley Street East
Toronto 284, Ontario, Canada

CANADIAN PEACE RESEARCH & EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
[illegible] & Michael Wallace
[illegible], President
[illegible] Department
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

CANADIAN PEACE RESEARCH INSTITUTE
Hanna Newcom[illegible]
Norman Z. Alcock, Director
119 Thomas Street
Oakville, Ontario, Canada

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE
[illegible], Assistant to the President
United Nations Plaza & 46th Street
New York, New York 10017

CENTER FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION
[illegible]
[illegible]
Madison, Wisconsin 53715

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
[illegible]
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
30 Wadsworth Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
[illegible]
[illegible] Director
[illegible] University of Pennsylvania
[illegible] 15701

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
[illegible] Director
[illegible] Building
[illegible] of [illegible]
[illegible] 55455

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
[illegible] Lockwood
Room 33, 6 Washington Square North
New York University
New York, New York 10003

CENTER FOR NONVIOLENT CONFLICT RESOLUTION
A. Paul Hare
Department of Sociology
Haverford College
Haverford, Pennsylvania 19041

CENTER FOR PEACE STUDIES
Warren F. Kuehl, Director
University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325

CENTER FOR PEACE STUDIES
Richard McSorley, S.J., Director
Room 2, O'Gara Building
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C. 20007

CENTER FOR PEACEFUL CHANGE
Raghbir Basi, Director
5 North Hall
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44240

CENTER FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
AND DEVELOPMENT
Adam Curle & Bernard Lafayette
Charles N. Myers, Executive Director
Graduate School of Education
Larsen Hall, 500 Appian Way
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

CENTER FOR TEACHING ABOUT PEACE & WAR
Lillian Genser, Director of Programs
780 University Center Building
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202

CENTER FOR TEACHING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Charles Rivera, Director
Graduate School of International Studies
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado 80210

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF POWER AND PEACE
Patrick P. McDermott, Executive Director
110 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE PERSON
William Durland, Director
Purdue University at Ft. Wayne
Ft. Wayne, Indiana

CENTER FOR WAR/PEACE STUDIES
Doris Shmaloffer, Dir. of Resources
Robert Freeman, Western Area Director
Robert W. Gilmore, President
218 East 18th Street
New York, New York 10003

CENTER FOR WORLD ORDER STUDIES
Burns H. Weston, Director
College of Law
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

CENTER OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
Richard A. Falk
Cyril E. Black, Director
118 Corwin Hall
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

COALITION ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES AND
MILITARY POLICY
Joseph S. Clark
100 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

COLLEGE COUNCIL ON COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
Marty Dickson, Consultant
Haverford College
Haverford, Pennsylvania 19041

COMMUNITY CRISIS INTERVENTION CENTER
Gerald W. Cormick, Director
Box 1202, Social Science Institute
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

COMPARATIVE, INTERNATIONAL & GLOBAL
SURVIVAL STUDIES
David Schirmel, Director
School of Education, Room 8
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

COMPUTER INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE
RESEARCH
James Phillips
Charles Wrigley, Director
515 Computer Center
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

CONFERENCE ON PEACE RESEARCH IN HISTORY
Charles Chatfield, President
Department of History
Wittenberg University
Springfield, Ohio 45501

CONFLICT AND PEACE STUDIES PROGRAM
Jerome Laulicht, Director
Department of Sociology
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

CONFLICT STUDIES COMMITTEE
Roy L. Prosterman, Chairman
268 Condon Hall
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

CONRAD, INC.
Consortium for Higher Education Religion Studies (CHERS)
Jim Leggs & Frederick Kirschenmann
1435 Cornell Drive
Dayton, Ohio 45406

COUNCIL FOR A DEPARTMENT OF PEACE
Mary Liebman, Executive Secretary
DeWitt C. Baldwin, Chairman
110 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

COUNCIL FOR INTERCULTURAL STUDIES AND PROGRAMS
Ward Morehouse, President
Foreign Area Materials Center
60 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10017

DIMENSIONALITY OF NATIONS PROJECT
George Kent
Rudolph J. Rummel, Director
University of Hawaii
2500 Campus Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

EARLHAM SCHOOL OF RELIGION
Hugh Barbour
Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana 47374

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
James S. Last & Richard L. Deats
Box 271
Nyack, New York 10960

GOSHEN COLLEGE
J.R. Burkholder, Department of Religion
John A. Lapp, Dean of the College
Goshen, Indiana 46526

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
Robert C. Good, Dean
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado 80210

INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES
Arthur Waskow
Mark Raskin & Richard Barnett, Co-Dirs.
1520 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF NATIONAL BEHAVIOR
Lincoln Bloomfield, Director
Suite 510
1707 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF PEACE
James McGinnis, Director
3801 West Pine
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

INSTITUTE FOR WORLD ORDER
Saul H. Mendlovitz, Dir-World Order Prog
Michael Washburn, Dir-University Program
Betty Reardon, Dir-School Program
11 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

INSTITUTE OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
Elise Boulding & Kenneth Boulding
Gilbert F. White, Director
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

INTERNATIONAL PEACE ACADEMY
Phillips Kopon
Indar Jit Rikhye, Chairman
777 UN Plaza
New York, New York 10017

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS CENTER
David M. Krieger, Director
San Francisco State College
San Francisco, California 94132

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION
Chadwick Alger
John E. Turner, Executive Director
2000 Fifth Street South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404

LONG ISLAND COMMITTEE ON PEACE EDUCATION
Gordon V. Webster, Jr.
Long Island United Campus Ministries
Box 731
Stony Brook, New York 11790

MANKATO STATE COLLEGE
John B. Foster
Peace Studies Program
Department of English
Mankato, Minnesota 56001

MERSHON CENTER
Chadwick F. Alger
Richard C. Snyder, Director
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43201

NONVIOLENCE STUDIES PROGRAM
Neil Katz, Director
249 Physics Building
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210

PACEM IN TERRIS INSTITUTE
Tom Stonier, Director Peace Studies Prog
Joseph J. Mahey, President
Manhattan College
Bronx, New York 10471

PEACE RESEARCH LABORATORY
Theodore F. Heath, Director
6251 San Bonita
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

PEACE SCIENCE CURRICULUM COUNCIL
Kevin Marion, Co-Chairperson
William Paterson College of New Jersey
300 Pompton Road
Wayne, New Jersey 07470

PEACE SCIENCE SOCIETY (INTERNATIONAL)
J. David Singer, President
Walter Isard, Executive Secretary
Department of Regional Science
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174

PEACE STUDIES INSTITUTE
Allen Dexter, Director
Robert Johansen, Dept of Pol Sci/History
Manchester College
North Manchester, Indiana 46962

PEACE STUDIES PROGRAM
Alan Geyer, Director
Colgate University
Hamilton, New York 13346

PEACE STUDIES PROGRAM
Barry Sloan, Coordinator
State University of NY at Albany
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

PEACE AND CHANGE, A Journal of Peace Research
Berenice Carroll, Co-Executive Editor
Jan-sheng Lin, Managing Editor
Sonoma State College
1810 East Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, California 94928

PROGRAM ON PEACE STUDIES
George Quester, Director
Center for International Studies
URIS 156
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14850

PROGRAM FOR STUDIES IN PEACE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
Fr. Edward Leady, S.J., Director
St. Joseph's College
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131

PROGRAM FOR THE STUDY OF PEACE & WAR
James Halpin, S.J., Director
Kenneth W. Wadecki, Asst. Director
109 Gasson Hall
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167

REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
Judy Frank, Administrative Assistant
Office of International Student Affairs
1101 Bruce Hall
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

RULE OF LAW RESEARCH CENTER
Arthur Larson, Director
Duke University School of Law
Durham, North Carolina 27706

SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
Harald von Riekhoff
H. Edward English, Director
Carleton University
Ottawa 1, Ontario, Canada

SOCIETY FOR A WORLD SERVICE FEDERATION
Kurt Dreifuss, President
P.O. Box 545
Wilmette, Illinois 60091

SOCIETY FOR THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF SOCIAL ISSUES (SPSSI)
Robert Hefner
Caroline Weichlein, Administrative Assoc.
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS
Don D. Smith
Irenea Horning, Administrative Officer
P.O. Box 533
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

STANLEY FOUNDATION
John R. Rodick
Maxwell Stanley, President
Stanley Building
Muscatine, Iowa 52761

STUDENT (ADVISORY) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
Carol Vaagt & Rick Cohen
Suite 503
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

STUDIES OF CONFLICT AND PEACE
Edward Azar, Chairman
Department of Political Science
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT AND INTEGRATION
Robert C. North, Director
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

UNION COLLEGE
Norman V. Walbek, Dept of Political Sci
Dee Wentworth, Dept of Sociology
Schenectady, New York 12308

WITTENBERG UNIVERSITY
E.J. Dahl, Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Springfield, Ohio 45501

WORLD DATA ANALYSIS PROGRAM
Bruce M. Russett, Director
124 Prospect Street
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

WORLD ISSUES PROGRAM
George Young, Director
School for International Training
Kipling Road
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301

WORLD INSTITUTE COUNCIL
Julius Stulman, Pres.
777 United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017

Consultants

Joseph Lazar
COPRED General Counsel
Institute of Law in Society
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Vincent Rock
National Research Council
Division of Behavioral Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20418

Oscar Schachter, Director
United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)
801 United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017

NAMES & ADDRESSES OF THE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES WHOSE ADDRESSES ARE DIFFERENT THAN THAT OF THEIR ORGANIZATION:

Israel Charny
13 East Central Avenue
Paoli, Pennsylvania 19301

Louis Kriesberg
Department of Sociology
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210

Hanna Newcombe
25 Dundana Avenue
Dundas, Ontario
Canada

Michael Wallace
Department of Political Science
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC
Canada

Robert Freedman
Western Area Director, Center for
War/Peace Studies
Suite 300, 50 Vashell Way
Orinda, California 94563

Mary Liebman
410 South Ridge Road
McHenry, Illinois 60050

J. David Singer
Mental Health Research Institute
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Berenice Carroll
Department of Political Science
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Robert Kelner
Department of Psychology
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Don D. Smith
Department of Sociology
Florida State College
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

ADDENDUM: NEW COUNCIL MEMEBERS, May 1973

ARMS CONTROL ASSOCIATION
Thomas A. Halsted, Executive Director
Suite 503
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

CENTER FOR PEACE STUDIES
Richard McSorley, S.J., Director
Room 2, O'Gara Building
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C. 20007

EMERGENCY MINISTRY ON CONSCIENCE AND WAR
UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE USA
L. William Yoder, Secretary
Room 050, Witherspoon Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

PEACE STUDIES INSTITUTE
Wayne Floodstrand, Director
Box 104
University of Dayton
Dayton, Ohio 45469

CONSORTIUM ON PEACE RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT

COPRED COUNCIL MEMBERS

Foundations

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE
INSTITUTE FOR WORLD ORDER
STANLEY FOUNDATION

Professional Societies and Journals

AMERICAN ORTHOPSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
CANADIAN PEACE RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
CONFERENCE ON PEACE RESEARCH IN HISTORY
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION
PEACE SCIENCE SOCIETY (INTERNATIONAL)
SOCIETY FOR THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF SOCIAL ISSUES
SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS
PEACE AND CHANGE, A Journal of Peace Research

Program Organizations

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, New York City
AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
ARMS CONTROL ASSOCIATION, Washington, D.C.
CENTER FOR WAR/PEACE STUDIES, New York City
COALITION ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES AND MILITARY POLICY, Washington, D.C.
COLLEGE COUNCIL ON COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
COMMITTEE ON ECUMENICAL PEACE EDUCATION, Syracuse, New York
CONRAD, Inc. - Consortium for Higher Education Religion Studies, Dayton, Ohio
COUNCIL FOR A DEPARTMENT OF PEACE, Washington, D.C.
COUNCIL FOR INTERCULTURAL STUDIES AND PROGRAMS, New York City
EMERGENCY MINISTRY OF CONSCIENCE AND WAR, United Presbyterian Church in the USA
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION, Nyack, New York
INSTITUTE FOR WORLD ORDER, New York City
INTERNATIONAL PEACE ACADEMY, New York City
IOWA PEACE NETWORK FOR EDUCATION AND ACTION, Dubuque, Iowa
LONG ISLAND COMMITTEE ON PEACE EDUCATION, Stony Brook, New York
REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
SOCIETY FOR A WORLD SERVICE FEDERATION, Wilmette, Illinois
STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, Washington, D.C.
WORLD INSTITUTE COUNCIL, New York City

Research Centers

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, Washington, D.C.
CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, Toronto, Canada
CANADIAN PEACE RESEARCH INSTITUTE, Oakville, Ontario, Canada
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF POWER AND PEACE, Washington, D.C.
COMPUTER INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, University of Michigan
INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES, Washington, D.C.
INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF NATIONAL BEHAVIOR, Washington, D.C.
INSTITUTE OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE, University of Colorado
PEACE RESEARCH LABORATORY, St. Louis, Missouri
RULE OF LAW RESEARCH CENTER, Duke University
WORLD DATA ANALYSIS PROGRAM, Yale University

Teaching and Research Programs

ASSOCIATED MENNONITE BIBLICAL SEMINARIES, Elkhart, Indiana
BELOIT COLLEGE, Cullister Center for International Studies, Beloit, Wisconsin
BETHEL COLLEGE, Peace Studies, North Newton, Kansas
CENTER FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION, Madison, Wisconsin
CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, New York University
CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, University of Minnesota
CENTER FOR NONVIOLENT CONFLICT RESOLUTION, Haverford College
CENTER FOR PEACE STUDIES, University of Akron
CENTER FOR PEACE STUDIES, Georgetown University
CENTER FOR PEACEFUL CHANGE, Kent State University
CENTER FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT, Harvard University
CENTER FOR TEACHING ABOUT PEACE AND WAR, Wayne State University
CENTER FOR TEACHING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, University of Denver
CENTER FOR WORLD ORDER STUDIES, University of Iowa
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE PERSON, Purdue University at Ft. Wayne
CENTER OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, Princeton University
COMMUNITY CRISIS INTERVENTION CENTER, Washington University
COMPARATIVE, INTERNATIONAL AND GLOBAL SURVIVAL STUDIES, University of Massachusetts
CONFLICT AND PEACE STUDIES PROGRAM, University of Pittsburgh
CONFLICT STUDIES COMMITTEE, University of Washington
DIMENSIONALITY OF NATIONS PROJECT, University of Hawaii
EARLHAM SCHOOL OF RELIGION, Earlham College
GOSHEN COLLEGE, Goshen, Indiana
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, University of Denver
HONORS AND EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, College of William & Mary
INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF PEACE, St. Louis University
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS CENTER, San Francisco State College
MANKATO STATE COLLEGE, Peace Studies Program, Mankato, Minnesota
MERSHON CENTER, Ohio State University
NONVIOLENCE STUDIES PROGRAM, Syracuse University
PACEM IN TERRIS INSTITUTE, Manhattan College
PEACE SCIENCE CURRICULUM COUNCIL, William Patterson College of New Jersey
PEACE STUDIES INSTITUTE, Manchester College
PEACE STUDIES INSTITUTE, University of Dayton
PEACE STUDIES PROGRAM, State University of New York at Albany
PEACE STUDIES PROGRAM, Colgate University
PROGRAM FOR STUDIES IN PEACE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, St. Joseph's College
PROGRAM FOR THE STUDY OF PEACE AND WAR, Boston College
PROGRAM ON PEACE STUDIES, Cornell University
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, Carleton University, Canada
STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT AND INTEGRATION, Stanford University
STUDIES OF CONFLICT AND PEACE PROGRAM, University of North Carolina
UNION COLLEGE, Schenectady, New York
WITTENBERG UNIVERSITY, Springfield, Ohio
WORLD ISSUES PROGRAM, School of International Training, Vermont
WORLD ORDER PROGRAM, University of Hawaii

Chart of Courses, Workshops and Enrollment Figures

	No. of Courses	No. of Workshop	Student Enrollment
Fall 1970	1	41	400
Spring 1971	7	64	800
Fall 1971	5	43	256
Spring 1972	6	60	215
Fall 1972	5	7	43
Spring 1973	4	10	150

Note: Many of the workshops subdivided - figures are as close to accurate as possible.

RESUME

Bernard LaFayette, Jr.

Education

1971-1974	Harvard University, Graduate School of Education Ed.D. (Administration)
1971-1972	Harvard University, Graduate School of Education CAS
1970-1971	Harvard University, Graduate School of Education Ed.M.
1969-1970	Boston University, School of Law
1963-1964	Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee (Philosophy)
1958-1961	American Baptist Theological Seminary, Nashville, Tennessee B.A.

Employment

1974-	Director for Peace Education and Adjunct Professor of Peace Education, Gustavus Adolphus College
1972-1973	Administrative Assistant to the Principal -- St. Francis De Sales Community School
1971-1973	Teaching Fellow in Education -- Harvard University
1971-1972	Coordinator of Middlesex Community College, A.B.C.D. Extension
1970-1971	Assistant Director, Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University Graduate School of Education
1970-1972	Assistant Dean of Admissions, Harvard Graduate School of Education
1968	National Coordinator of the Poor People's Campaign
1967(fall) -1969	National Program Administrator of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Atlanta, Georgia (worked with Martin Luther King, Jr.)
1967 (spring)	National Coordinator of the Spring Mobilization to End the War in Vietnam
1964-1967	Director of the Urban Affairs Program of the American Friend's Service Committee, Chicago, Illinois
1962-1963	Organizer and Director of the Alabama Voters Registration Project, Selma, Alabama
1960-1961	Field Secretary for SNCC, Jackson, Mississippi Co-founder of the Jackson Non-Violent Movement

Professional Appointments

1973	Executive Committee of Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development, University of Colorado - Vice-President (1974)
1972	Executive Director of JAPLA -- Justice Action and Peace for Latin America
1970	Member of the Executive Committee of the International Affairs Division of the American Friend's Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Editorial Appointments and Publications

1973	Author of "Pedagogy for Peace and Non-Violence" (QP) Harvard University
1971	Senior Writer for 'The American Education Publications Unit Book,' Harvard Social Studies Project
1970	Editor-in-Chief of the Boston University Law School newspaper, Comment
1968	Member of the Editorial Board of the Soul Force, Atlanta, Georgia
1961	Editor-in-Chief of the Voice of the Jackson Non-Violent Movement
1961	Editor-in-Chief of the School Annual of the American Baptist Theological Seminary, Nashville, Tennessee

Consultative and Advisory Appointments

1973 Wounded Knee, South Dakota -- Mediator
1970 Fellowship of Reconciliation, National Staff, New York

International Activities

1973 Founder of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Justice and Social Change, Panama, Republic of Panama
1972 Travel and Research -- Puerto Rico, Venezuela, Panama, Mexico
1971 International Non-Violent Planning Conference for Latin America
1970 Member of the Fact-Finding Team that investigated the repression of the peace movement in Saigon
1969 Delegate to the International Diplomat's Conference in Montrose, Switzerland

Community Activities

1971 Organized a research action course for 7th and 8th graders to combat deaths caused by lead poisoning in paint chips
Director of the Martin Luther King Film Project, Boston, Massachusetts
Organized a plane load of Boston area residents to join the March Against Repression in Atlanta, Georgia
1969 Joined the delegation of Poor People who met with President Nixon to discuss specific failures of his social welfare program. Also met with entire cabinet, Washington, D.C.
1966 Strategist and Non-Violent architect for the Chicago Open Housing Movement
Founder of the Citizen's Committee to End Lead Poisoning and the Student Organization for Urban Leadership, Chicago

Campus Activities

1971 Vice-President of the Student Association, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Honors

Recipient of a Danforth Foundation Fellowship Underwood Fellow
Recipient of a full scholarship award from the American Baptist Home Mission Board Fisk University
Eleanor Roosevelt Scholar, Boston University
Dwight D. Eisenhower Scholar (first alternate), Harvard University
Freedom Rider and Co-founder of SNCC, Raleigh, North Carolina
Served on the executive staff of the late Dr. Martin Luther King
Recipient of full fellowship from the National Council of Negro Women
Treasurer and past president of the Phi Delta Kappa Honorary Professional Fraternity, Harvard Chapter

Personal

Married -- Kate Bulls LaFayette

Children: James Arthur
Bernard III