ANNALS, *AAPSS*, **504**, July 1989

Peace Studies as Experiential Education

By ANTHONY G. BING

ABSTRACT: This article argues that peace education and good peace studies at the university level must include peace action as well. Despite general agreement in the peace studies field that such inclusion of peace action is important, few colleges or universities have successfully incorporated an experiential component into their academic programs. Using the Peace and Global Studies Program at Earlham College as a model, this article attempts to show how peace action, in the form of on-campus cocurricular experiences, off-campus internships, and foreign study, gives new meaning to the study that precedes it but also is modified by further course work. When constructed on a developmental basis, good peace studies programs are able to offer students a way both to "think [their] way into . . . acting" and to "act [their] way into . . . thinking."

Anthony G. Bing is a graduate of Haverford College who received his master's degree at Oxford and his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. From teaching English literature at Kenyon College, American University of Beirut, and Earlham College, he has moved to being director of peace and global studies at Earlham. His special focus in peace studies has been the Middle East, an area about which he has lectured and written a great deal. His written works include a biography of the Israeli pacifist Joseph Abileah.

ERNEST Boyer's *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America* begins: "The undergraduate college in America, with its long and venerable tradition, has a unique mission to fulfill, one that will enrich and, at its best, transform."[1] Boyer contends that this mission is currently not being fulfilled, largely because of a "disturbing gap between college and the larger world."[2] After analyzing curricular and cocurricular phases of college life, his study ends with a plea for commitment:

> In the end, the quality of the undergraduate experience is to be measured by the willingness of graduates to be socially and civically engaged. Reinhold Niebuhr once wrote: "Man cannot behold except he be committed. He cannot find himself without finding a center beyond himself." The idealism of the undergraduate experience must reflect itself in loyalties that transcend self.[3]

His findings compel him to the following conclusions, however:

> But during our study we found on campus a disturbing lack of knowledge and even at times a climate of indifference about our world. . . . While some students have a global perspective the vast majority, although vaguely concerned, are inadequately informed about the interdependent world in which they live. . . . As we talked with teachers and students, we often had the uncomfortable feeling that the most vital issues of life—the nature of society, the roots of social injustice, indeed the very prospects for human survival—are the ones with which the undergraduate college is least equipped to deal.[4]

There are undoubtedly many peace studies advocates throughout the United States who would agree wholeheartedly with Boyer's analysis. Many would also claim that they are doing precisely what he says needs to be done. Indeed, they would go on, if peace studies could infuse curricula more pervasively, we would be well on the way to creating the sort of college Boyer is seeking. Words and phrases like "transform," "commitment," "global perspective," "interdependence," and "social justice" pepper the descriptions of the goals and objectives of peace studies programs throughout our country. The fact that more and more colleges and universities have adopted peace studies programs would seem to indicate that there are forces in American higher education already in the process of responding to Boyer's call.

But it would not do to be too smug. Despite our intentions, there would also appear to be gaps within the peace studies field as well, most especially a gap between theory and practice in our curricula, or what James Coleman calls "information assimilation" and "experiential learning."[5] In "A University Peace Studies Curriculum for the 1990s," George Lopez makes the following claim, one that would seem to speak directly to what Boyer found lacking in undergraduate education:

> Due to the uniqueness of the field, peace studies has a dynamism and relevance lacking in traditional disciplines. This is most manifest in the action component of peace studies, thus university peace education must have an experimental dimension in which students engage in or observe problems of peace and conflict.[6]

---

[1] Ernest L. Boyer, *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p. 6.

[3] Ibid., pp. 278-79.

[4] Ibid., pp. 281, 283.

[5] James S. Coleman, "Differences between Experiential and Classroom Learning," in *Experiential Learning: Rationale, Characteristics, and Assessment*, ed. Morris T. Keeton and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 50.

[6] George A. Lopez, "A University Peace Studies Curriculum for the 1990s," *Journal of Peace Research*, 22(2):119 (1985).

But Lopez indicates that peace studies is not immune from Boyer's criticism when he admits that "the thrust of this vision became widely accepted but its specific dimensions were never fully explored."[7] As Lopez looked for current experimental and experiential dimensions of peace studies curricula, he found that only 22 of 52 programs surveyed offered internship possibilities and only 8 of them actually required internships as part of their certificate or degree. Lopez concludes: "Thus, despite the rhetoric of mixing peace action with peace research and theory, the reality of the situation was [that] only about 15% of the programs which reported to us considered it an important enough component to demand it for degree completions."[8] Lopez, like Boyer, is aware of a gap: "The greatest gap between prescriptions for peace education and the actual curriculum of undergraduates was in the area of experiential learning, foreign study and internships. Peace 'action' simply was not a high priority."[9]

It may be that if peace studies is to be part of Boyer's solution instead of being part of his problem, it will have to find better ways to be truer to its own rhetoric. Peace studies, I believe, will find its best form in colleges and universities devoted to a symbiotic connection between theory and experience. Experience and theory should interact with one another throughout an undergraduate's career. A program should avoid the either/or nature of what W. J. Byron calls the "ongoing debate in academe," which addresses the "interesting question of whether it is preferable to act one's way into new ways of thinking or to think one's way into new ways of acting."[10] It is not just a question of adding what Lopez calls "peace action" to "peace research and theory." It is rather the process of creating a curriculum where theory gives meaning to experience and experience in turn produces a reconsideration of theory.

John Dewey has been often viewed by his critics as claiming that the only genuine education is that gained through experience. While most peace studies programs have not accepted such a simplistic view of either education or experience, they need to do more to challenge narrow definitions of experiential learning, or learning by doing, as if the doing were not prepared for or subject to subsequent analysis. Such a narrow definition of experiential learning does not help make the case for including experience in the undergraduate curriculum.

This is not to say that there is no value in looking at experience in this fashion, but inasmuch as such statements appear to elevate experience at the expense of what goes on inside the classroom, they do not lead to an academically sound or acceptable peace studies program. Strong proponents of experiential education themselves are quick to point out—as did Dewey, by the way—that all experiences are not equally educative and that there is nothing magical in the idea of action as an end in itself. According to Richard J. Kraft, "Experiential education is all too often caught in meaningless action which neither liberates the individual nor changes the society in which those individuals find themselves."[11] Those interested in both individual and social change stress the need for both action and reflection. Morris Keeton reflects on Dewey's theories in the following manner:

---

[7] Ibid., p. 119.

[8] Ibid., p. 124.

[9] Ibid.

[10] William J. Byron, "Economics," in *Justice and Peace Education*, ed. David M. Johnson (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1986), p. 71.

[11] Richard J. Kraft, "Towards a Theory of Experiential Learning," in *The Theory of Experiential Education*, ed. Richard J. Kraft and Mitchell Sakofs (Boulder, CO: Association for Experiential Education, 1985), p. 11.

> Far more fundamental than learning how to do something is the creation of new knowledge or the transformation of oneself although learning how to perform a new role borders on self-reconstruction. . . . One senses a problem, gets an idea, tries it out in its area of applicability, undergoes or experiences the consequences, and confirms or reinterprets theory in the light of those consequences.[12]

When skeptical faculties are presented with proposals to institute peace studies programs, they bring to the ensuing discussion concerns for academic respectability, fears of intellectual flabbiness, worries about their colleagues' intellectual biases, and frustrations that they cannot fit modes of inquiry into neat categories. When these same faculties are presented with the need for a strong experiential dimension to the programs, many almost unsurmountable barriers to acceptance appear to be erected. Rather than taking the required care to be very specific about what is meant by the "experiential dimension," many proponents of new programs retreat from insisting on requiring an action component to the study. Catering to what can be acceptable to skeptical faculties, however, undermines the integrity of many programs. The reason integrity is undermined is that those engaged in peace research and education need a developmental model in which theory is modified by action and action by theory. As Johan Galtung put it,

> The danger is not that researchers also are interested in education and action. They should be, and thereby get some important feed-back from the real world, from people who challenge the "findings" and from a complicated reality that refuses to respond to actions in the way suggested by the research. Much more dangerous than this would be those who engage in education and action without any research basis and for that reason have a tendency to repeat their own cherished beliefs, whether those of the establishment or the anti-establishment, trying to shape the world according to their dogmas.[13]

As if anticipating Galtung's caution, Jerry Folk some ten years ago called for an integrated approach for peace studies programs. He stated:

> That both peace research and peace education are incomplete without peace action might also be made evident in the structure of the program by including a field education component. . . . It should not be put together haphazardly, but be thoroughly thought out and integrated into the total educational approach of the program. Field experiences ought to be authorized only if they actually provide opportunity to apply and test the theoretical knowledge gained in the traditional educational experiences. Students ought also be required to reflect extensively on their field educational experiences in both written and oral form and to integrate them into the general educational experience provided by the program.[14]

The educational imperative is clear. What is less clear is what form this integration of theory and practice might take.

LINKING THEORY AND ACTION: THE EARLHAM EXPERIENCE

What follows is the description of one program that attempts to be experiential in the manner suggested by Folk. Although the Earlham College Peace and Global Studies (PAGS) Program continues to struggle to be true to the philosophy that informs it, we have tried to present a model where students, by thinking their way into new ways of action and also by acting their way into new ways of thinking, encounter and embrace a process of change that prepares them for the task of transforming their society. Although the specific forms—foreign study experiences and so on—that I describe here may not be replicable on each and every U.S. campus, I believe that no experiential dimension to peace learning, nor other serious academic work, will be educationally sound without an affirmation of this thinking-acting link.

---

[12] Morris T. Keeton, "Experiential Education," in *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (New York: Free Press, 1982), 2:619.

[13] Johan Galtung, "Twenty-five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses," *Journal of Peace Research,* 2(2):148 (1985).

[14] Jerry Folk, "Peace Education-Peace Studies Programs: Towards an Integrated Approach," *Peace and Change,* 5(1):57 (Spring 1978).

While there is a little of Dewey in all of this, there is a lot of Paulo Freire, who informs our model, along with the Quaker character of our college, a character that is shaped by traditional Quaker values of community, equality, social justice, and nonviolence. Since all colleges and universities cannot become, nor should wish to become, Quaker, the usefulness of the Earlham example must rest on the applicability of Freire's principles.

> Liberation is a praxis: the action and reflection of men upon their world in order to transform.... When a word is deprived of its dimension of action, reflection automatically suffers as well; and the word is changed into idle chatter, into *verbalism*, into an alienated and alienating "blah." It becomes an empty word, one which cannot denounce the world, for denunciation is impossible without a commitment to transform, and there is no transformation without action. On the other hand, if action is emphasized exclusively, to the detriment of reflection, the word is converted into *activism*.[15]

One should not make the mistake of assuming that historical peace-church colleges are immune from faculty criticism with respect to their peace studies programs. There were no major difficulties in getting a peace studies program accepted at Earlham in 1974, but questions of the program's academic respectability and suspicions surrounding the connection between theory and experiential learning continue to be present some 15 years later. The aim of our program has never been to measure our success by the numbers of our majors, but rather to infuse the study of peace throughout the curriculum. This has made some faculty even more wary of our enterprise. About 80 percent of the students at Earlham have had a peace studies course before they graduate, but we do not feel that even after 15 years we have been able to reach the point where the implications of our model are fully realized.

As stated previously, our model is a developmental one, with important experiential components at each stage in the student's undergraduate career. The philosophy that informs the model is that, to achieve peace, one needs to transform the structure of our society and of global society and that nonviolent means of transformation are those most likely to bring about the desired end. Howard Richards, the person most responsible for constructing our model, has given it the acronym ISMEM, which, if not strikingly memorable as an acronym, still gives an accurate idea of the four stages we see in our approach to the study of peace. These stages are:

- —IS: issues to structures;
- —M: methods of making peace by transforming structures;
- —E: experience in applying these peacemaking methods;

---

[15] Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Seabury Press, 1974), pp. 66, 75-76.

— M: methodologies of peace research and practice.

We try very hard to have students choose courses that prepare them to move systematically through the sequence. Thus the issues-to-structures courses are taken in the first two years of college. These courses treat issues of interest to entering students—world hunger, terrorism, racism, human rights, gender roles, social and economic justice—and attempt to connect particular issues to the structure of global systems. In keeping with our principle of trying to infuse the whole curriculum with peace issues, there are four courses in this sequence that also serve as introductory courses to the disciplines of anthropology, political science, economics, and philosophy. Each of these courses fulfills the general college distribution requirements. In each of the four courses we attempt to develop four types of understanding and awareness: a perspective consciousness, especially an awareness that different cultures develop different perspectives; an understanding of global dynamics, especially the dynamics of interdependence; an awareness of human choice, including how to make responsible choices; and finally, the knowledge of particular problems and issues.[16]

The second stage—methods courses—takes place in the sophomore year, usually after the first four issues-to-structures courses have been completed. These courses are "Conflict Resolution" and "Methods of Peacemaking." Both these courses, unlike the first four courses, have strong experiential elements built into them. "Conflict Resolution" includes a great deal of simulation and role play, often centering on actual conflict in our local community but sometimes involving international conflict as well. The readings in the course also try to prepare students for conflicts they may encounter in off-campus study programs or internships that follow in the student's third or fourth years. "Methods of Peacemaking" differs rather significantly from "Conflict Resolution" in its concentration on how one goes about transforming a society. Students in this course begin by practicing a kind of ethnographic research similar to what Paulo Freire calls "codification of a thematic universe." They enter into the local Richmond, Indiana, community in order to attend labor union meetings, pentecostal, black, and mainstream churches, football games, rock concerts, Rotary Club meetings, factories, old people's homes, schools, bars, and so on. They read local newspapers and watch the top-ranked television shows, keeping careful notes and card files on what themes these groups appear to find valuable and motivating.

As a second step they are asked to see where there are what Howard Richards calls "growth points" in these organizations and activities—places where energy is concentrated in ways that might allow for positive redirection and ultimately for social transformation.[17] For example, students might discover that current interest in rock concerts could be redirected to constructive social ends by having concerts held to benefit the homeless or the impoverished local farmers. Students could take the phenomenon of local civic pride and explore how it might be redirected toward establishing local community ties with sister cities in the USSR. It appears to be axiomatic that Americans are often so comfortable with the status quo that it is hard to convince them, except in dire economic depression, that there is need for structural change if this country is to fulfill its democratic promise.

---

[16] These categories appear in an essay that has helped inform our thinking: see Robert G. Hanvey, *An Attainable Global Perspective* (New York: Global Perspectives in Education, 1982).

[17] For a discussion of the idea of "growth points," see Howard Richards, *The Evaluation of Cultural Action* (New York: Humanities Press, 1985), chap. 15.

Because of inertia it also becomes difficult to think of alternatives to the present, even when that present is bringing us no closer to peace, justice, or genuine community. "Growth points," as discovered in experiential contact with the local community, allow us to build upon what a group values, thus the acceptance of alternative structures is not such a revolutionary proposition. Richards, the designer of this course and the supervisor of the experiences in the local community, relies both on the theories of Freire for a codification of meaning and on the theories of anthropologist Victor Turner for a model of motivational energy.

The Earlham student's experiential learning in peace studies does not, however, begin with these methods courses. As we taught the introductory issues-to-structures courses over the years, we came to see the need to supplement these courses with certain human relations experiences. At first we called these "human relations labs," and through them we hoped to offer instruction in skills that would help students better understand the study of peace, become better peacemakers, and be better contributing members to the immediate college and local communities. Some of the topics of these labs were training in listening skills, in assertiveness, in racial and gender awareness, in group dynamics, in nonviolence training, in human sexuality, in leadership, and in imaging the future. We hoped to use this training outside the courses to make specific links with the classroom experience.

Over the years we have had imperfect success with these workshops and labs. While a certain number of hours were required for our majors—75—no academic credit was given, and more important, no real priority was given to the activity by faculty and students already overcommitted. Faculty could not find extra time to lead the workshops, administrative staff could not be found to keep track of how many hours each student accumulated, and, most significant, students did not stick with the labs and workshops when academic pressure began to mount. Other multidisciplinary programs also encountered difficulties similar to ours when they attempted skills training for their majors.

We began to see that we needed to pool our resources with other programs, and we turned to our Student Development office for help. Much of what they were doing to train undergraduate counselors, tutors, hall advisers, student organization heads, and student government leaders quite naturally merged with the skills training we wanted in peace studies. Indeed, we came to see that almost all the community-building skills that fell within the area of Student Development were just what we were calling skills in educating for peace. By contributing to Student Development planning and activities and by encouraging Student Development staff to expand and regularize their cocurricular offerings, we could be true to our own goals of infusing peace studies throughout the curriculum, thereby strengthening the potential for all Earlham students to be peacemakers and transforming agents in their society.

Once the various programs on campus discovered the commonalities of their needs, coordination was not that difficult. The Student Development office has taken responsibility for scheduling events, minicourses, and workshops, and program directors have served as an advisory committee to the associate dean and have also agreed to be resources for implementing some of the planned activities. Now, at the beginning of each term, all students receive a schedule of human relations activities. We ask PAGS majors to participate in 8-10 of these a year during their first two years in college. An examination of the schedule prepared for the winter term of 1989 suggests the range of action in promoting what the field of peace studies calls "positive peace"—that is, the creation of structures and perspectives that stress values of cooperation, harmony, and empathetic understanding achieved through nonviolent means. Through developing skills that enhance the learning environment, we hope to affect not only the dedication of our students but also the wider community into which our students enter after graduation. The winter-term Student Development-PAGS workshops will be in

- — leadership training;
- — racial awareness;
- — assertiveness training;
- — cultural awareness—a reentry experience for those returning from foreign study, a preparation for those planning off-campus experiences, and an exploration of the contributions made by our own foreign students;
- — nonviolence training;
- — training in group dynamics and initiative games;
- — religious diversity;
- — human sexuality;
- — deepening relationships of couples; and
- — preparation for volunteer work in Richmond.

When we chose to call these skills "peace-building" rather than "personally enriching," we consciously shifted the emphasis from the individual and his or her growth to a development that cannot be measured or achieved apart from relationships with others. Education for peace does not neglect the individual, but inevitably it must shift the focus to the development of the community of which the individual is a part. The experiential learning tied to this sort of skill building speaks directly to what British peace educator Adam Curle says must be the center of all peace studies programs: "Peace studies must be concerned with approaches to reshaping society and the world order in such a way that not only is violence, overt and covert, eliminated, but harmony and cooperation are established and maintained."[18]

The third stage of the ISMEM model builds upon the courses and experiential learning of the first two. We call this stage "experience in applying peacemaking methods," and while we try to have practical experience at every stage of our curriculum, we regard a sustained field experience as the next important step. In our program these field experiences have taken the form either of individual internships, usually undertaken in the summer after the second or third years of college, or of individual participation in a group foreign-study program or in off-campus domestic programs that have a special peace and justice focus. If our courses and training have properly prepared the students, their awareness of the interrelated structures of reality will allow them to fit this sustained experience into the idea of a wider reality and to make connections that students without their preparation would find almost impossible to duplicate. It is in this sense that fieldwork as experiential learning is more than just learning by doing. It is learning by testing theory against practice. We take seriously the words of Jerry Folk that "field experiences ought to be authorized only if they actually provide the opportunity to apply and test the theoretical knowledge gained in the traditional educational experiences."[19]

---

[18] Adam Curle, "The Scope and Dilemmas of Peace Studies," in *Peace with Work to Do*, ed. James O'Connell and Adam Curle (Leamington Spa, Warwickshire, United Kingdom: Berg, 1985), p. 20.

The independent peace studies internship at Earlham is a participant-observer experience that usually takes place in summer. At times a student can pursue an internship during the school year, but we prefer to have the student totally immersed in the experience, even though in many cases this produces financial problems because of a loss of summer earnings. We do not encourage trying to receive academic credit for the experience, because then the student would have to do more reading and writing—including the writing of papers while on the job—in addition to keeping the reflective journal and writing the self-evaluation required of all those doing internships. Our hesitation about making arrangements for academic credit is, however, not just philosophical but reflects a practical consideration—unlike schools like Tufts, we simply do not have the staff to oversee and evaluate the academic features of such an internship.

Over the years we have developed a list of organizations that are open to having our students for short—minimum of 150 hours—periods of time. These include domestic and international placements. When students suggest their own internships, we ask them to follow these guidelines:

1. The students should strive to make the experience an intercultural one, preferably in a culture relatively foreign to them;
2. The students should not merely do clerical and menial work in the organizations; rather, they should have the opportunity to be involved, if even as an observer, in planning and programming;
3. The students should experience, if at all possible, a conflict situation in which they can see and feel injustice;
4. The students must secure an on-site supervisor prior to beginning the internship, and this supervisor should be actively engaged in the work of the organization as well as be able to help students reflect on their situations. Such a supervisor will write an evaluation of the student at the conclusion of the internship and will, if possible, stay in touch periodically with the PAGS director during the course of the internship.

When a PAGS student petitions to become a major, he or she indicates how the internship requirement will be fulfilled. At that time the PAGS director talks with the student about the appropriateness of the internship proposed. If the student elects an independent internship, the student submits a four- to seven-page self-evaluation after the internship is over, and makes an oral report to the joint student-faculty committee that has oversight of the PAGS program. These written and oral reports address the extent to which course work prepared the student for the experience and also reflect how the student thinks the experience might contribute to the courses elected in the rest of the student's academic program.

Another approach to stage three is the group field experience, which usually takes the form of off-campus study. Our main PAGS field experience of this sort has been our Jerusalem program—the Great Lakes Jerusalem Program—which I shall discuss in some detail. Recently, however, we have developed a Latin American refugee program in southeast Texas and will soon be initiating a peace studies program in Northern Ireland and possibly in Costa Rica or Nicaragua and Chile.

---

[19] Folk, "Peace Education," p. 57. Those seeking more information about field experience should consult *Experiential Education*, the journal of the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION IN A REAL CONFLICT SITUATION: JERUSALEM

It is difficult to imagine a more appropriate field-study experience than the one undertaken in Jerusalem. Located for most of their time in the Old City of Jerusalem, students are offered courses by Palestinian and Israeli professors that illuminate the background and current character of the Palestinian and Israeli conflict. Extensive preparation for this fall-semester program takes place the previous spring in weekly orientation meetings and during the summer with extensive assigned reading. The reading reflects both sides of the issues, and each student is assigned a small topic for which he or she is responsible when the topic comes up in the fall. The readings reflect how it is possible to have diametrically opposed interpretations of the same historical phenomena. This exercise requires the students to begin to get not only outside themselves but into the worldviews of two bitter opponents. The reading and the subsequent program could be said to be training in the imagination, especially in the kind of empathetic imagination that is the key to understanding any conflict and its possible resolution. The experience in Jerusalem challenges not only a Manichaean way of looking at the world—because one soon discovers two truths, two senses of justice, two conceptions of history—but also an objective, positivist view of knowledge itself.

Marguerite Rivage-Seul has recently called this training of the imaginative faculty the development of "moral imagination," a concept pervasive, she finds, in the work of Paulo Freire. In a recent article, "Peace Education: Imagination and the Pedagogy of the Oppressed," Rivage-Seul paraphrases G. Reddiford's description of the imaginative process as

> the ability to suspend attachment to one's personal wants and needs, as well as to the social pressures and conventions of one's own culture, or of one's place in society, in order to enter into the circumstances of another and experience them as one's own. In essence, then, Reddiford's description of imagination is equivalent to the exercise of compassion.[20]

Having to understand and enter both the Israeli and the Palestinian position on the conflict while living in the midst of it forces the Earlham students to a new recognition of the importance of feelings as well as reasoning in the formulation of knowledge. Perhaps they come close to experiencing Freire's claim that human subjectivity is the measure of the moral. The way this knowledge is learned is in confrontation with the "working of the real world."[21]

The students in Jerusalem not only have courses in Zionism, contemporary Israeli politics and contemporary Israeli society, and Palestinian politics and contemporary Palestinian society; they also have extensive fieldwork. For two weeks they work on a kibbutz. They participate in olive harvests on the West Bank and have work camps with Bir Zeit University students. They have a week-long field trip in historical geography led by a Palestinian geographer, and they have a comparable field trip in

[20] Marguerite K. Rivage-Seul, "Peace Education: Imagination and the Pedagogy of the Oppressed," *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(2):158 (May 1987).

[21] Ibid., p. 169.

the Negev led by the Israeli director of desert research for Ben Gurion University.

The most important experiential component, however, involves a term-spanning project in ethnography and conflict resolution. At the beginning of the term the group decides on three issues to explore that would open up an understanding of the current conflict from the point of view of those engaged in it. These issues have included the matter of settlements on the West Bank, the status of Jerusalem in any future peace settlement, the role of the Israeli Arab in guard duty on Israeli university campuses, and comparative aims of Israeli and Palestinian women's movements, among others. The 24 students are split into three groups, and within each group half develop the Palestinian point of view toward the problem and half the Israeli. Each side has to encompass the often widely divergent views frequently held within their own groups. Working with the director of the program, the students begin to plan their fieldwork and to keep an ethnographic journal, where they record their impressions and observations.

The courses taught by the Israelis and Palestinians feed into the fieldwork as the term progresses. For example, while working on the kibbutz, group members can assess left-wing, predominantly secular Israeli views. Often the many outside speakers who come to talk to the group—twenty to forty in a semester—can be questioned as well. More important, the students are sent to villages, cities, towns, and settlements all over Israel/Palestine. Four might interview inhabitants of a settlement on the West Bank while another four might speak to inhabitants of the Palestinian village or villages adjacent to the settlement.

Group meetings discuss progress in the field research, and at the end of the term the groups assemble for three days of role playing of the problems chosen for investigation. Typically, 8 students do the role play—half portraying Israelis; half, Palestinians—while the other 16 students observe. At the end of each day all 24 reflect on what has happened, and after the three days each student writes a reflective essay about what he or she has learned about the nature of the general conflict. We cannot claim that the students arrive at any profound solutions, but they do come to a very real understanding of the nature and cause of the conflict.[22]

Through this experiential development of their own "moral imagination," students come away from the final simulation knowing that the real source for the impasse in peace talks between Israelis and Palestinians lies in a failure of imagination on the part of the combatants. Neither Israelis nor Palestinians habitually go through the exercise of trying to see the problem through the eyes of the other. Because of this, for example, Palestinians have genuine difficulty understanding why a powerful country like Israel should fear for its security, while Israelis appear to have similar difficulties understanding Palestinian fears for their own national identity. A fear of being driven into the sea is balanced by a fear of being driven into the desert, and until these fears are acknowledged, no progress is possible. Earlham students, using their "moral imagination," come to see the reality of these fears for those who hold them. While most Earlham students will have had a course in conflict resolution before going to the Middle East, the actual experience of the conflict causes a reexamination of theories and assumptions, especially the assumption that it is relatively easy for people of goodwill to work out a solution to almost every conflict. In this case, only the exercise of the imagination appears to bring understanding of the imaginative potential in others.

---

[22] Such experiences, it could be noted, also reflect what real conflict researchers and peace researchers do themselves in real conflicts. See, for example, John E. Mroz, *Beyond Security: Private Perceptions of Arabs and Israelis* (Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press, 1980); Saadia Touval, *The Peace Brokers: Mediators in the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1948-79* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982).

This experiential dimension of peace studies has strong parallels to peace action of other sorts. For example, James Hanigan talks of Martin Luther King's quest for freedom in an analogous, developmental way:

> Human becoming is not a function of human wishing or hoping or intending but of doing, and that is as important for social as for personal growth. Only free action can achieve freedom, only truthful search can find truth, only just dealing can realize justice. Hence it is essential to care for the means of human becoming rather than for the anticipated ends of the process.[23]

"Care for the means of human becoming" is an excellent guide for anyone attempting to create a meaningful experiential dimension to the academic study of peace. In the Earlham model, the "becoming" is continued when the students come back from their field experiences to begin stage four, the study of methodologies of peace research and practice. Courses like the "Theory of International Relations" become places where the Jerusalem or internship experiences might challenge certain notions of arms control, military containment, and defense systems. On the other hand, the courses will also cause the returning students to reinterpret their own experiences, which might produce a reflection on why in Jerusalem the group paid so little attention to Soviet or American spheres of influence. Students returning from internships with agencies for social change are able to challenge some of the theories about social movements, the role of religion in social change, the limits and potential of nonviolence in social struggle, or the adequacy or inadequacy of a Marxist analysis of social change. But at the same time, methodology courses in philosophy of social science or sociological or anthropological theory enable the students to reassess their experiences in the light of theories they have not encountered in their fieldwork. In this, too, we are following Freire, who believed practical action is the indispensable complement to, not substitute for, education for critical consciousness.

CONCLUSION

Our model itself does not provide final answers, any more than the capstone conflict-resolution seminar in our Jerusalem program did. What the model does do is help construct a lifetime pattern for peacemakers in which theories and aims are constantly reexamined and adjusted in the light of experience. We want the process of the undergraduate experience to be consistent with the ends sought by graduates of our peace studies program. In our pedagogy and in our desire to integrate the theoretical with the experiential, we hope our students come to realize that in order to accomplish the peaceful transformation of our society, their means, as Jacques Maritain put it, "are, in a sense, the ends in the process of becoming."[24] These means, as we have seen, involve the development of the "moral imagination," which in itself is an exercise in compassion—compassion informed by knowledge and compassion as a means of knowing.

---

[23] James P. Hanigan, *Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Foundations of Nonviolence* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984), p. 222.

[24] Ibid., pp. 214-15.

John Hurst, in "A Pedagogy for Peace," says this about the ends of peace education:

> If the goals of Peace Studies, as well as education's historic purposes in democratic societies, are to be achieved—that is, the development of active citizens dedicated to democratic values and the public good—the end of education can not be the mere acquisition of knowledge. Rather, the end must be critically informed judgment and wise action. Knowledge alone does not either motivate or enable people to live democratically.[25]

To the extent that we are encouraging "wise action," we are moving toward the model advocated by Folk in 1978, a model yet to be realized by most peace studies programs. Once this model is in place, peace studies may not only become more secure as an acceptable academic field of study, but it may also help move us closer to the undergraduate college experience advocated by Ernest Boyer:

> The undergraduate experience at its best will move the student from competence to commitment. . . . We emphasize this commitment to community not out of a sentimental attachment to tradition, but because our democratic way of life and perhaps our survival as a people rest on whether we can move beyond self-interest and begin to understand the realities of our dependence on each other.[26]

The "realities of our dependence on each other" lie at the heart of every good peace studies program, but our ability to grasp the full implications of these "realities" will depend upon a more successful blending of theory and practice, of knowledge and action, than is currently to be found in the majority of undergraduate peace studies programs in the United States.

---

[25] John Hurst, "A Pedagogy for Peace," in *World Encyclopedia of Peace* (Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press, 1986), p. 275.

[26] Boyer, *College*, pp. 284, 8.