

INFORMATION FOR JFS SUBSCRIBERS

Journal of Futures Studies is published quarterly: February, May, August and November. Subscriptions entered after the appearance of the first issue in a volume should specify whether the subscriber wants the current volume (including back numbers) or wants to begin the subscription with the next volume. Subscription rates: Individuals US\$30/year; Students US\$10/year; Institutions US\$40/year. Postage (by air mail) and handling charge are included. Please make US dollar denominated bank check payable to Tamkang University.

COPYRIGHT POLICY

Unless a prior agreement is reached with the editors, it is a condition of publication that manuscripts submitted to this journal have not been published and will not be simultaneously submitted or published elsewhere. By submitting a manuscript, the authors agree that the copyright for their article is transferred to the publisher if and when the article is accepted for publication. This transfer does not negate the authors' rights to use their own work in the future, as in a book they are writing. The copyright does cover the exclusive rights to reproduce and distribute the article, including reprinted, photographic reproductions, microform or any other reproductions of similar nature, and translations. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, electrostatic, magnetic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, for commercial purposes, without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

Any correspondence on this subject should be addressed to :

JOURNAL OF FUTURES STUDIES

Center for Futures Studies
College of Education
Tamsui Campus
Tamkang University
Tamsui, Taipei, Taiwan
website: www.ed.tku.edu.tw/develop/JFS
E-mail: future@mail.tku.edu.tw

ISSN 1027-6084

Contents abstracted by Future Survey, Future News and New Zealand Futures Trust
--

Journal of Futures Studies

Volume 7 Number 2

2002 November

Articles

- 1 **Towards the Non-Violent Transformation of Conflict**
Francis Hutchinson
- 21 **Futures Learning: from eLearning towards a futures - oriented way of learning**
Anita Rubin
- 35 **Integrating Futures Thinking into First Year Engineering**
Patricia Kelly
- 59 **Challenging the Digital Divide**
L. P. Rai
- 75 **Looking Backwards Into the Future: A Critique of Islamic Modernism**
Istiaq Ahmed

Essays

- 97 **Trends Shaping Transportation's Future**
Robert L. Olson
- 127 **Organisational Future Sense: Action Learning and Futures**
Robert Burke
- 151 **To end terrorism**
Dietrich Fischer & Johan Galtung

Reviews

- 155 **The Skeptical Environmentalist**
Richard Eckersley
- 163 **Futurewatch**
Jennifer Coote



Tamkang University
Taiwan



WORLD FUTURES STUDIES
FEDERATION

Towards the Non-Violent Transformation of Conflict: Working to Transcend “Natural” Assumptions about Violence and War

Francis Hutchinson
University of Western Sydney, Australia

A slightly revised version of a paper presented at the 19th General Conference of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), “Globalisation, governance and social justice: new challenges for peace research,” Kyung Hee University, Suwon, South Korea, July 1-5, 2002. This paper is an invitation to reflect and widely converse on the importance of combining pedagogies of critique with pedagogies of hope. We live in an increasingly interdependent but deeply troubled world. Are there particular challenges for ourselves as peace educators?

Correspondence : Faculty of Health, Humanities and Social Ecology, University of Western Sydney, Howkesbury, Bourke St, Richmond, NSW 2753, Australia.
Email: f.hutchinson@uws.edu.au

Journal of Futures Studies, November 2002, 7(2):1~20

1

Beginnings of a Global Civic Culture

We may be encouraged by a number of positive signs of the beginnings of a global civic culture. At the start of the twenty-first century, there are some signs of wider reflection and active engagement by civil society members and global citizens on issues such as ecological responsibility, intergenerational equity and alternatives to violence. There is now more demonstrated concern, as shown for example in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, of the importance of our children having real opportunities to grow up in caring and non-violent environments. As peace educators and peace researchers, we have contributed to such developing consciousness and constructive change in some small but significant ways (Boulding & Boulding 1995; Butovkaya et al. 2000; Harris 2002; Patomäki 2001).

Yet, we know that such peacebuilding processes, including newly emergent institutions such as the International Criminal Court, are highly vulnerable. They are provisional parts of much longer-term social change processes and political contexts. They relate to the uneven development of a global civic culture, meaningful enfranchisement and improved governance at both the local and global levels (Choue 1986, 2002; Kung 1993; Adams 2000; Stephenson 2000; Suter 2000; Gilligan 2001; George 2002; Kitamura 2002; Slaughter & Burke-White 2002).

Countervailing Indicators

In our contemporary world, there are strongly countervailing indicators to those of the emergence of an effective global civic culture. There are continuing broad patterns of corporate transnational irresponsibility and greed rather than ethical investment and foresight. There is strong environmental short-sightedness by some rich world governments, including countries such as the USA and Australia, on greenhouse gas emissions and related matters of ecological concern. Globally, too, there are damaging trends in racist and gendered violence, an upsurge in the arms trade, and resurgent militarisms and fundamentalisms.

While the Cold War has gone, there has been a squandering of many of the opportunities for a major peace dividend. Over the last decade, more than 2 million children have died in wars and many more have suffered from the miseries of malnutrition, poverty, disease and sexual violence. According to the latest United Nations statistics, over 10 million children have been dying each year from preventable causes. There

are presently nearly 3 billion people living on less than US\$2 day. Meantime, for example, the three richest individuals in our world have assets that exceed the combined Gross Domestic Product of the forty-eight poorest countries (Machel 2001; UNDP 2002).

During these same years, the major arms traders in descending order of profit-making have been the United States, Britain, Russia, France, Germany, Sweden and China. While around 140 countries have signed the landmine-ban treaty (1999), only two of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council have done so. In terms of conventional arms sales over the past five years, the United States exported, for example, \$44.8bn compared with Russia's \$17.4bn. Major arms importers through these years have included countries in world trouble spots such as India and Pakistan and the Middle East (International Campaign to Ban Landmines 2001; UNDP 2002).

In the aftermath of the atrocities of September 11, we now have the War on Terror. There is an ongoing campaign against what has been defined as "the axis of evil." With these shifts and anxieties, there has come an enormous increase in global military expenditure and allocation of scarce public resources "to fighting terrorism." There are several hundred billion dollars in extra military expenditure projected for the next few years (Mazzetti 2002).

Relatedly, are there emerging signs of foreclosure and the push of the past on matters of global security and "pax" for the opening decades of the twenty-first century? A critical scanning of major contemporary discourses in mainstream print and electronic media suggest that there is. These discourses say much about the powerful persistence, for example, of variants of Hobbesian, Social Darwinist, "macho" masculinist and other reductionist assumptions about security and survival in insecure times. Dominant mentalities rarely venture beyond the conventional strategic mindsets and maxims of "preparing for peace by preparing for war."

Whether, for example, with the early Hollywood genre of guns-blazing action heroes, such as John Wayne "taming the wild west," or in major contemporary aspects of globalised, popular culture, with the explosion of television crime series, suspense movies and "interactive," recreational computer war games, arguably too few dissenting voices are being heard. The cultural preparations are for using military might or physical force not as the last but rather as the first resort in resolving conflicts and meeting life's various and complex challenges:

...The cry for destruction and killing in defence of human rights ...makes a certain appeal to the John Wayne lurking within us all...The attrac-

tions of decisive violence frequently tend to distract us from the more fundamental, though less glamorous, task of reconsidering and reconstructing our domestic and international politics so that our world will be a somewhat less dangerous place for all its inhabitants. The current drive to solve the problems of terrorist attacks by "a war against terrorism" may well involve the same unbalanced confidence in violent solutions...but the surer path to a more tranquil world is to prepare for peace directly (Coady 2002:36).

Already, there is significant evidence of much political and psychological denial. There is considerable short-sightedness about what the positives and negatives of living in an increasingly interconnected world may mean for ourselves and future generations. There are some major trends that point to policy myopia about the opportunity costs likely to flow from a global agenda that focuses heavily on military solutions while failing to engage deeply with underlying causes of destructive conflict.

Through uncritical acceptance of the long-held axiom of "preparing for peace by preparing for war," feared futures may be fomented, rather than averted, with increased risks of more cycles of war, other acts of extreme violence and planetary environmental crisis. Here is one such grim forecast about unintended negative consequences:

....No country, no matter how wealthy..., has the ability to bomb its way out of the crisis that faces the world at the beginning of the twenty-first century. The US can destroy terrorist training camps, but new ones will spring up in their place and every mistaken map coordinate, every accidental air strike on innocent civilians, creates new recruits...(Smith 2002)

Reductionism and Its Discontents

The counter-intuitive logic of "preparing for peaceful and sustainable futures directly," implies much more participatory, democratic and multilateral approaches whether to terrorist atrocities or other forms of violence. With this questioning of one true world of reality and potential reality, there are appeals for constructive beginnings of rethinking "peace" as far more than the interval between wars — a temporary pause in hostilities or relative absence of actual high level conflict and bloodshed at a given juncture. There is an invitation for critical and creative dialogue about the futures of peace, rather than foreclosure.

Active civil society envisioning and involvement, with processes associated with an emergent global ethic, are seen in these alternative discourses as valuable potentialities for improved futures in global governance. Such social alternatives thinking and engagement do not take for granted, for example, the permanency of the institution of war, of war-like behaviour as irrevocably embedded in "human nature," or of the inevitability of low level conflict spiralling into high intensity violent conflict. To begin to walk alternative pathways that may help to transcend militarisms, chauvinisms, bigotries and fundamentalisms, are understood as deeply difficult but crucial. Public policy discussion about alternatives is welcomed as part of an emergent culture of "responsible global citizenship." Rather than being foreclosed by linear-mode assumptions about security, whether through "the logic" of retaliatory "lesson-teaching" against the enemy or "pre-emptive defence" to forestall a feared future, there is openness to a variety of "alternative futures" ideas and approaches.

Critical, strategic, humanitarian and ecological questions, such as those raised at the world environmental summit in Johannesburg, need to receive, according to the arguments put by many civil society organisations, much more than high-sounding rhetoric and tokenistic application (Annan 2002; Pearce 2002; Vidal 2002). Questions such as the following deserve creative and meaningful responses that get beyond short-termism, insularity and narrowly reductionist ways of interpreting the world: How might potential realities in peaceful construction come about in basic areas such as schools, health care, provision of clean drinking water, adequate housing, catering for the needs of children, environmental protection and respecting the rights of future generations? What needs to change? What lateral thinking may assist?

According to United Nations estimates, the additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic education for all, basic health care for all and safe water and sanitation for all is roughly \$40 billion a year. To put these seemingly impossibly large sums in some perspective, projected annual expenditure to meet such targets would be less than 4 per cent of the current combined wealth of the world's top 200 super rich individuals. Put differently, it would work out as substantially less than one in ten dollars of the present annual global military budget.

With a strong pushing forward of older, culturally highly selective notions of "security" and "peace," however, many peace-building projects face a future of grossly inadequate funding and marginalisation rather than more far-sighted engagement. In these circumstances, too, the pull of alternative ideas and more inclusive or holistic approaches to peace-

making and peace-building is likely to be that much harder. A serious hearing of the latter tends to be made more difficult.

Illustrative of aspects of such conventional or dominant discourses are strategic studies and economics pieces such as the following. It is from the influential British business weekly, *The Economist*, in a major recent survey of the defence industry that forecasts on likely developments and investment opportunities in a post-September 11 world:

...Byron Callan, a defence-industry analyst at Merrill Lynch, an investment bank, has an office next to what used to be the World Trade Centre in New York. "When the second plane hit, we looked up to see an F-15 fighter circling overhead. Everybody cheered and clapped. That's the difference: people are more defence-minded, and it's carte blanche for the defence budget."

For the world's stockmarkets, September 11th was a "buy" signal. Stocks of defence companies soared after more than a decade caused by the fall of the Berlin Wall...(Carson 2002:3).

Beyond Extrapolation?

Judged by the broad thrust of trends and indicators such as these, the future looks remarkably foreclosed and bleak except perhaps for those gambling on defence industry stocks or in denial about what is happening. Meaningful peaceworking may look out of the question. Elise Boulding has reminded us, however, that our feared futures are more likely to become self-fulfilling prophecies if we cannot even imagine what a non-violent, socially just and environmentally sustainable future looks like:

We need images of the peoples of the planet living gently adventurously on the earth, walking the ways of peace, in a future still filled with challenges. It is essential to spend time dreaming the possible shapes of that future as it is to learn the skills of peace building to maintain it ... (Hutchinson 1996: 253).

In times of war and intensified perceptions of a risk-filled environment, there are increased pressures to curb criticisms and extinguish our children's dreams for a better, less violent world. Such times are likely to be ones of considerable difficulty and challenge for peace educators. Yet, they are vital periods in many ways. After all, there is much wisdom in the critical insight that "the first casualty in war is truth"(Knightly 2001).

Pressures that condone a silencing of discussion about alternative futures need to be resisted as far as is practicable. Our students merit meaningful opportunities to critically reflect on what is happening and what may happen in their world. To enable opportunities to inquire into the background factors behind acts of violence and escalating conflict, as well as for exploring alternatives, is at least a starting point for potentially valuable ideas about citizenship, human rights, democratic participation and the non-violent transformation of conflict.

At the heights of the Cold War, Johan Galtung highlighted the importance of challenging fatalistic fallacies, dystopian “inevitabilities” and “natural” assumptions about the future of cycles of hatred and revenge, violence and war. Transformative learning, dissenting and critical futures thinking and non-violent civil society action might contribute, he suggested, in practical ways to some opening up of ideas and strategies for possible pathways beyond terror or violence filled landscapes of “the future”:

To peer into the future with the methods of empirical science means extrapolation, and prediction based on extrapolation today points to catastrophe ... That does not mean that everybody has to give in to facile pessimism. Much more challenging, important, and difficult is the search for openings, for possibilities of transcending those trends (Galtung 1980; Hutchinson 1996: 1).

Such critical issues and challenges are further considered in my paper. It invites a wide sharing of ideas on creative approaches and “resources of hope” that are occurring in peace and related fields of education in various contexts and countries. As a contribution to this ongoing dialogue, my paper includes critical reflections and examples of materials from my own teaching and active engagement in peace education in Australia at the tertiary and pre-tertiary levels.

Peace Education: Challenges and Opportunities

Many challenges exist for building more peaceful futures and for learning to transform conflicts non-violently. Many more opportunities deserve to exist for integrated, cross-disciplinary studies of violence and alternatives to violence at the tertiary and pre-tertiary levels. We have just emerged from a century in which an estimated 100 million people have

died in wars and many others have suffered from the destructive effects of institutionalised forms of racist, gendered and ecological violence.

To share and learn from each other as peace educators is important for our resilience in difficult times but also for enhancing our sense of shared futures creation. Together with other civil society participants, we may contribute in working to resist colonising, violent assumptions about the world and the future. Similarly, to the extent that we are concerned about our children's futures, we need to actively listen to what they are saying. What hopes, dreams and fears do they have? Whether in formal or informal education, young people's learning experiences are much more likely to be conducive to building cultures of peace if there is meaningful dialogue and a willingness to learn from each other (Boulding 2000; Hutchinson 1998 1999; Martin 2002).

An emphasis on the principles of inclusiveness, active participation, compassion and equity in the classroom are vitally important starting points. However, such pedagogical principles may come up against entrenched "us" versus "them" fears, stereotypes and hatreds from within the wider society. The latter may include both intensified anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. The challenges are clearly great for peace educators and other peace workers if such negative assumptions are held uncritically within significant sections of the broader society.

The future is foreclosed, for example, if the world is uncritically reduced to an unrelenting struggle in which conflicting parties are starkly depicted in dichotomous terms of the "good Self" retaliating for acts of aggression by the "evil Other." Cycles of bloodshed and retaliation are reconfirmed as historical inevitabilities rather than critically reflected upon in the context of "what-if" alternative histories and processes. Ingrained assumptions about war, together with institutionalised forms of gendered, racist, homophobic and ecological violence, are "normalized" rather than resisted.

If dehumanisingly stereotypic and xenophobic reactions to refugee men, women and children fleeing from oppression and war are taken for granted, there are also major negative implications. There are serious implications for human rights in our time and for the needs of future generations. This is similarly the case if "the future" is simply viewed through the cultural lens of "hard-headed realism" in a threatening world and is narrowed dramatically to "military solutions" to complex problems. Any attempt at achieving an almost exclusive solution militarily by major nation state actors to "bottom up," asymmetric non-state terrorism is most unlikely to secure a durable peace.

In addition, there are associated major opportunity costs with scarce public financial resources channeled to meet large increases in the global military budget. Such increases come at the expense of possible funding of much needed projects for alleviating poverty, enhancing economic security for women and children, improving educational opportunities and health services, and lessening environmental degradation. In circumstances such as these, more than immediate financial considerations are involved. Levels of tolerance, inclusiveness and respect for basic civil liberties are likely to be strained or adversely affected with long-term consequences. Crucially, too, from the perspective of peace education action and challenges for civil society, there is likely to be in conventional or dominant ways of thinking on “security” an impoverishment of imagination about non-violent alternatives.

The Importance of Resources of Hope

Fear-laden images of the future can work to reinforce “natural” assumptions about “preparing for peace by preparing for war” with no real exit strategies in sight. Aung San Suu Kyi has cautioned against this. She has commented on how such limited vision and “us” versus “them” fears and hatreds can rebound on what we do in the present as teachers, parents and community members:

...A most insidious form of fear is that which masquerades as common sense or even wisdom, condemning as foolish, reckless, insignificant or futile the small, daily acts of courage which help to preserve [our] self-respect and inherent human dignity... (Aung San Suu Kyi 1999:315)

As part of practical peace-building, “resources of hope” are important (Hutchinson 1996; Boulding & Mayer 2000). An uncritical sense of fear-laden helplessness or hopelessness can reinscribe in the present taken for granted ways of thinking about damaging violent trends as inevitabilities. Rather than any practical sense of hope about meaningful and participatory alternatives, fatalistic fallacies about the futility of creatively meeting challenges and transforming conflicts non-violently leave unchallenged powerful cultural assumptions. War and violence are reconfirmed as “natural parts” of our human landscape now and for the ad infinitum future.

Practical lessons from peace-building “basics,” such as those of the three Rs of reconstruction, reconciliation and resolution, have much to offer for our troubled times. Whether in formal, non-formal or informal

education, such resources need to be much more than matters of hidden history. They deserve a much wider hearing. They deserve much more creative expression and implementation if less violent futures are to be created (Galtung & Jacobsen 2002; Reardon & Cabezudo 2002).

This is not to exaggerate the potential of creative resources of hope. There are clearly major ideological and institutional constraints in our contemporary world. Humility and realism about what we may do as peace educators and concerned citizens are sensible (Hicks 2001; Sommers 2001; Toh 2001).

Yet, foresight about damaging trends and the development of critical political literacy about institutional constraints are not the same as denying the value of idealism and active engagement. Anticipatory action learning may contribute not merely to questioning reductionist "predictive" thinking about the future as a singularity or a given dominant trajectory but in inviting constructive engagement. To do otherwise is to risk self-fulfilling prophecies (Slaughter 1995; Hutchinson 2000; Inayatullah 2002).

Working to Encourage Global Awareness: a Case Study

The University of Western Sydney has a small but active peace studies program. Since joining the staff of this university seven years ago, I have negotiated the introduction of three subjects with a strong peace studies/peace education approach at the undergraduate level: 1) "Peace, Sustainability, and World Futures;" 2) "Culture, Diversity, and Change" (a second-year Subject); and 3) "Sociology of Peace, Violence, and Sustainable Futures"(a third-year subject). These subjects are offered to a wide cross-section of social science and humanities students and include students enrolled in a newly developed Global Citizenship and Peace Studies major, as well as students studying Sociology, Social Ecology, Criminology, Tourism, and Urban and Regional Development. *Appendix 1* contains an outline of the Global Citizenship and Peace Studies major.

Peace, Sustainability and World Futures is a strongly cross disciplinary subject that invites students to critically reflect on their assumptions, fears and hopes for the future. Students are introduced to thought-provoking combinations of theory and practice drawing upon peace studies, critical pedagogy and critical futurism. Topics that are explored and discussed include Images of the Future, Dealing with Feared Futures, and Creating Cultures of Peace and Sustainability. *Appendix 2* contains some example course material.

“Culture, Diversity and Change” places a major emphasis on anti-racist and anti-violence education. Important contemporary issues such as possible pathways to meaningful reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians are discussed, along with human rights, migration and refugee issues. Related undergraduate subjects that form part of the Global Citizenship and Peace Studies major include units on interpersonal violence, women and development, and global structures and local cultures which are taught by Moira Carmody, Frances Parker and Mike Clear.

“Sociology of Peace, Violence and Sustainable Futures” deals with the causes of war and violence, as well as exploring alternatives to violence. Sub-topics include: the theory and practice of non-violent action, conflict resolution theory and practice, anti-violence education/peace education, reconciliation and community building, active citizenship and global civil society, understanding links between peace-building and sustainability, and issues of an emergent global civic ethic and responsibilities towards future generations. Subject texts are M.B. Steger and N. S. Lind (eds.) *Violence and its Alternatives* (Macmillan) and Francis Hutchinson, *Educating Beyond Violent Futures* (Routledge). *Appendix 3* contains some exemplar material.

Experiential learning approaches and active student participation are important features of each of these subjects. Rather than a lecturer-centred model, the emphasis is on co-learning, cooperative learning techniques and negotiated student projects. Students are encouraged to research and do joint presentations. There are opportunities to creatively develop peace/eco design projects. There is also a range of choices for students to do relevant fieldwork through cultural and environmental site visits. Over past years, these have included: visiting a primary school with an innovative peace education/futures education program; walking through Country with an Aboriginal Elder; investigating at first hand the Mobbs/Armstrong family’s sustainable house; visiting the Jewish Museum and talking with a holocaust survivor; and learning from various Indigenous exhibitions at the Powerhouse Museum and the Australian Museum. More recently, an urban walk on the theme of Greenbans and the history of non-violent action in Sydney have been popular with students, as has a site visit to the first government house at Parramatta with an Aboriginal teacher to encourage cross-cultural understanding and reveal hidden history. Particularly in the aftermath of September 11, there have been significant efforts to introduce students to non-Western perspectives on peace (e.g. Islamic, Buddhist) and to counter stereotypes and xenophobia (e.g. negative attitudes toward refugees).

Students are asked to keep a learning journal to reflect on what they have learnt both in and outside the class-room. Students' evaluations of their learning experiences strongly highlight the value of each of these courses for not only raising critical awareness about the causes of violence but also raising a practical sense of hope and engagement with building non-violent futures.

Supervision at the Honours, Research Masters and Ph.D. is available for students interested in Global Citizenship and Peace Studies, Peace Education and Futures Studies. Further information may be obtained by contacting Dr. Frank Hutchinson, College of Social and Health Sciences, University of Western Sydney, Locked Bag 1797, South Penrith Distribution Centre, NSW, 1797, Australia; <f.hutchinson@uws.edu.au>; or Dr. Mike Clear <m.clear@uws.edu.au>

Working to Encourage Meaningful Reconciliation: a Case Study

Another significant curriculum initiative that I have contributed to over the past few years is an Indigenous studies project (Hutchinson 2001). This curriculum initiative has emerged as a collaborative project between the open learning program of Technical and Further Education and the Aboriginal Programs Unit of the New South Wales Department of Education. It directly addresses issues of "hidden" history and the destructive effects of colonialism and institutionalised racism on Indigenous Australians. A crucial dimension of the course materials developed for this project is their focus on creative futures-thinking. There is a major emphasis on encouraging consideration of non-violent pathways for working towards socially just and meaningful reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians over coming years.

To date, the course has met a significant degree of success, even though the challenges remain substantial. Clearly, there is still a great deal to be done in terms of wider community education and enhancing intercultural understanding. Since enrollments commenced in 2001, the course has attracted considerable numbers of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous students.

There are currently almost 200 students enrolled in this course. This has happened even with little advertising. Students range from members of "the stolen generations," seeking to reclaim their Indigenous culture and identity, through to nurses, teachers and members of the wider community interested in learning about Indigenous culture and questions of reconciliation.

For further information on this innovative curriculum project, please contact Lyn Waddell, the project's co-manager. Her e-mail contact details are <lynette.waddell@tafensw.edu.au>. The relevant website is <www.oten.edu.au>

Responsibilities to Future Generations

Let me conclude with the words of Nelson Mandela and Graca Michel:

...We see young lives scarred by poverty and violence, racked by disease, contorted by discrimination. In the shadows cast by bursting wealth, we see futures cut short and potentials unrealised...We must not let this be...We have to hope too much in the potential of our children to leave things as they are...(Hutchinson & Fulton 2002:39-40)

For peace educators, there is clearly much unfinished business. At this juncture, the sharing of "resources of hope" and ongoing engagement in projects and processes of peace-building are vital. Both resilience and creativity are critical in diverse peace-working challenges that each of us may engage with not only in our time but also for the needs of future generations.

Appendix 1 Global Citizenship and Peace Studies Major

Bachelor of Social Science major, University of Western Sydney 2003-

Global Citizenship & Peace Studies

Description

Global Citizenship & Peace Studies aims to develop knowledge and critical understanding of the interrelationship of citizenship, political ideas and political action in shaping issues of governance, active citizenship, peace and sustainability. It embraces social theory within an interdisciplinary and applied framework of important civic and global issues. The award provides, *inter alia*, valuable preparation for graduates seeking a career in areas such as: policy planning and public administration, foresight and strategic development, adult and social futures education, and in the international civil service (UN and related agencies) and international non-government organisations, community and global development.

The major offers a coherent interdisciplinary course of study that examines and explores society not just as it was and is, but as it might be. It does this through the lens of an integrated use of social theory applied to the policy issues of the day.

BSS Glocal Citizenship & Peace Studies

Schedule B

Unit No.	Unit Name	Level	Cr Pts		
SS110A	Politics and Public Policy	100	10		
SS103A	Peace, Sustainability & World Futures	100	10		
<i>And 6 from the following</i>					
ET101A	Introduction to Indigenous Australian Studies	100	10		
100266	Introduction to Australian Politics	100	10		
B1953G	Global Structures & Local Cultures	100	10		
60357	Multicultural Studies	200	10		
SS203A	Multicultural Australia	200	10		
100277	Politics of Australia and Asia Relations	200	10		
SS227A	Culture, Diversity and Change	200	10		
63157	Culture & Globalisation	200	10		
SS302A	Social and Political Change	300	10		
SS204A	Crisis & Revolution	200	10		
ED201A	Critical Pedagogies	200	10		
EX203A	Issues in Third World Development	200	10		
C3176	International Community Development	300	10		
SS237A	Disability, Society & Care	200	10		
C2429	Dispute Resolution	200	10		
SS231A	Interpersonal Violence	200	10		
XXXX	Youth Cultures & Moral Panics	100	10		
C1047	Crime & Society	200	10		
XXXX	Imagined Futures	100	10		
SS307A	Sociology of Peace, Violence & Sustainable Futures	300	10		
SE110A	History of Ecological Ideas	100	10		
CT304A	Community, Identity & Culture 1-Rsch Prjt	300	10		
CT305A	Community, Identity & Culture 2-Rsch Prjt	300	20		

Assistance with course inquiries may be obtained through the University of and SE103A Western Sydney's web site: <<http://www.uws.edu.au/students>>

Appendix 2 Peace, Sustainability and World Futures (SE 103A): Unit Outline

Unit Co-ordinator: Dr Frank Hutchinson

UWS 2002 Autumn Session

When & Where **Tues Class: 12 noon – 2pm, L5, Rms 1 & 2**

Preparation for Class:

- The subject is very much designed to encourage self-directed learning, critical thinking and cross-disciplinary enquiry. What you get out of it depends a lot on what you put into your studies, and what you share and learn from others in the class.
- You are invited to actively contribute in class, to participate in field-trips, and to share ideas and insights through joint presentations/workshops on relevant themes/topics.
- Importance is attached to providing opportunities to develop creative futures thinking and conflict resolution literacy.
- One useful starting point is your Unit Reader. It is organised into 3 main parts: images of "the future," dealing with feared futures, and creating cultures of peace and sustainability.
- Throughout the session, you will be given recommendations for other useful resources (books, articles, TV programs, websites, etc.).

Tasks and submission dates:

(all work should be submitted on time unless there are extenuating circumstances)

No. : 3 tasks Worth: Task 1 (30%), Task 2 (40%), Task 3 (30%)

Dates: Task 1 (joint presentation) Negotiated class times beginning with week 8. Please reconfirm agreed time for your presentation.

Task 2 (critical futurist exercise or Time Capsule exercise or Eco/Peace design project) due Week 8 (April 26)

Task 3 (learning journal) due Week 12 (May 24).

For details of each of these tasks, see Unit Reader Pp 301-305

Peace, Sustainability and World Futures (SE 103A)

Unit Co-ordinator: Dr Frank Hutchinson

Course Outline

Weeks	Topics	Related reading/study
Weeks 1&2 (beginning March 4 & 11)	<p><i>Our Expectations of Things to Come</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introducing the unit. What are our hopes, dreams and fears about the future? Are there risks of self-fulfilling prophecies? How might such risks be lessened? Consider the value of applied foresight. Keeping a learning journal Preliminary planning for co-learning workshops Developing library and other inquiry skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For a brief introduction to key peace concepts and future-oriented issues, see Unit Reader Pp. 88-92, 134-46, 242-50. "The future in me" workshop activity Consider various influences on how many of us see "the future," e.g. popular accounts in movies, computer games and books with science fiction themes. What do such accounts reveal? What do they leave out? What assumptions are made? (e.g. About men and violence, weaponry and the settlement of disputes, the position of women, technology and change, the other/alien/foreigners/invasion anxieties). Part A of your Unit Reader invites you to critically reflect on such questions. For further discussion of the importance of rethinking taken-for-granted ways of seeing our world and the future and for opening dialogue on alternatives, see, for example, R. Slaughter (ed), <i>New Thinking for a New Millennium</i> (Routledge), Elise Boulding & K. Boulding, <i>The Future: Images and processes</i> (Sage), R. W. Connell, <i>The Men and The Boys</i> (Allen & Unwin), Riane Eisler, <i>The Chalice and the Blade</i> (Pondora/HarperCollins, London), D. Hicks & C. Holden, <i>Visions of Tomorrow</i> (Trenton), E. O'Sullivan, <i>Transformative Learning</i> (Zed, London). Check the following websites for innovative ideas/links: <http://www.aboutforesight.org> <www.metafuture.org> <www.oneworld.org/nl/> <www.worldwatch.org>

Weeks 3 & 4
(beginning
March 18 & 25)

Violence and its Alternatives

- **What are the causes of violence (local to global levels)? Are these constructive approaches to resolving conflicts non-violently?**
- Is "the first casualty in war truth?" Is war "a dying business?" The situation post Sept 11 and the challenges for long-term peacebuilding.
- Further preparation for co-learning workshops

- See Unit Reader, Pp 42-69, 72-86, 284-300, 311-326.
- Relevant websites include
 - <http://www.transcend.org> <www.peaceseite.org>
 - <www.unesco.org> <www.relationshipjourney.org>
 - <www.womenwagingpeace.net> <www.hrg.org>
 - <www.human.mie.u.ac.jp/~peace/aboutipra>
 - <www.ipb.org/index.html> <www.oneworld.org/ai>
 - <www.caat.org.uk> <www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>
- How important are empathy and cross-cultural understanding for resolving conflicts? What can we learn from different cultural and civilisational traditions on peace? (e.g. Desmond Tutu, *No Future without Forgiveness*; Rider, J. Callega & A. Perucca eds. *Peace Education*, UNESCO; D.W. Chappell ed. *Buddhist Peacework: creating cultures of peace*, (Wisdom Publications)
- View and discuss relevant film and video material, e.g. "Rabbit Proof Fence" (2002) or 'One Night the Moon' (2002). What important ideas do they raise about greater honesty in dealing with past acts of violence and working to achieve reconciliation?

Week 5
(beginning April 1)

Intra-session break

Week 6
(beginning April 8)

Thinking globally, acting locally

- Citizenship, conscience and global society. What is "Globalisation?"
- What is "grassroots globalism?" What groups, organisations and movements are engaged in non-violent action? (eg peace, human rights, environmental protection, rights of indigenous people, rights of children). How do such developments relate to newer concepts of "citizenship" in the twenty-first century?
- Guest Speaker: Dr. Keith Suter, author of *In Defence of Globalisation* (NSW Press 2000). Dr. Suter is Former President, Peace and Conflict Studies Centre, Sydney University.

- See Pp. 252-69, 282-3 in your Unit Reader.
- Relate your reading to case-studies of the work of NGOs/INGOs (e.g. Amnesty International, Oxfam, ANTaR, Greenpeace) and to UN agencies (eg Unicef, Unesco, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).
- Check relevant websites e.g. <www.unicef.org/> <www.essential.org> <www.unher.ch> <www.antar.org.au> <www.amnesty.org.au>

Week 7
(beginning April
15)

Field trip
(Details and options to be advised in class during
week 6)

Week 8 – 13
(beginning April
22, 29, May 6,
13, 20, 27)

**Good news for a change: sharing ideas
about alternatives**

- Student facilitated co-learning presentations/ workshops.
- It's not hard, if we focus almost exclusively on "the bad news," to feel helpless or even hopeless about achieving a less violent and more sustainable future.
- While it is important not to deny current problems and negative trends, let's invite much more discussion of innovative ideas on resolving conflicts non-violently, foresight and environmentally sustainable design, "good news" stories, alternatives to our feared futures.
- Are there "resources of hope" that we can learn from and share with each other? What practical actions may we take individually and collectively in working for better futures?

NB there will be no on-campus class this week. Don't forget to record your ideas and reflections on your field trip experience in your learning journal.

- Parts C & D of your Unit Reader offer some starter ideas for your presentations.
- Other useful resources include:
 - Frank Hutchinson et al. *Our Planet and its People* (Macmillan, Melbourne), D. Suzuki & H. Dressel, *Good News for a Change: Hope for a troubled planet* (Allen & Unwin, St Leonards), H. Cornelius & S. Faire, *Everyone can win: how to resolve conflict* (Simon & Schuster, Brookvale), M. Mobbs, *Sustainable House* (CHOICE Books, Marrickville), Anita Roddick, *Take It Personally* (Harper Collins, London)
 - In addition, there are various websites
(e.g. <www.yesmagazine.org> <www.rmi.org> <www.rprogress.org>
<www.oxfam.org.uk> <www.transcend.org> <www.utne.com>
<www.hazeldenerson.com> <www.creating.org/index.html>
<www.empowermentresources.com> <www.wholeearthmag.com/>
- Remember, this is a good opportunity to be creative and to work cooperatively together. You'll need to think how best to share tasks within your group and to present your ideas in an engaging and integrated fashion to the class (e.g. loosely connected lectures by individual group members don't work so well!)
- *Follow up:* You may be interested in doing more in-depth study of issues raised in this unit. *Sociology of Peace, Violence and Sustainable Futures (SS307A)* offers one such opportunity. It is taught in Spring Semester.
- *Recommended texts for SS307A* include:
 - F. Hutchinson, *Educating Beyond Violent Futures*, (Routledge, London).
 - P. Ackerman & J. Ackerman, *A Force More Powerful: a century of non-violent conflict* (Palgrave, New York)
 - M.B. Steger & N.S. Lind eds *Violence and its Alternatives: an interdisciplinary reader* (Macmillan, London)

Notes

1. Students must satisfactorily complete at least 80 credit points from the units listed below in order to complete a major in Global Citizenship & Peace Studies
2. Students must satisfactorily complete the two foundation units SS110A

References

- Adams, David. 2000. "From the International Year to a Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence." *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction* 2(1): 1-10. <<http://www.culture-of-peace.info/>>.
- Annan, Kofi. 2002. "UN Earth summit: the cost of inaction is greater than conservation." *Pacific Weekly Review*. September: 6.
- Aung, San Suu Kyi. 1999. "Freedom from fear." in Steger, M.B. and Lind, N. S. (eds) *Violence and its Alternatives*. Geneva: Macmillan.
- Boulding, Elise and Kenneth Boulding. 1995. *The Future: images and processes*. London: Sage.
- Boulding, Elise and Frederico Mayer. 2000. *Cultures of Peace: the hidden side of history*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Butovskaya, Marina et al. 2000. "A Multicultural View of Peacemaking Among Children." in Aureli, Filippo. and Frans B. M. De Waal eds. *Natural Conflict Resolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Choue, Young Seek. 1986. "Pax United Nations." in Laszlo, Ervin and Yoo, Jong Youl (eds) *World Encyclopedia of Peace* 2: 172-176. London: Pergamon.
- _____. 2002. "Global Common Society." *Korean Times* July: 9-10.
- Coady, C. A. 2002. "The Ethics of Armed Humanitarian Intervention." *Peaceworks* 45. Washington: United States Institute of Peace.
- Galtung, Johan. and G. Jacobsen Carl. 2002. *Searching for Peace*. 2nd edition. London: Pluto Press. <<http://www.transcend.org/>>
- Gilligan, James. 2001. *Preventing Violence*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- George, Susan. 2002. "Globally local." *New Scientist* 174(2340): 42-45.
- Graca, Machel. 2001. *The Impact of War on Children*. London: UNICEF in assoc. with Hurst and Co.
- Hicks, David. 2001. *Citizenship for the Future: a practical classroom guide*. Surrey WWF-UK: Godalming.
- Hutchinson, Francis P. 1996. *Educating Beyond Violent Futures*. London: Routledge.
- Hutchinson, Frank. 1998. "Young people's hopes and fears for the future." in Hicks, David and Slaughter, Richard. eds. *Futures Education: world yearbook of education*. London: Kogan Page.
- _____. 1999. "Building Alternatives to Violence." in Calleja, James and Perucca, Angela (eds) *Peace Education: Contexts and values*. Pensa multimedia in assoc. with UNESCO and the International Peace Research Association: Lecce.
- _____. 2000. "Education, Foresight and Global Citizenship." in Ursula Spring ed. *Peace Studies from a Global Perspective*. International Peace Research Association/Maadhyaam Book Services. Delhi.
- _____. 2001. *Race Relations, Open Training and Education Network, Technical and Further Education* in assoc. with the Aboriginal Programs Unit, Sydney: New South Wales Department of Education.

- Hutchinson, Frank and, Jane Fulton. 2002. "Studying peace." *Social Alternatives* 21(1): 39-41.
- Ian, Carson. 2002. "Transformed? A survey of the defence industry." *The Economist*. July: 20-26. (a 16 page supplement).
- Ian, Harris. 2002. "Challenges for Peace Educators at the Beginning of the 21st Century." *Social Alternatives*. 21(1): 28-31. <<http://www.uwm.edu/People/imh/>>
- Inayatullah, Sohail. 2002. *Questioning the Future: Futures studies, action learning and organisational transformation*. Centre for Futures Studies. Taipei: Tamkang University. <<http://www.metafuture.org>>
- International Campaign to Ban Landmines. 2001. "Landmine Monitor Report 2001: toward a mine-free world." New York: International Campaign to Ban Landmines.
- Kitamura, Osamu. 2002. "Peace Education for Global Citizenship: a Cosmopolitan Perspective." unpublished paper, 19th General IPRA Conference, Kyung Hee University, Suwon, South Korea, July 2-5. <O.Kitamura@lse.ac.uk>
- Knightly, Phillip. 2001. *The First Casualty: the war correspondent as hero and myth-maker from the Crimea to Kosovo*. Prion Books.
- Kung, Hans. 1993. *Global Responsibility: in search of a new global ethic*. New York: Continuum.
- Martin, Olivia. 2002. "The Role of Young People in Peace Education." unpublished paper, 19th General IPRA Conference, Kyung Hee University, Suwon, South Korea, July: 2-5. <olivia@ipb.org>
- Mazzetti, M. 2002. "How to Fight in the Future" in Fishburn, D. (ed.) *The World in 2002*. Pp. 49-50. London: The Economist.
- Patomäki, Heikki. 2001. "The Challenge of Critical Theories: Peace research at the start of a new century." *Journal of Peace Research* 38(6): 723-738.
- Pearce, Fred. 2002. "Partnerships don't Live up to the Hype." *New Scientist* September: 8-9.
- Reardon, Betty A. and Alicia Cabezudo. 2002. "Learning to Abolish War: Teaching towards a culture of peace." New York: Hague Appeal for Peace. <www.haguepeace.org> and <www.ipb.org>
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie, and Burke-White William. 2002. "The Future of Law: protecting the rights of civilians." *Harvard International Review* 24(1): 66-70.
- Slaughter, Richard A. 1995. *The Foresight Principle: Cultural recovery in the 21st century*. London: Adamantine.
- Smith, Joan. 2002. *Moralities*. London: Penguin.
- Sommers, Marc. 2001. "Peace Education and Refugee Youth." in J.Crisp, C. Talbot & D.B. Cipollone, eds., *Learning for a Future*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- Stephenson, Carolyn. 2000. "NGOs and the Principal Organs of the United Nations." Taylor, Paul & Groom, A.J.R. (eds) *The United Nations at the Millennium*. London: Continuum.
- Suter, Keith. 2000. *In Defence of Globalisation*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Toh, Swee-Hin. 2001. "Educating for International Understanding: towards a culture of peace." *Sang Seang* 1.September: 8-12.
- Vidal, John. 2002. "US wrecks green summit." *Guardian Weekly* September: 1-2.
- UNDP. 2002. *Human Development Report*. Oxford: Oxford University Press in assoc. with UNDP <www.undp.org/hdr>