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ABSTRACT

In his 1994 call for the creation of a “culture of peace,” UNESCO Director-General, Federico Mayor, urged educators to begin a transformation of thinking and practice. From the position that the English curriculum in high schools represents one site for the formation of attitudes towards war and peace, this inquiry looks at the study, historical and current, of war-related literature in English curricula in Ontario high schools, and in several Quaker schools in Canada and the United States. It asks how the English curriculum has played a role in helping to create and sustain a culture that glorifies violence, and that affirms war as inevitable. Finally, it looks for strategies to begin the transformation urged by Mayor.

Historically, English Literature studied in Ontario mainstream high schools has established a set of notions - courage, heroism, patriotism, glory, sacrifice and manhood - in a context that accepts war as inevitable and often glorious. Alternative voices have been excluded from literary discourse about war. This exclusion poses a problem, unacknowledged at the secondary school level, to the project of teaching for democracy, which requires access to the widest possible range of perspectives on fundamental issues.
Only with such a range will negotiation of textual and contextual meaning constitute an authentic discourse-as-crucible for transformational thinking and practice.

Anthologies authorized for use in Ontario mainstream high schools up until the 1970s offered students and teachers a body of works in which there was little, if any, challenge to the dominant cultural attitude towards war. While curricular changes have since occurred on issues of race, gender, and multiculturalism, there has been little substantial change on issues of war.

One might expect a different approach to the same literary heritage in the schools of Quakers, a community founded on pacifism. My research, however, shows no curricular discourse on the tension between literature accepting, even promoting war, and the Quaker Peace Testimony. The intersection of the teaching of English and the Quaker Peace Testimony represents a potentially rich site for the development of a challenging curricular discourse, one leading to Mayor’s “transformation in thinking and practice.”
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CHAPTER ONE

A Cultural Shift Proposed

In 1995, Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO, issued a call for the creation of a culture of peace. In the document, UNESCO and a Culture of Peace: Promoting a Global Movement, Mayor says,

To counter the culture of war, let us build a culture of peace, that is to say, a culture of social interaction, based on the principles of freedom, justice and democracy, tolerance and solidarity, and respect for all human rights; a culture that rejects violence and, instead, seeks a solution to problems through dialogue and negotiation, a culture of prevention that endeavours to detect the sources of conflicts at their very roots, so as to deal with them more effectively. Peace, universal human rights, and non-violence should be the focal points of all education. These principles should run through all the phases of human and social development, and should contribute to civil society’s one day being able to transform violent responses to conflicts into something constructive, and ultimately to eliminate them altogether. (Preface, 3)

Since then, many groups have concerned themselves with answering this call. The “Cultures of Peace Action Committee” of UNESCO describes itself as “promoting a Global Movement.” The Fourth Annual International Women’s Conference at Beijing offered speakers and workshops on the topic; the Voice of Women, Canada, held a conference in Toronto in 1997 called “Creating a Culture of Peace.” Peace organizations, and some school boards, promote ‘peace education’ in a variety of ways, including non-violent conflict resolution from the earliest grades in school and there are formal Peace Studies in graduate programmes at some universities. However, as a university Peace Studies educator, psychiatrist, and former president of Canadian Physicians for the Prevention of War commented in a paper delivered to the Canadian Peace
Research and Education Association in 1997, peace education needs critical attention:

We are strongly programmed for individual rationality…We are weakly programmed for collective rationality. We are weakly programmed for acting for the common good, and require much bolstering by culture in the form of moral education and legal constraints. Peace education can and does add the powerful component of demonstrating the rationality of acting for the common good, and illuminating the convergence of morality (which is never enough on its own) and rationality. (Santa Barbara, 1997, Abstract)

Santa Barbara further notes important aspects of peace education for elementary and secondary school students:

For these younger citizens, peace education focuses on applied skills rather than theory. But theory, and the values base of peace education need to be examined by educators. A criticism of peace education at primary and secondary levels is its focus primarily on what we know as ‘negative peace’; that is, violence prevention at an immediate level, rather than positive peace - fostering structures, values and practices which make violence much less likely and create many other positive outcomes. (Santa Barbara, 1997, Abstract)

It is the fostering of these structures, values and practices that seems critical to me and that informs the investigations in this work.

A call for the creation of a culture of peace rather than for, more simply, peace, goes to the heart of the matter that is civilized evolution. We are capable of changing our ways of thinking and living; so that to call war inevitable is essentially to choose it, to choose not to attempt to alter the human course. Mayor’s call for a culture of peace assumes an existing culture of ‘not peace’, of what we know to be a culture of violence and the crucible of war. His concept stands over against the current culture of war and is “both a product of
this particular moment of history and an appropriate vision for the future that is in our power to create” (Preface, 4).

If Mayor’s claim is true, a few effects obtain: first, we can feel relief in the face of Einstein’s dire prognosis, that unless we change our ways of thinking, we drift towards unparalleled catastrophe, and of H.G.Wells’ definition of history as a race between education and catastrophe; second, our task as teachers in and of both ‘cultures’ must first be to unpack the elements of the one which has brought us to the brink of global extinction and clearly to affirm our valuing of the other.

Notwithstanding arguments against the need for the conscious building of a culture of peace, from those that would call the project a ‘straw man’, holding that many teachers provide thoughtful, multi-faceted literary sites for potential anti-war determination (through curricular selection of, for example, The Red Badge of Courage, The Wars, the ‘War Poets’, and so on); and that one must guard against replacing one ideology with another, I affirm with my exploration here the necessity for an active structuring of a culture of peace. This affirmation is based partly on the definition of peace as “the elimination of the structural and attitudinal roots of violence” (Voice of Women, Canada, 1997). More particularly, my work here represents part of the effort to “research how to rewrite the school curriculum to promote humane values, peaceful attitudes, equality and respect … research on the links between sexism, inequality, violence, and militarism” (Preface).

The Persian Gulf War presented high school teachers of English and Media with a storm of ‘teaching moments’ perhaps unparalleled since the war in Viet Nam. My experience in the classroom during that time so disturbed me that I began an exploration of curricular and pedagogical thinking, selection, guides, and practice in the area of English Studies, with a particular attentiveness to the selection and treatment of war-related works.
This exploration has led me into studies of accounts, from contemporary postcolonial perspectives, of the construction, nature, and history of canonic texts in English Literature. My earlier study of anthology texts authorized for use in Ontario senior high school classrooms during the middle decades of this century revealed several pertinent characteristics and patterns in curricular selection and in pedagogical guides to the material.

Foremost amongst these, it seems to me is the uninterrogated, even unacknowledged assumption of the necessity and inevitability of war, however much deplored, in the range of available options for conflict resolution. Further, this perceived necessity depends upon a less than thoroughly examined complex of assumptions about our culture’s notions of manhood, courage, honour, patriotism, and right relations with each other.

My inquiry poses several questions. First, with Quaker educator, O’Reilley (1993), it asks, “Is it possible to teach English so that people stop killing each other?” Of course, O’Reilley’s intention is not to fix the matter in a facile “direct effects” model. Her deceptively simple formulation serves only to bring into focus for a moment the question at the heart of a much more complex problem.

Second, my inquiry asks what has been the history of English canonic texts as delivered through high school English curricula and the elements in these texts that have contributed to the existing culture of ‘not-peace’, of violence, which tolerates war?

Third, it asks whether there are differences in the curricular thinking in Friends schools deriving from the Quaker Peace Testimony, the Quakers’ founding statement of pacifism?

Fourth, it asks whether there are strategies from the Quaker approach that mainstream English teachers, curriculum designers, could use to invite “positive peace-fostering structures, values, and practices which make violence less likely,” as suggested by Santa Barbara?
Finally, it asks what an English curriculum for a ‘culture of peace’, that is, a curriculum to make possible a future, might look like.

I approached the first two questions through an examination of Anthologies authorized for use in Ontario senior high school English classrooms during the middle years of this century (1940-1970). This research pays special attention to war-related literature. Accompanying graphs point to the presence and nature of these selections.

The third and fourth questions I asked of the Quakers for the following reasons. I wanted to know how groups to some extent outside mainstream culture, and with a core principle of pacifism, deal with the matter of war in the canonic texts. My earlier research on the connections among war, pacifism, and the teaching of literature in the Ontario Mennonite community and in the Quaker community led me to a more thorough exploration of the Quaker experience. This was owing in large part to the historically important role Quakers have played in education.

The Religious Society of Friends (hereafter Friends or Quakers) has historically valued education highly. From George Fox and Margaret Fell who instituted gender equality as an educational principle, through the nineteenth century Friends who achieved universal public education, to the much respected and coveted contemporary Friends Schools. Quakers have been at the forefront of actively bringing about formal educational development in Britain and the United States. In the Canadian context, however, the Quaker presence in education has dwindled to one school, and that one now with only historic connections to Quakerism. Academic rigour and the perception of links between education and the pursuit of social justice with an emphasis on individual conscience in community commitment have been the marks of a Quaker educational environment.
In order to reach a significant sample of Quaker teachers across the United States, I designed and sent a questionnaire to the English Departments of thirty schools, drawn from the National Listing of Friends Schools in the Swarthmore Library, schools which included or consisted only of senior grades. This instrument invited teachers to reflect on their personal understanding of the Peace Testimony, on the influence of that Testimony in their own practice, in their particular Department and its curricular thinking, and on its influence in the world of Quaker education.

I addressed the third, fourth, and to an extent, the fifth questions of the questionnaire in stages: first, by preliminary conversations with the Quaker librarian/archivist at Pickering College, Newmarket, Ontario, the only remaining Quaker-related school in Canada. Through her, I made contacts with Quaker organizations in the United States, including the Director of the National Association of Independent Schools, whose annual week-long conference for Quaker educators I attended in 1996; I have spent three study sojourns at Pendle Hill, Quaker Centre for Study and Contemplation in Pennsylvania; I studied in the Swarthmore University Peace Collection and consulted the Quaker Centre for Information in Philadelphia; I visited, in 1997, Quaker House in New York, associated with the United Nations; I had several conversations with individual Quaker educators such as author and teacher Mary Rose O’Reilley, whose “Writing as Contemplation” workshop at Pendle Hill I attended in 1997, and Paul Lacey, Director of Religious Education at Earlham College, Indiana. It was from discussions with these contacts that I decided to approach Quaker teachers about their praxis regarding the teaching of war-related literature and their perceived influence of the Peace Testimony on their teaching.

I further consulted various schools’ Mission Statements as well as the Disciplines of Yearly Meetings, stored in the Pickering College Archives, starting in the nineteenth century and at several points up to the present day.
The final question of the inquiry, ‘what might an English curriculum for a ‘culture of peace’ look like?’ draws on and projects from the earlier findings of the anthology study and the history of canonic texts in Ontario.

If what we have created is a ‘culture of violence’, what role has education, specifically, literary education, played in its creation?

‘Culture’ includes dominant strands of discourse, standard iconic forms in advertising, film, theatre, music, dress; generally accepted values, generally defined political stances, party structures and platforms, the language and postures of international relations, institutional discourses and structures; and among these, schools and their curricula. This inquiry concerns itself with the last of these strands.

The need to interrupt the dominant discourse which places war naturally, inevitably, and still often gloriously in the ‘human’ experience asserts itself by virtue of two compelling frameworks. The first is the notion (traceable back to John Dewey) of ‘teaching for democracy’; the second is the UNESCO call for the creation of a ‘culture of peace’. In its narrowest reading, Dewey’s notion can be construed as a preparation of students for civic responsibility; in a deeper reading, it invites a more complete confrontation with the nature of democracy itself, particularly with its challenges to the notion of freedom and choice. ‘Teaching for democracy’ becomes thus a matter of both leading students to understand the paradox of a freedom that has restrictions, which change, moreover, according to evolving societal attitudes, and offering them as wide a range of choices as an educational system at any given time is capable of. The latter task requires a continuing vigilance to ensure that every significant voice is heard, particularly on fundamental issues like war, so that students will be empowered to make informed choices.

How do we as educators help to create a culture of peace when within that society we are seen to value and to teach “the best that has been thought and
said” (Matthew Arnold) from a culture of violence? What does it mean to unpack the elements of our culture of violence?

As a result of extensive critical exploration into the nature of the earliest stories we tell our children, we can begin to refuse the cultural thrust to pass on these stories as our cultural heritage. I am assuming here that creating a culture of peace implies the promotion of education for social change and an educational approach aimed at developing our knowledge and experience of alternatives, including alternative narratives in our imaginative re/creations.

No doubt war and violent encounters have been a seminal part of what we are and how we have become that. But it can be argued equally that we have become what we are through practical philosophies of compassion and cooperation. These are the stories that have been overshadowed, certainly in the agreed-upon texts of formal curricula as well as in the flourishing media of popular culture. War has become, through our long literary history, and continues to be in the works we choose to value, and in popular culture, that which holds, perversely, our world ‘together’. Peace, and non-violent (though not struggle-free) ways of achieving it, remains an abstraction impossible to attain, while war continues to be a concrete ‘necessary evil’.

If we as educators are guiding future citizens into the concepts of democracy and alternative ways of being, and out of habitual patterns of thought, where are the fully intended, fully informed curricula and pedagogies for a culture of peace?

For these reasons, I turned to the study of Quaker education, assuming that of all groups they would be most likely to offer strategies, already in practice or potential, for such curricula.

The question that informs O’Reilley’s book, The Peaceable Classroom (1993) also inspires this inquiry. “Is it possible,” she asks, “to teach English in such a way that people stop killing each other” (O’Reilley, 1993,9)? Despite
the "radical nuttiness" (Elbow in O'Reilley, x) of the question which of course implies that it has been possible to teach English in such a way that people would kill each other, and go on doing so, it assumes that there is a substantive connection between the two activities. And there is as much necessary connection here as exists between courage and killing, manhood and killing, patriotism and killing. Peter Parker (1987) has vividly demonstrated this connection in his examination of the links between the English public school ethos, including the Classical and English curriculum, sports on the one hand, and the willingness to go to war and performance in battle on the other. Paul Fussell (1975), similarly, has demonstrated this connection in his exploration of the influence of the First World War on Western consciousness. In Ontario, Bert Case Diltz (1962) claims an explicit connection between "the English classroom" and "the Soldier".

With Whitehead and O'Reilley and others, I argue here for the reclamation of the revolutionary power of literature to effect change, personal, societal, global. In the light of our literary history, beginning with The Iliad and The Odyssey, and in the light too of Parker and Fussell's analyses of that history, such a project can surely defend itself against charges of 'grandiosity'.

Chaiwat Satha-Anand cites political scientist, Glenn Paige, who in 1985 asked various scholars a question strikingly similar to O'Reilley's: Is it possible to have a non-killing society? The resounding answer was that such a phenomenon was unthinkable. Satha-Anand describes the "hegemony of violent discourse in academia ...[as a result of which] there seems to be no space for non-violence...knowledge is produced to support the normality of violence" (in Boulding, E., 1991,124).

Knowledge, Pedagogy and the Problem of Rhetoric

Roger Simon speaks of "a notion of power that emphasizes its productive effects, underscoring the way it works, not just on people, but through them" (1992, 37). He continues,
...power inheres in the forms of knowledge and desire that guide the possibility of conduct and order possible outcomes of certain forms of action. In other words, productive power enables and regulates possibility through structuring of the field of action of others. (37)

These “forms of knowledge and desire” include, though they are certainly not restricted to, curriculum and teaching practices, which “attempt to frame the ways in which meaning is produced, identities shaped, and values challenged or preserved” (40). These practices, which Simon calls “cultural technologies,” represent “deliberate attempts to structure ... the way signs are mediated as people attempt to attribute meaning to aspects of their own and others’ existence” (40). Further, “schools have been sites within which legitimated authorities have attempted to ‘regulate into dominance’ particular ways of meaning” (52. n.15). Curriculum practices have played their role in this attempt. “Practices that articulate particular modes of semiotic production are simultaneously educational and political in that they attempt to inform a sense of what is significant and ‘true’ as well as what is desirable and possible” (38). While curriculum and teaching practices within schools are only one location in which semiotic production occurs, and this fact represents “an obvious circumscription on the importance of school-based pedagogy (38); nevertheless, “taken up not as limit but as possibility, this recognition of the multiplicity of points through which power is exercised can be the basis for a radical hope in relation to efforts at progressive practice” (38).

It is with this recognition and in this hope that I place my own sense of a pedagogical practice that would be ‘multilogic’. Acknowledging Simon’s caveat that says “any easy reference to democratization [becomes] shallow rhetoric” (50, n.3) in the face of hard questions about the nature of democracy, I believe that as wide a range of voice and choice as is possible at any given cultural moment to offer, contradicts no reasonable description of democracy but rather enhances any attempt to embody democratic practices. This is so I believe in any engagement with curriculum and pedagogy.
"Any 'turn toward pedagogy' conceived as a challenge to existing conventions of schooling must be understood as entering into a continuing legacy of historical contestation" (Simon, 36). What I see as informing the 'multilogue' in the pedagogy I am proposing are the "historical contestation" with traditions of canonic texts and their readings, the challenge of Mayor to turn from a "culture of violence" and towards the creation of a "culture of peace," an awareness of the dangers of replacing one ideology with another through a simplistic kind of censorship, and the Quaker notion of "paying respectful attention" to each voice in any gathering, class, discussion, dispute. on the principle that no one has a complete grasp of "the Truth," but that through "mindful discernment" of each member's contribution, a more complete grasp may be had. I do not see this positioning as contradictory in a fundamental sense, though it is not without complexity and difficulty. It is patient of an advocacy standpoint (in terms of espousing the desirability of changing the nature of the culture with regard to attitudes towards war). but stops short of what might be called a "recruitist" sensibility and mission. Advocacy is what we always already do; that is, we (teachers in Canadian public schools) 'advocate' respect - for self, for others, for authority, for democracy, for peace, amongst other concepts, although some are so loosely defined as to remain undefined). A "recruitist" pedagogy would take a narrowly propagandistic short-cut to the attainment of an often unarticulated (because unexamined or unacknowledged) aim: a hidden agenda, or a hidden curriculum. I understand there to be, from this setting out of the elements in a teaching situation, a system of checks and balances, constantly in need of reviewing and recasting.
CHAPTER TWO

The Mother of All Narratives:
Teaching Against the Grain During the Gulf War

Admittedly, by now, Saddam Hussein’s murderous metaphor and plays on it are hackneyed. I use it purposefully to underline a concern in this section with gender, militarism, narrative, and teaching.

War seduces us in part because we continue to locate ourselves inside its prototypical emblems and identities. (Elshtain, 1987, 3)

The final telos of nonviolence is to completely supplant violence in the world of men [sic]. To succeed in the domain of action means the success of one idea over another. This contest requires strategies that will seriously take into account existing discourse and the way in which counter-discourse would be successful in challenging the former. Nonviolent academicians have to be more aware of their own roles as producers of knowledge. Nonviolent knowledge produced with this awareness may have a better chance to chart the course for a better world in the future. (Chaiwat Satha-Anand in Boulding, 1991, 130-131)

Believing that it is our responsibility to address from our particular disciplines the most dangerous and destructive activities of our species, violence, and war… (Adams et al, 1992, 65)
In a world which spends over $800 billion per year for military programs and in which there is one soldier per forty people and one physician per one thousand people; in which 80% of American (for example) scientific research is related to the military (Sivard, 1986), and which allowed itself to spend $1 billion per day during the Gulf War, and yet which claims peace to be its objective (the most commonly used words in Bush’s State of the Union address: ‘peace’, ‘children’, ‘flag’); in which almost two-thirds of Canada’s 1993 export total and ninety per cent of Third World sales was due to one contract: the sale of over one thousand light armoured vehicles to Saudi Arabia by the Diesel Division of General Motors in London, Ontario, estimated to be worth in excess of one billion dollars (Ploughshares Monitor, vol.15, No. 3, September, 1994, in Peace Research, vol.7, No. 4, November, 1995, 104); in which “sixteen of the Third World recipients of Canadian military goods [in 1994] were listed in the top frequent official violence against citizens category [to an estimated two hundred and thirty million dollars]” (as drawn up by Sivard in 1992 World Military and Social Expenditures (Peace Research, 104); in which Canada’s Department of National Defense 1994-5 budget - $11.910 billion - “is more than twice as large as the entire annual peacekeeping budget of the United Nations” (DND estimates, May. 1994, UN Department of Public Information, in Peace Research, 104-5); and finally, in which the spectre of Star Wars looms again as Canada prepares to enter NORAD talks about a continental Ballistic Missile Defense system, a pacifist must re-articulate her position almost continuously and still expect to be perceived in most venues as irrelevant.

In the world as described moreover, the dialogue appears often to be between militarists in the Bismarck mode on the one hand and ‘just war’ proponents on the other hand.

In his study, “From Violent to Nonviolent Discourse,” Chaiwat Satha-Anand ascribes the “hegemony of violence” to three beliefs:

First, man is a dangerous animal capable of killing by nature. Second, there will always be a scarcity of economic resources which, in turn,
will lead to violence. Third, violence may be used in the case of self-defense or defending loved ones. In other words, violence is an accepted course of action because of human nature and social reality. On the one hand ... human nature is incurably violent [Conrad Lorenz, On Aggression, Robert Ardrey, The Hunting Hypothesis, Anthony Storr, Human Aggression]. On the other hand, modern social sciences usually believe that conflict is integral to social reality. In order to resolve conflict, violence is generally regarded as a practical, effective and hence, rational means. When such ‘nature’ of man and ‘practical/effective/rational’ conflict resolution are combined, violence is transformed from being merely a means of conflict resolution to a normal course of action and the possibility of violence being questioned is dangerously curtailed. Once accepted as normality, violence is naturalized ... Knowledge is produced to support the normality of violence. Ideas which are considered respectable, academic and learned are judged by the extent to which they correspond to the norm of knowledge in society....there seems to be no space for nonviolence in the existing discourse. ... In order to allow for a proliferation of alternatives, a strong challenge at the center with a counter discourse of comparable power may be necessary. (in Boulding, 1991, 125)

The ‘just war’ theory, like militarism, has a long history. An equally ancient voice, one now and for some time missing from mainstream dialogue about war in general and almost entirely absent from mainstream discussion of the Gulf War, is that of the pacifist, who argues that war is never justified. There are as many different pacifisms as there are different feminisms or socialisms, but common to all pacifisms is the fundamental belief that war is not an option. Not all pacifists believe that force is never justified (they accept a police force, the idea of defense of self or other in an immediate sense as opposed to the state-waged, rationalized war; and then there are organized sports, about which pacifists are not unified). One general critical perception of pacifism, however, equates it with cowardice stemming from an ineffectual idealism. In a world of realpolitik it is not often granted airtime.

Further, during the two World Wars, as during the Vietnam War and subsequent wars, declared pacifists were harassed and viciously threatened, even attacked, so threatening did their message seem to those who, for one
reason or another - personal, moral, or political - had high stakes in the waging of war.

The figures at the beginning of this section show how central war and war-preparedness are to economies as we have structured them. How did war come to be so central and so valorized as to become also a seemingly transparent 'value' in our literature and in our culture?

The 1993 Report of the American Psychological Association Commission on Violence and Youth. Vol.1 has this to say about attitudes toward violence in society:

Violence is woven into the cultural fabric of American society ... Our folk heroes and media images ...[are] from the cowboy of the old west, to John Wayne, Clint Eastwood, and Arnold Schwarzenegger ... Violent films are widely attended. American news media present image after image reflecting the violence in society, and in some cases may exploit or contribute to it. Football, one of the most violent of team sports, is an American creation. A plethora of guns and war toys are marketed and are coveted and possessed by small children. Although few Americans would claim to enjoy or encourage violence, many, at the very minimum, passively condone aggression and violence through acceptance of current film and television productions. (22-23)

The report says further that,

There is absolutely no doubt that higher levels of viewing violence on television are correlated with increased acceptance of aggressive attitudes and increased aggressive behavior. Three major national studies ... reviewed hundreds of studies to arrive at the irrefutable conclusion that viewing violence increases violence. In addition, prolonged viewing of media violence can lead to emotional desensitization toward violence. (33)
Another study suggests that we have a less than clear understanding of the relationship between television viewing and viewer behaviour:

Although some progress has been made in eliminating the nature of certain types of television influence, we are still a long way from knowing fully the extent and character of television’s influence on children’s aggressive behaviour. (Gunter and McAleer, 1997, 116)

While there is considerable controversy about the nature and extent of the possible correlation or causality at work between the viewing of television violence and subsequent behaviour, there seems to be some agreement on the matter of desensitization towards violence as a result of heavy viewing; that is, heavy viewing of television violence contributes to an increased acceptance of, and desensitization towards violence (Gunter and McAleer, 1997; Gerbner, Gross, Morgan and Signorielli, 1986; Signorielli, 1990; U.S. Surgeon General’s Report, 1982; APA Report, 1993; and by implication, Provenzo, 1991).

Of the studies on the effects of media violence cited in this chapter, none addresses, at least explicitly, the connection between media violence and the fostering of positive attitudes towards war as a means of conflict resolution. Their focus is on personal and social effects exclusively. Attention to the formation of attitudes towards war remains in the area of peace research. In this literature, researchers have focused on psychological development, religious and moral training, the influence of media violence and, to a limited extent, on the writing and teaching of history and political science (Peace Research Review, Peace Review, Peace Magazine, Project Ploughshares Monitor, all Canadian, are the major organs publishing in this area over the last thirty years). Neither social science studies nor peace studies have addressed the issue of the role of the teaching of English in the formation of attitudes towards war. While it is possible that there is only correlation and not causality at work among the texts we teach, how we teach them, and the formation of
attitudes towards war. many studies suggest that a strong influence exists. Furthermore, while the choice of text is one thing and the matter of how meaning is negotiated with that text, its context. the reader and her/his context, is another; nevertheless, if we limit the range of texts to those which confirm the dominant point of view (masked by the limiting criteria of tradition and aesthetics) we are both demonstrating a closed circle of what we are seen to value as a culture, and cutting off the possibility for students to engage in a fuller range of perspectives. This fuller range is surely necessary in education based on democratic principles.

The present inquiry asks whether it is possible to work with the body of stories, poems, plays, essays from which we create our curricula both to maintain an authentic sense of our heritage and to transform our sense of the possibilities inherent in imaginative literature to transform our culture? Further, it asks whether any educational environment has undertaken this project and whether there might be strategies to be followed.

The following narrative describes how I came, as a teacher, to ask these questions and begin the research set out here.

Readers of the alternative press’s analyses of the events leading up to the bombing of Iraq which began on January 15, 1991, knew that there would be two wars taking place: one on the ground in the Middle East to see which world power would control oil, the other in the media to see which power - the government of the United States or competing perspectives of the public interest from across that country and around the world - would control the narrative of that war and thus the moral support of the majority.

One of my teaching assignments that year was a grade eleven class in Media Studies, an optional course offered by the English Department and a new one for me. Immersing myself in the key concepts and strategies of media literacy
as well as in the works on media and democracy by Noam Chomsky. I then had to struggle with my life-long bias in favour of the printed word. Accordingly, I culled media ‘texts’ from television, videos, film, billboards, ‘subway walls and tenement halls’.

As the escalating crisis in the Gulf took over the news that summer, I recognized, not without some of the grateful neophyte’s guilt, the ‘classroom potential’ of this ‘media event.’ It could be the entire course; there were all the key concepts: economic, political, ethical, and social stakeholders; there were even aesthetic dimensions (camouflage costumes in the press conferences), drama, rhetoric, heroes and villains, a centuries’ long literary tradition of war ballads, poems, epics, plays, novels, stories (something could be done with ‘lines’: thin red lines, thin blue lines, lines in the sand, “Ozymandias” perhaps).

The Ontario high school at which I had been teaching for five years was the only one in a town of seven thousand and received students from many surrounding ‘feeder’ schools. The town was almost entirely white, of largely British extraction with a small population of Dutch Reform farmers. French Immersion had never got a foothold, the mention of it evoking a strong Francophobic reaction. The Reform Party had significant support in the larger community. The local Legion sponsored public speaking competitions, and held war memorial services. Rotary also played a highly visible role.

Traditional in its hierarchical structure, paternalistic, oligarchical in its ethos, and virtually paralyzed in a state of staff gender imbalance, the school reflected community values and the two existed in a state of relative harmony. Athletic groups were always well-funded and daily announcements featured the vicissitudes of the many teams.

The language of these sports announcements, while predictable in its commonality with most other high school announcements, needs to be noted again here because of its inextricability from the language of violent conflict: X creamed Y; X went down to defeat to Y; X decimated Y; X massacred Y; X downed Y; X triumphed over Y; X slammed Y; X battered Y; X slaughtered
Y; and so on and on daily. The linguistic connections between sports and war were made explicit during the period of the war: the U.S. pilot of the ‘mission’ over Baghdad said, “You can score the first touchdown and still lose the game;” likewise. General Schwarzkopf addressed the public: “Ladies and gentlemen, what I’m going to describe to you next is basically the Hail Mary play in football,” thus linking sports, war, and religion. Throughout the war I remember standing on duty, patrolling the halls in the morning, listening to the announcements while keeping down incipient armed insurrection, and wondering if anyone else was making these connections and if not, why not?

In the school, the office staff was entirely female, the History, Science, Mathematics Departments had one woman each out of eight, ten and ten; the woman in History was half-time English. The Board’s Inclusive Language Guide had been introduced ineptly by the principal at a staff meeting to lewd jokes by the Head of Science and laughter and trivialization of the issue. The small but active Amnesty International Group I started five years earlier came in for constant harassment from students and more indirectly from faculty. Likewise, the Women’s Film and Discussion Series I began for the school and community was interrupted frequently by hostile male students. members of fundamentalist religious groups and again indirectly, in the Staff Lounge. The nearby military base annually put on recruitment programs in the school during school hours; members of the local branch of the peace group, Project Ploughshares, on the other hand were allowed in only after school hours as speakers.

The Media Class of grade eleven sixteen-year-olds from backgrounds in farming of various kinds, small business, two from the ‘base’, British or European, were mixed in terms of gender, with five more boys than girls. The majority of their households took the Toronto Sun exclusively. They were a lively group, eager for this new course, many of them in Drama, and all naturally avid video and film and music consumers. Most were walking media texts: labels, t-shirts covered with names, images, name-brands visible from
Reebok shoe or Doc boot to cap. With little variation, they liked the ‘right’ music, film and clothing. Most of the boys, some of the girls, were involved in team sports; seventeen of the twenty-three households had more than one television; all of the boys played video games regularly at home or in arcades, while five of the girls played these games occasionally in arcades.

We worked enthusiastically through thematic units on The Hero across the Media, Images of Female and Male across the Media, News, Situation Comedies as a Mirror to American Life, Violence across the Media, and The Mall as a Media-constructed phenomenon, applying in each unit the eight key concepts of media literacy. Students wrote interesting, idiosyncratic logs, worked on projects, creative and distinctively their own. They became sophisticated (to varying degrees) in their ability to deconstruct an apparently seamless ad, sitcom, infomercial, and other ‘products’, in order to see social, economic, political and aesthetic implications, to place texts in context, to realize who had what at stake in every step of the construction and presentation; and to a significantly lesser extent, they came to see something of their own role in the ‘game’ as objects of manipulation, subjects of consumerism of all kinds. They tended to see themselves, individually, as more or less immune to the kinds of targeting and manipulation being practised on the rest of society by the media and corporate interests. This tendency seems to bear out the findings of media researchers:

Even though confidence levels in the media are high and intake amounts are inordinate, young people are reticent about admitting they are being greatly influenced. Only eight per cent maintain that their lives are influenced ‘a great deal’ by the media, while 28 per cent give the media a ‘quite a bit’ influence rating. Another 41 per cent think the media only have ‘some’ influence on their lives. The remaining 22 per cent go as far as to say the media have ‘little or no’ influence on them. (Bibby and Posterski. 1992, 272)
With the above in mind however, it is interesting to note that, “when asked about the impact of television on others, 55 per cent of teens believe watching violent TV shows tends to make people more aggressive” (275).

According to the 1982 U.S. Surgeon General’s report, which reviewed ten years of research, “the consensus among most of the research community … is that violence on television does lead to aggressive behaviour by children and teenagers who watch the programs” (quoted in Gerbner, 1988, 25 and cited in Spears and Seydegart, 1993, 37). Further, “researchers using the cultivation paradigm (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan and Signorielli, 1986; Signorielli. 1990) argue that, while aggression may be an occasional consequence of television violence, the predominant effects of media violence are to instill fear and mistrust in viewers; the more people watch television the more fearful they will become” (Spears and Seydegart, 1993, 37). If the world thus becomes a mean and violent place on the personal and societal levels (the only levels that are addressed in the studies), it seems a reasonable extension to view the international world as also mean and violent, and so to accept, even welcome, war-preparedness as a necessity.

Some observations relevant to the Gulf War issue arose from the units on The Hero, Violence, Gender images, and News. Heroes for these students were all related to exploits involving violence.

While the girls showed less tolerance for (and some boredom with) media violence, they nevertheless tended to condone its use in certain situations, including war. They shared to a lesser extent an excitement at special effects in film and rock videos depicting violence. The group at first expressed the opinion that women newscasters were distracting and less authoritative, therefore less trustworthy than men (this opinion was held by male and female students). While some moved from this position during the course they reverted when the war coverage began.
While the Gulf War was certainly not the only matter explored in the Media course, it was a large part of it, involving many assignments, individual and group. We read, watched, listened to, compiled, compared news reports, pictures, and analyses from mainstream and alternative media, Canadian, American, and English. The students heard an ‘intelligence’ officer from the nearby military base who was pro-war, pro-Gulf War, and pro-nuclear war “if need be,” as well as from a ‘counter-culture’ journalist-observer-critic who was opposed to the Gulf War and to nuclear war “in any event” though not to a ‘conventional war’ in some circumstances. They also heard a pacifist’s position, though not from any media source. The most significant immediate outcome was that, of a class of twenty-three, not one (at least at the time) changed either their initial position on the War or their perceptions of media reportage of it.

Militarism to this group of males and females however was a given; it underpinned our way of life; at best it was a ‘necessary evil’, something men and governments had to do. It was also on a continuum: parents had to use force sometimes on children, boys had to be physically rough, have fights, learn to be ‘manly’; sports for males were an outlet for pent-up ‘violent instincts’. The term ‘pacifism’ for these students was charged with negative connotations: cowardice, lack of patriotism, lack of manliness, negatively subversive.

Nancy Huston’s analysis of the metaphor of narrative in relation to war, women, and men seems pertinent here: “It is men who have made war into the paradigm of all narratives, and it terrifies me to think that war and narrative can have become identified to such an extent that women should renounce attempting to invent other paradigms” (279-280). Huston posits a line in our cultural story-telling that runs, from Homer and Virgil unbroken to the present. This war narrative, made by men but told also by women, informs our
literature, our language, our relating, our dominant world-view and hence our seeing and understanding of war itself and the reporting of war.

War imitates war narrative imitates war ... what counts is the capacity to kill the triumphal narrative of the Enemy ... [heroic verse] describes the forces who are disputing the right to use the first-person triumphant ... the story of each war is patterned by different cultural media (...novels, movies, or television, but also the press and history textbooks) in such a way as to provide the greatest moral and aesthetic pleasure to the audiences for whom the narrative is intended. (274)

I think of a recent ABC ad for a new 'news' show: "so real it feels like a movie" and the news media dictum, 'if it bleeds, it leads'. What became apparent early on in the Gulf War reportage was that the U.S. government had learned from the experience with the free press and its wide access to the war front (and sides and underbelly) in Vietnam: public reaction to media images of that war was, arguably, responsible for its termination or at least for U.S. withdrawal. Thus, the U.S. government fed the Gulf war through the conduit of CNN to a receptive public, including my class. What appeared to be missing was an expressed understanding by the media of their crucial role in framing the discussion of the Gulf War. In the mainstream media, this coverage dwindled to a narrow spectrum of thinkable thought and it did not include pacifist thought. I am aware of only one source of a pacifist perspective in the Canadian media and that was Ernie Regehr (Director of Project Ploughshares) who argued that the Gulf crisis and the current state of weaponry challenged the notion of a possible moral and rational contemplation of war as a policy instrument at all.

Meanwhile, gurus of Media Literacy announced that the Gulf War was the most outstanding media event of the decade and that now was the time to capitalize on it in our classrooms. They pointed, in their post-war analyses of media reportage, to missing or marginalized perspectives but pacifism was not amongst the perspectives named. This absence shaped the whole discourse,
contained the nature of the arguments about this war and did it so efficiently that twenty-three sixteen-year-olds of average intelligence and awareness seemed, at the time, adamant in their resistance to a counter perspective and narrative when one was presented in the classroom. As Roger Simon says of a perceived resistance to theory in his classes,

The key insight here is that resistance itself can be a crucial source of learning. A teaching that is directed by this insight will be one that does not pose as its objective the transmission of ready-made knowledge. Rather, it is aimed at the creation of new conditions within which recovery of the knowledge needed to assess a new discourse is made possible. (1992, 95)

Two days after the U.S. bombing of Iraq began, the school's History Department brought in an 'intelligence' officer from the nearby military base to explain and describe what was going on in the Gulf. At an open forum for all students, the officer's presentation fed into the assembled group's (consisting mostly of younger boys) fantasies of hi-tech weaponry, speaking of the "giant Nintendo game we're playing in the Gulf." His version was the official story coming through the media; that is, Saddam Hussein was evil incarnate, a second Hitler, rapaciously annexing the entire East, sanctions had been tried and had failed, the 'free world' had a duty to Kuwait and therefore war had been declared. When, during the question period, some of my senior Literature students spoke from a different perspective, he ridiculed them.

One hundred per cent of the Media class believed reports from mainstream media and simultaneously approved of the 'military restrictions' on reporting. Further, they believed the public was getting as much as it needed to know. As one student put it, "General Schwarzkopf and those military guys know what's best for the country [sic], that's how they got where they are." (Schwarzkopf and Bush became heroes to many in the class). Attempts to present and discuss reporting from the 'alternative media' were met with skepticism mixed with hostile resistance. Interestingly, these students (most of whose families
displayed yellow ribbons and some, Saddam Hussein toilet paper) were quick to pose the critical, searching questions of the alternative material, questions as to sources, facts, bias, everything that as a teacher I had tried unsuccessfully to have posed to the mainstream material. Other questions they did not want to consider included where the Iraqis had bought their weapons, the ‘history’ of the Middle East with its intrication of political groups vying over oil and arms interests, the reasons for the U.S. intervention, where the images of civilian casualties were, and what it meant that in the First World War, five per cent of casualties were civilians, in the Second this figure rose to fifty per cent. and in current armed conflicts around the world the figure was closer to ninety per cent.

These students seemed powerless to resist the media coverage, although I do not suggest that this was the only factor influencing the formation of their attitudes, even to get to the point of open inquiry. It is arguable that television news should, in a democracy, be judged not by asking people whether they like what they are watching (as war-time polls kept doing), but by asking them what they know - a serious question since it goes to the core of a democratic system, and the quality of democratic decisions depends on the quality of the information on which those decisions are based. The Report by the Centre for the Study of Communication, University of Massachusetts, concludes that “culpability for [an ill-informed public] rests on the shoulders of the news media, particularly television, who have a duty to present the public with all the relevant facts. Our study suggests they have failed dismally” (Ploughshares Monitor, February, 1991, 17).

When the alternative press journalist talked with the class, presenting another perspective, suggesting reading and listening materials for further inquiry, his attempts to counter what he suggested were purposely disseminated myths and disinformation were met with considerable resistance. War fever seemed rampant. He suggested to me that a large part of what seemed to block these
students was the intense weight given to position, title, authority, power and the belief that these somehow made 'truth'. Other factors, I concluded, were family, community values and attitudes, the environment in the school, attitudes of teachers, materials available for analysis and comparison, and a long history of colonial relations and racism.

These same students, sophisticated sufficiently in media literacy to deconstruct, and discuss other media products, including some news materials, seemed unable to activate their critical faculties during the Gulf War. Given that among my senior Literature students there was greater diversity of opinion and openness to inquiry which acknowledged and explored bias and the question, 'cui bono?'. I concluded that age and development were also factors. Simon's observation regarding the site of resistance as a fruitful one for significant teaching returns to colour my perception of my own teaching with the class. I failed in this instance because I did not work with the resistance, but instead engaged in a kind of tug-of-war, a recruitist pedagogical practice designed to 'win over'. I believe too, however, that the absence of material genuinely counter to the cultural grain, from which to draw for a true multilogic exploration, increased the intensity and detracted from the 'democratic' nature of my aim to introduce new perspectives on war.

Further, materials critical of the War, that is, alternative media 'narratives', were presented with a greater degree of sophisticated thought, often using subtle irony. They were often longer than comparable mainstream items (which relied often on cultural 'givens' and cliches) and depended on some historical, political knowledge on the part of the consumer. Examples of these media are Z Magazine, Lies of Our Times, and The Guardian Weekly. What was available, at least in the print media, at their level and in their homes and aimed at their concentration level and fascination with weaponry was The Toronto Sun.
Reviewing the media images of the War, we find confident and happy-looking ‘Allies’, a grim Saddam, aerial maps explaining smart bombs, scuds, Hornets and Tornadoes, with a camel left of frame and the sun rising over the cockpit. Cue the bagpipes.

The Observer on December 30 illustrated an article about the British Army in the Gulf with a picture of a Colonel Denaro blowing a hunting horn to summon his driver. The colonel was described as an ‘extravagant character with an attractive swashbuckling manner.’ His regiment, the Hussars, ‘are sometimes to be found wearing their big Browning automatics in shoulder holsters over tank crew’s overalls, which gives them a rakish appearance.’ Some of the officers come from ‘the same stock as Wellington’ and are heirs to the Light Brigade, ‘the same gallant six hundred …’ (Guardian Weekly, January 13, 1991)

The bizarre image of a pre-World War One colonel with his troops preparing for a war intended by the ‘Allies’ to involve not their own soldiers’ bodies, but ‘clean’ weapons, nevertheless underlines the tradition in which war is still fought, the “prototypical emblems and identities” of which Elshtain speaks. In light of this, I was brought to wonder what factors might be influential in creating the startling discrepancy I found in the range of media literacy skills among my students in terms of the constructs with which they were presented, faced with the Gulf War as media event.

Films and television, computer and video games play a role in infusing the culture with images of violence. George Gerbner’s Cultural Indicators Study, “a database and a research project that relates recurrent features of the world of television to viewer conceptions of reality,” is described by Dines as having been “one of the most important long-term studies in this country [U.S.] of both the content of media and the effects of living in a society where the supreme storyteller is the television”(546). Gerbner defines violence as “the overt expression of physical force (with or without a weapon) against self or
other compelling action against one’s will on pain of being hurt or killed, or actually hurting or killing” (cited in Gunter and McAleer, 1997, 94).

The questions driving Gerbner’s study ask ‘how do news and entertainment programs influence patterns of thought and action?’ and ‘are violent scenarios beneficial to those who define and control their use?’

In the final analysis, force and violence are used to promote respect for law and order and to defend the status quo ... as a result of the symbiotic relationship between the media and the authorities, those in power succeed in using terrorism to their own advantage. (Gerbner, in Atkinson and Gourdeau, 1989, 40)

The conclusion points, though not explicitly, to a connection between media violence and positive attitudes towards war. Why is this connection not made explicit? Perhaps because war remains a given, outside our formal discourse of questionable phenomena.

Among the preliminary considerations to his study on television and violence, Jacques de Guise suggests of Gerbner’s “cultivation analysis” that it does not distinguish between “the cruelty of the sadist and legitimate defence” (in Atkinson and Gourdeau, 51). He criticizes the study saying that in it, [r]eal violence, as seen on the news, is not distinguished from fictional violence ....According to the definition given, several of Shakespeare’s works could be considered violent...Nor does this definition take into consideration the manner in which the violence is presented. In many cases, the purpose of the violence is to place the hero in a difficult situation, thus allowing him to display qualities such as courage, self-control, and helping others. ‘High Noon’ is a violent film even though Gary Cooper demonstrates courage and self-denial, qualities that epitomize great heroes. It is significant that the most effective characters in scenes of violence are the ‘good guys’. According to certain theories, violent actions are more apt to be imitated if they are perpetrated by a person with whom the viewer can identify. If so, the sheriff in ‘High Noon’ or the soldier who is to be decorated for bravery become ‘bad examples’. (in Atkinson and Gourdeau, 1989, 40)
But these are precisely among the distinctions that Gerbner does make. What Gerbner argues is that,

- television violence must be understood as a complex scenario and an indicator of social relationships...it is driven by forces other than free expression and audience demand...violence in drama and news demonstrates power...[it] is an integral part of a system of global marketing...the system inhibits the portrayal of diverse dramatic approaches to conflict, depresses independent television production, deprives viewers of more popular choices, victimizes some and emboldens others, heightens general intimidation and invites repressive postures by politicians that exploit the widespread insecurities it itself generates. (Gerbner, in Dines, 548-549)

deGuise’s analysis arises from several unacknowledged assumptions. With regard to “High Noon,” the hero is a hero by virtue of characteristics assumed to be heroic in a context of violence. That is, deGuise does not consider that “courage and self-denial” could (much less, should) be exhibited in other than violent terms. It is true that these are “qualities that epitomize great heroes”: but this attribution comes from a history (and a literary history) that has excluded alternative ways of demonstrating these qualities so that they have been conflated with violent actions in violent contexts. Nor can we let pass unchallenged deGuise’s assertion that “the most effective characters in scenes of violence are the ‘good guys’.” We would at least have to unpack “effective” as he uses the term. Does he mean getting the job done, being admirable in some moral sense, making the strongest impression, or something else? Which of these criteria would apply to the violence in “Silence of the Lambs,” “H20,” “Batman,” “Saving Private Ryan”?

Gerbner suggests that “we need to ask the kinds of questions that can place the discussion of television violence as a cultural policy issue in a useful perspective...who will tell the stories and for what underlying purpose?”(549). Tantalizingly, he does not give a name to the repeated ‘underlying purposes’ and ‘other interests’. I understand that among these are the development and sustaining of positive attitudes towards the state-sanctioned violence of war. It
is as if, in these studies, war is outside the range of vision, its violence different in kind because state-sanctioned. In Gerbner’s ‘mean world syndrome’, the insecurities that he suggests are induced by ubiquitous violence in the popular media seem to lead to an often unquestioning reliance on authority. War is beyond interrogation.

The world of video games is defined by violence. Forty of the forty-seven video games identified by a Players’ Poll “have violence as their major theme” (Provenzo, 1991, 127). In this world,

[v]iolence and aggression, whether shooting alien invaders, fighting bad dudes, or making one’s way through the jungles of Vietnam, become the only viable operative principle by which the player can function. They become a substitute for personal reflection and contextual judgment. (127)

Without naming explicitly the possible connections between video game violence and the development of positive attitudes towards war, Provenzo acknowledges these obliquely: “a discussion of video games and violence would not be complete without at least some reference to the military” (132). In a chapter called “Video Games and the Military,” Provenzo says that “video games provide an almost perfect simulation for the actual conditions of warfare” (132), except that they “promote total war and aggression” instead of providing contexts in which “surrender, compromise or truce” might be alternatives. Provenzo quotes a military officer: “It’s important to have training devices that don’t appear so obviously to be training devices” (132) and cites former U.S. President, Ronald Reagan, who made explicit the role these games play in preparation for the military (133).

With Gerbner, Provenzo is concerned that media programs, specifically video games, work towards the elimination of alternatives to violence: “there are no conscientious objectors in the world of video games; there is no sense of community; there are no team players” (118).
Among other things, Provenzo concludes, “video games are a domain of inquiry in which the researcher can ask questions concerning why we are the way we are as a culture” (139). In the same way, my inquiry began to form in the domain of English Literature as presented in the high school curriculum. That is, how did the stories we tell, from The Odyssey and The Iliad, through myths, fairy tales, poems, plays and novels, to contemporary written and visual texts, help to create cultural attitudes towards violence, and particularly an attitude of acceptance toward the state-sanctioned violence of war?

Birgit Brock-Utne argues that the data regarding the co-relation of media violence and later aggression in boys are translatable to the curricular reading of ‘classic’ literature:

Ways of behaviour are learned by observation not only of real performance, but also of media-fed performance. ... [literary] violence may lead to the acquisition of aggressive responses that are imitated in appropriate situations in real life... Eyseneck and Nias [1978] ... have shown that the natural inhibitions against violence are grossly reduced in children if they have a feeling that their surroundings accept violence. Children get desensitized to the use of violence...watching and reading about violence may lead to real life violence. (1985. 95-96)

What in these students’ English curriculum might have contributed to laying the ground for uncritical acceptance of certain seminal attitudes towards violence? From what sources had come their seemingly unshakable notions regarding heroes, courage, manhood, patriotism, war? The characters of popular media, the plots, the language did not spring fully-formed; rather, they derived surely from a long literary tradition. The descent of the Star Wars series from the Tolkien trilogy Lord of the Rings represents only one of a large body of such derivations.

The dominant discourse of the mainstream media during the Gulf War reflected what Satha-Anand sees operating in academic discourse:
Dominant discourse defines rules of life. In the process of knowledge production, then, dominant discourse becomes the arbiter of what can be legitimately studied, taught, submitted as policy recommendations by which disciplines and by whom. Such production processes at the same time relegate different ideas, based upon unfamiliar rules and nurtured by values deemed alien by mainstream academicians, as idealistic, impractical, unsupported by institutionalized knowledge, and therefore illegitimate. It is this complex process which renders ideas of nonviolence “unthinkable” for those academicians drowned by dominant discourse which, in turn, delimits their potential to see things differently, to study the seemingly idealistic, and to exercise their creativity for a better world. (in Boulding, 1991, 126)

The implications of Satha-Anand’s argument for curriculum designers are obvious. The task is to challenge the dominant discourse to enlarge its boundaries so that they include alternative ‘knowledge’ and perspectives.
CHAPTER THREE

‘Canon Matters’: War in/Formation

And behind the diplomats, dimly heard in the official documents, stand vast forces of national greed and national hatred - atavistic instincts, harmful to mankind at its present level, but transmitted from savage and half animal ancestors, concentrated and directed by Governments and the Press, fostered by the upper class as a distraction from social discontent, artificially nourished by the sinister influence of the makers of armaments, encouraged by a whole foul literature of ‘glory’ and by every text-book with which the minds of children are polluted. (Russell, in The Nation, 1914. in Rosen and Widgery, 1994. 321)

Neither teachers nor parents nor society at large can safely abdicate responsibility for the attitudes they foster in the young, whether by precept or example or through the literature they offer them to read. (Whitehead, 1991, 11)

Myself not least, but honour’d of them all
And drunk delight of battle with my peers
Far on the ringing plains of windy Troy.
(Tennyson, “Ulysses,” Oxford Anthology of Verse, 143)

We shall be made into things of song for the men of the future.
(Iliad VI, 356)

The glory of war is all moonshine...
(Ulysses S. Grant)

In her study of the intricate connections between war and war narrative, “the age-old tradition which consists of transforming the events of war into stories, and then of using these stories as models or justifications for the waging of new wars” (Huston, 1982, in Stiehm, 271), Nancy Huston argues,
...in order that human violence not be reducible to animal violence, it [has been] imperative for men to establish a narrative sequence; to show how a given series of incidents resulted in the outbreak of armed conflict, to show how in the course of confrontation certain individuals or groups were distinguished by their courage while others were dishonored by their cowardice; to show what spectacular reversals took place in the positions of the protagonists; to show what curve was described by the escalation of aggressions, up to and including the obligatory denouement consisting of peace treaties, calculation of losses, and 'definitive' distribution of the terms Conqueror and Conquered (271-2).

Huston continues: "Thus wars descend to us as texts ... the fact that the military function is associated with a prestigious literary tradition is anything but an extraneous detail: in going off to war, men have always sought to demonstrate their ability not only to 'make' history, but also to write it" (272). And not only to write it. Naturally the fact that the struggle to dominate the discourse of war narrative increasingly extends to media other than the printed word, that is, film and music, intensifies the endeavour. It must be said that in the context of my work, I perceive the nature of the struggle to have shifted to involve those who would justify a military response and those who would refuse it.

"The struggle for the exclusive occupation of the field of discourse is as vital as the struggle for exclusive occupation of the field of battle; the difference is that the former outlives the latter"(274). The combatants in the struggle are conflicting ideologies. But there is a significant corollary to the struggle:

It is because art's impact on the passions, aspirations, admirations, sympathies and desires of individual members of an audience cannot be controlled by ideology and is as often as not at odds with it that totalitarian governments have historically been suspicious of art. (Hawkins, 1990, 94)

Someone once said that tyranny does not so much fear guns and tanks as it fears some drunken poet on a barstool who strikes a phrase to capture the common imagination. (O'Reilley, 1993, 61)
While these assertions offer hope against a powerful tradition, the fact of an ongoing ideological literary tradition remains. The following section looks at Russell’s “whole foul literature of glory” through Peter Parker’s *The Old Lie: The Great War and the Public School Ethos* (1987), Winnifred Whitehead’s *Old Lies Revisited* (1991), and Paul Fussell’s examination of the formative influence of the First World War on subsequent thought in *The Great War and Modern Memory* (1975). It also includes research into the teaching of war-related literature in Ontario English high school courses during the middle decades of the present century. That this discussion needs to take place indicates the still unproblematized nature in high school English Studies’ discourse of what it might mean to teach ‘for democracy’ (in Dewey’s terms) and to teach for a ‘culture of peace’ (in Mayor’s terms).

My position is that teaching for either must offer access to, and a valuing of, materials that present all the thinking (and in particular, the imaginative thinking of literature) available in our cultural heritage on the fundamental issues of war and peace. This would include pacifist voices writing about alternative visions of conflict resolution, of the nature of heroism, patriotism, courage, manhood, honour. If this inclusion happened, not by happenstance, but by theoretically grounded, transformational curricular thinking, we would truly be engaged in the project of ‘teaching for democracy’. As Nancy Warehime says in *To Be One of Us: Cultural Conflict, Creative Democracy, and Education*.

I have become increasingly aware of John Dewey’s presence just over my shoulder. Dewey recognized, much more clearly than most, that we are not only parasitic upon tradition, we shape it by acts of interpretation and critique. Taking this task seriously means ridding ourselves of the illusion of objectivity and contributing to a democratic tradition which has not yet become. (Warehime, 1993, 171)
Though written in the 1930s, Dewey's observations on the integral role of education in the struggle to create a more just, radically democratic society remain timely:

[The ... need especially urgent at the present time is connected with the unprecedented wave of nationalistic sentiment, of racial and national prejudice, of readiness to resort to the ordeal of arms to settle questions that animates the world at the present time. The schools of the world must have somehow failed grievously or the rise of this evil spirit on so vast a scale would not have been possible. (in *Education Today*, 1922, 190)

Again,

To nationalize education is to promote our national idea which is the idea of democracy ... to make it an instrument for the active and constant suppression of the war spirit and in the positive cultivation of sentiments of respect and friendship for all men and women wherever they live. (in *Education Today*, 1922, 119-120)

Peace has been given the status in our curricula, as in our society, of a formal abstraction. War has provided a significant amount of the substantive material of our literature: the novels, plays, and poetry which in turn have provided our working notions of honour, courage, patriotism, manhood, and excitement, as the anthology research of the following section will demonstrate. Without all voices being heard, suppression results, "and the experience of democracy, which is vital to the development of political judgment is so restricted as to preclude the very possibility of democracy" (Warehime, xxxi). No voice is so authoritative, to paraphrase Dewey, as to preclude the need for interrogation.

I

Seeds of a Tradition

It is the War that wins and goes on winning.

(Blunden, in Fussell, 1975, 16)
We do but teach bloody instructions. Which being taught, return to plague the inventor. (Shakespeare. Macbeth. IV, vii, 8-10)

Human freedom … is the capacity to make something of that which makes us, and the portmanteau word for that is history. (Eagleton, 1990, 32)

In her analysis of war in The Iliad or The Poem of Force, The Iliad being arguably one of the seminal imaginative works of Western literary tradition, Simone Weil claims that

[t]he true hero, the true subject, the center of the Iliad is force. Force employed by man, force before which man’s flesh shrinks away. In this work, at all times, the human spirit is shown as modified by its relations with force. as swept away, blinded, by the very force it imagined it could handle, as deformed by the weight of the force it submits to...

To define force - it is that x that turns anybody who is subjected to it into a thing. (Weil, 1956, 3)

However, if force is the central theme, love too hovers over the epic: love of son for parents, of father for son, of mother for son, of husband for wife, of brother for brother; but

the purest triumph of love, the crowning grace of war, is the friendship that floods the hearts of mortal enemies … These moments of grace are rare in the Iliad, but they are enough to make us feel with sharp regret what it is that violence has killed and will kill again. (Weil, 29)
In the end, suggests Weil, an essential statement of the Iliad is that “[o]nly he who has measured the dominion of force, and knows how not to respect it, is capable of love and justice” (34).

It is the question of ‘how not to respect it’ that seems to me to be our continuing challenge: for citizens in a democracy, for students in a violent society, for teachers and makers of curriculum. It is the addressing of this question that has been absent in our conscious curricular thinking and that if present might begin a revolutionary, transformative, truly democratizing process.

Weil points to a connection taken up by Parker and Fussell: the connection between ‘games’ and war. In the Iliad,

they go off as though to a game, as though on holiday from the confinement of daily life … the first contact of war does not immediately destroy the illusion that war is a game … heroism is but a theatrical gesture and smirched with boastfulness … then war is easy and basely, coarsely loved. (21)

In Replacing the Warrior, William Myers, American Quaker philosopher, traces the descent of the warrior-hero from Achilles to Baron von Richtofen:

For von Richtofen, war is an aristocratic game, a sport; he speaks of it as hunting and intersperses his tales of prowess in the air with tales of hunting large animals as a guest on somebody’s estate. When he thinks the rules of chivalry have been broken, he is very offended. (Myers, 1985, 8)

Myers notes too, however, the significant detachment which von Richtofen experiences, a detachment not available to Achilles. With this new detachment, produced by the mechanical nature of modern warfare, Myers says,

we see most clearly the shape of the future of warfare. We also see that the technology of warfare affects the appropriateness of particular ideals
to a culture. History changes the character of what we ought to find admirable. Our ideals change (and ought to change) because the context in which they exist changes. (10)

Myers juxtaposes an excerpt from von Richthofen’s journal with the actual consequence of his experience:

The most dramatic modern change in the conduct of warfare appeared in the Battle of the Somme, July 1, 1916. Of this battle, the Red Baron wrote, ‘I have never found a more beautiful hunting ground than in the skies at the Battle of the Somme. The first Englishmen came very early in the morning, and the last disappeared long after the sun had gone down.’ Meanwhile on the ground more than six hundred thousand English and French soldiers became casualties in a mechanized slaughter that defies comprehension. The majority of those killed and wounded fell before a weapon which had not before been a prominent part of combat - the machine-gun. (10)

Thereby, suggests Myers, did the individual hero become an anachronism. But our collective cultural consciousness seems not to have caught up with this reality. The notion of the need for ‘men to take up arms to defend X’ remains.

II

A Tradition in the Making

In The Old Lie: The Great War and the Public School Ethos, Peter Parker scrutinizes the ways in which the English Classical and Romantic literary heritage and the contemporary literary curriculum created the necessary ideological arsenal for English and colonial schoolboys - and by extension for those in the wider society - to prepare themselves for ‘the Great War.’ He studies the parallels between the creation, through the novels and poetry read at school, of fierce loyalty to the public school and equally fierce loyalty to
Empire. “The schools and their ethos exacted a loyalty which seems to have been virtually unshakable” (284). He notes that “dwelling upon the glories of school [during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries] was so commonplace that one sometimes feels that death was regarded as the only possible climax to such a cause” (85-6). As an illustration of this claim, Parker cites Rupert Ray, a young soldier whose musings are quoted by Ernest Raymond in *Tell England*:

Oh but if I go down ... it will be happy because victory came to the nation. And that is more important than any individual.... I may be whimsical tonight, but I feel that the old Colonel was right when he said he saw nothing unlovely in Penny’s death; and that Monty was right when he said that Doe had done a perfect thing at the last, and so grasped the Grail. And I have the strange idea that very likely I, too, shall find beauty in the morning. (in Parker, 280-1)

While the ‘classics’ (that is, Greek and Latin language and literature) held a central place in the curricula of the public schools because “they were considered the best mental training and because they had molded the English race politically” (85-6), England’s Clarendon Commission on Education of 1861 recommended expansion of the curricula to include contemporary literature. Parker notes that the literature promoted “[i]mperialist sentiment...similar to boys’ attitudes to their school ... [This literature] infused generations with notions such as ‘dulce et decorum est pro patria mori’ and ‘whom the Gods love die young’” (96). He points to the Classical-Romantic combination in the poems of A.E.Housman and in the translations of the Classics by Mackail as being “fatally attractive” (96). Particularly so, he holds, was the “recapturing of medieval iconography [and] chivalry” to which he refers as “the higher dottiness” (104).

In *Heroic Poetry*, C.M.Bowra writes of the classical hero,

Though the hero’s first and more natural need is to display his prowess and win the glory which he feels to be his right, he is ready to do so for some cause which does not immediately concern his personal interest but
attracts him because it gives him a chance to show his worth. This cause need not be very concrete. Indeed, with some of the greatest heroes it is simply an ideal of manhood and prowess to which he feels he must devote his life. (Bowra, 1964. 566)

Characteristically, then, Achilles’ decision to stay in the battle at Troy rather than return to live a long life at home, reflects the heroic assertion that glory is “the right aim for such a man” (Bowra, 103). Further, “although he has other gifts of counsel, courtesy, and eloquence, they are secondary to his essential and dominating desire to be a great warrior” (103).

Hector, on the other hand, adds a dimension to the heroic. According to Bowra, Hector is the first hero in the western tradition who does what he does purely on behalf of his country; not glory nor personal prowess, but patriotism inspires him: “No dishonour is it to fall for his country, leaving behind him his wife and his children alive and uninjured, leaving his home and possessions unharmed, so be the Achaeans sail away hence on ships to the much loved land which begat them” (Iliad, cited in Bowra, 112).

If the Classical Romantic tradition informed and inspired a generation as has been suggested by Fussell and Parker, it could equally be said to have betrayed its poets in their attempts to express the experience of the war that killed them. In his study of the works of a number of British writers, most of whom fought in the Great War and many of whom did not survive it, Bernard Bergonzi suggests that “the dominant movement in the literature of the Great War was … from a myth-dominated to a demythologized world. Violent action could be regarded as meaningful, even sacred, when it was sanctified by the traditional canons of heroic behaviour” (Bergonzi, 1965, 198). An emblem of this movement might be Read’s poem, “Happy Warriors,” in which Read “dwells on the gruesome business of stabbing a fallen enemy with a bayonet, whilst deliberately alluding to Wordsworth’s poem which complacently expounds the virtues of the soldierly life. Read describes the physical fact, whereas Wordsworth describes the attitudes that should ideally surround the fact” (199).
Before the Great War, suggests, Parker, "there was no War Poetry as we now conceive the term; instead there was martial verse. Most of this was written by civilians who, far from playing up and playing the game themselves, were generally cheering from the stands" (Parker, 137). The view of war that a civilian would have held in 1914 would have been derived from a narrow history curriculum and the fiction of the day, popular and serious. "A curriculum based upon classical texts tended to emphasize the noble aspects of warfare, particularly when taught by imperialists" (Parker, 137). From the beginnings of the Second World War, and as a result of the writings from the Great War, however, Bergonzi suggests that an unromantic acceptance dominates the literary attitude. He cites C. Day Lewis' poem, "Where Are the War Poets" as a defining example:

It is the logic of our times,
No subject for immortal verse -
That we who lived by honest dreams
Defend the bad against the worse.
In Bergonzi, 213

Bergonzi concludes,

This much we have learned from the writers of the Great War, who absorbed its shock and employed their art to change a generation's modes of feeling. In the course of doing so, they undermined a whole range of traditional responses: heroism, as a kind of behaviour, might still be possible, but not the rhetoric and gestures of heroism. (222)

Intricated with the curriculum and working with it to foster unquestioning loyalty to school and Empire was "a wholly spurious alliance ... forged between physical and moral courage which led to an even less tenable proposition that moral
worth was a concomitant of athletic prowess" (Parker, 81). Thus, sports and games were also of central importance at the public schools. Fun, manhood, and moral worth were all to be had on the playing fields. When the 'Great War' arrived, "notions of chivalry and patriotic duty combined with the various other elements of the public school ethos to inspire a generation" (105).

In this vein, Paul Fussell records the phenomenon of Captain W.P. Nevill at the Battle of the Somme (which wiped out virtually an entire generation of men in a matter of hours) climbing onto the parapet into No Man’s Land and kicking off a football as the signal to advance. He was killed instantly, but...
Intelligence officer speak to the Alliston high school students in terms of the "nintendo game our boys are playing in the Gulf".

In "Rivers and Sassoon," Elaine Showalter supports Fussell’s and Parker’s reading of the tradition and its consequences:

The poetic image of the Great War was one of strong, unreflective masculinity, embodied in the square, solid figure of General Haig, prepared by the poems of Kipling and the male adventure stories of G.H. Henty and Rider Haggard. For officers in particular, the cultural pressures to conform to these British ideals of stoic and plucky masculinity were extreme. (in Higgonet, 1987, 63)

In his Preface, Fussell notes that he has

tried to understand something of the simultaneous and reciprocal process by which life feeds materials to literature while literature returns the favour by conferring forms upon life. And [he has] been concerned with something more: the way the dynamics and iconography of the Great War have proved crucial political, rhetorical, and artistic determinants on subsequent life. (ix)

Literary works exert power over their readers; they exert power over a culture even when they are not widely read (but the more so of course when they are - as in mainstream English classrooms where, being valorized, they are seen as authoritative). They shape unconscious assumptions about what is right and wrong, how people do and ought to live. As folk tales, fairy tales, poems, plays, novels, essays, they inculcate feelings and attitudes, in part by saying ‘this is what our society thinks is important, what it values.’ Literary works, suggests Robert Scholes (1985), can act to enable a reader to form a new image of him or herself, a new sense of possibility; but these works are sources of power in a larger sense: they legitimate political and social institutions through mythic explanations of their sources in the way that scripture has been used to justify patriarchy and as Plato
wanted his invented history to legitimate the political institutions he proposed in The Republic.

Carolyn Heilbrun draws a parallel between the project of Darwin and that of postmodern literary critics who, she says, “are searching the earth for evidence of a ‘script’ wholly unlike that written for us by the sacred literature” (Heilbrun, 1987, 223). In Old Lies Revisited: Young Readers and the Literature of War and Violence, Winnifred Whitehead’s project in part encompasses this search. She is looking for texts that offer, not a replacement for that literature that has served the sanctification of war, but other perspectives, other scripts.

It is the function of the novels, memoirs, and poems discussed in this book to make real what is rapidly receding into folk memory and myth by specifically entering into the individual lives and tragedies of those who suffer in time of war and to make real, too, our fears for the future, which, with its possibility of inconceivable, unimaginable totality of destruction, apparently yet remains mythical, unbelievable to those who still cling pathetically to a reliance on the ‘nuclear deterrent’. (273)

Whitehead claims that not much has changed in our attitudes towards the literature we give our young to read at home and in school since the times studied by Parker (from whose book she draws her title). She believes that it is through education that changes in attitude will come, but is cautious about the potential danger in simply offering an alternative ideology. She quotes Bertolt Brecht’s poem, “Literature will be Scrutinised”:

Whole fields of literature  
Written in choice phrases  
Will be scrutinized for signs  
That then too there were rebels in the midst of oppression.  

(273)

Her warning note sounds in the recognition that it is necessary in material selection to offer a full range of voices and perspectives, since “just as one cannot achieve a lasting peace through violence, so one cannot achieve lasting conviction
either by confrontation or by preaching unremittingly to the young one point of view only” (274-275). Thus, she repudiates a ‘recruitist’ pedagogy.

In her discussion of Robert Cormier’s The Chocolate War, among other novels, Whitehead illustrates that the earlier British boys’ sports and war stories, which fed imperial and colonial youth well into mid-century, are still powerful in their contemporary form, the “story of male power-fantasy” (8). She suggests an unbroken line from Stalkey and Co., through The Lord of the Flies, to Cormier’s works. She says that the extremely pessimistic view of human nature [in the works of Cormier, Golding, and Robert Westall (The Machine Gunners)] which is, of course, ultimately the responsibility of the author, not of individual characters - is unfortunately one which can readily evoke a response from the volatile adolescent reader in his more despondent moods, crowding out the idealism which, at this stage of human experience, is also there to be utilized. (9)

The question she asks of this body of works is whether they “encourage young people towards a roughness necessary to...face the perils of the modern world” or whether instead they are “a sick indulgence in violent fantasy which undermines the strength of moral compassion and [are] alien, therefore to the needs of the modern world?” (16). She observes further that war is not only “a manifestation pressing upon the individual from the outside: it is a facet of his own personality, coming from within...[this reflection is] troubling, but it is endorsed by the fascination with violence betrayed in the books by Cormier, Westall, and Golding” (60). What is missing for young people, then, according to Whitehead, is a balanced, fully-informed presentation of works of imaginative literature on war and peace. Examples of novels embodying alternative perspectives on these issues appear in the final chapter of this work. One of the strengths of the books Whitehead proposes for offering young people is their “endorsement of quiet unheroic decency which refuses to kill, or to be carried along in unthinking acceptance of conventional catchwords of patriotism and heroism” (46-47).
Anthology Study: Purpose and Method

Purpose

What is referred to variously, and with a growing dis-ease as 'the tradition of English Literature', 'the canon of English Literature', or 'the works of English Literature', transmitted through curricular choices, pedagogical guides, and the training of its teachers, played and continues to play a significant role in the inculcation of attitudes towards war and peace. The following section studies Ontario senior high school English literary anthologies (as representing the core of the curriculum at that level: grades 11-13) authorized for use in the middle decades of the twentieth century. The anthologies appear in this study not according strictly to dates of publication, but rather to dates of authorized use. The study looks at the late 1950s and the late 1960s, the first being still close to, but not in the years of World War Two, the second being in the period of the Vietnam War and the Cold War. It further surveys some Ontario high school English curricula during the 1980s and 1990s, with a view to discovering significant theoretical and substantive changes in selection and pedagogy following changes in educational structure in the 1970s.

The Introduction to Curriculum R.P.4 of the Ontario Department of Education in 1962 says that

[t]he teacher of English should be well aware of the power literature has to shape the thoughts and the taste of its readers. It is a subtle and powerful force in building a nation...whoever comes to know English
literature will inevitably have his thoughts and feelings deeply influenced by that great tradition. (54)

That same teacher might also be aware of the power that curriculum - the selection from among the works of literature - and the educational thinking behind it, have to shape teachers and direct their presentation and interpretation of ‘that great tradition’. Further, as B.C. Diltz, himself one of the profoundly influential shapers of teachers in mid-twentieth century Ontario, noted, “[e]very conscientious teacher of English incidentally teaches a vision of life” (The Sense of Wonder, 20). Terry Eagleton, the English literary theorist, shares this view with radically different implications.

...[T]here is always a great deal more at stake [in various accounts of literary theories] than views of literature - ... informing and sustaining all such theories are more or less definite readings of social reality. It is these readings which are in a real sense guilty, all the way from Matthew Arnold’s patronizing attempts to pacify the working class to Heidegger’s Nazism. Breaking with the literary institution does not just mean offering different accounts of Beckett; it means breaking with the very ways literature, literary criticism and its supporting social values are defined. (Eagleton, 1983, 89-90)

My inquiry rests on the notions, expressed by Eagleton, first, of the powerful influence of “definite readings of social reality,” and second, of the necessity to understand the ways in which “literature, literary criticism and its supporting social values are defined.” Further, it supposes the potential in these activities for a broadening of the democratic nature of English study and English teaching.

At the end of his analysis of the history of English Studies in England, Brian Doyle, a theorist sympathetic to Eagleton’s views, specifically on the need to discard the idea of a falsely harmonious heritage, claims that

English studies should be reconstituted as the study of how verbal and written fictions have been produced and used, socially channelled and evaluated, grouped together, given social significance, institutionalized,
transformed, repressed, and eliminated. Such studies would be fundamentally relational in that the assumed and projected positions of the individual reader, author, text, and users would all be studied within social semiotic processes, or the making and unmaking of lived meanings. (142)

The study of these anthologies attempts on a small scale in one particular area of the English curriculum to participate in what Doyle et al are doing. Resting on the premise that literature, and the teaching of literature, profoundly influences attitudes and beliefs first of all, it recognizes and examines the shaping forces - ideas and those powerfully expressing them in significant documents - behind curriculum formation. It further observes, within limitations, the zeitgeist in the educational culture of the period of the study.

The study, which is of war-related literary works in authorized senior high school anthologies during the late 1950s and 1960s in Ontario, includes graphs (as Figures) of these works, divided into thematic categories, and showing trends in selection, omission, and weighting. “If,” as Robert Morgan suggests in his discussion of the “Englishness of English Teaching,” “we are to understand those problematic categories which inform our practice...we must turn to history, attempting to recover the substance from which their forms were cast” (198).

The purpose of the anthology analysis, then, is to illustrate some significant if modest patterns in curriculum decisions regarding the selection for senior grades of war-related literature in two not wholly distinct yet identifiable phases of the cold War. It does not claim to present a comprehensive review of all relevant literature in all relevant courses chiefly because of the unavailability of several texts. The data come from twenty-three texts, which, representing more than two thirds of the relevant texts, are presumed to be a significant sampling of what literature was available for students (and teachers) on the subject of war. It considers what was being offered and what was being, in Doyle’s words, ‘repressed’ or ‘eliminated’; in other words, it considers what Eliot Eisner terms, the “null curriculum” (1979, 74-92). “The null curriculum is untaught because it reflects unvalued or undervalued
aspects of culture for which there is an insufficient constituency, for which no agent or too few or too ineffectual agents have raised a banner and led a cause” (Peshkin, in Handbook of Curriculum, 1992, 250). It looks at some underlying assumptions in curricular choices. One of these assumptions suggests an apolitical, unbiased basis of selection amounting to a ‘transparency’; that is, it supposes a self-evident aesthetic criterion which includes an unassailable moral component. The “supporting social values,” pointed to by Eagleton, lie behind the transparency. Such an assumption is visible in Diltz’ pedagogical musing following a particular lesson plan on a sonnet by Wordsworth, which begins with the line, “It is not to be thought of.” Diltz’ thinking and influence figure in the study partly to point to the problem of presumed transparency, or (to a greater or lesser extent) unconscious bias always at play in a teacher’s practice and partly by way of illustrating that general principle in the absence of information about the actual delivery of the material by the thousands of English teachers across the province.

There is a woeful lack of teacher records about their own practice except in the most general of terms. Furthermore, as Morgan points out regarding the teaching of English in general, the idea of English studies as “a racial and imperial positioning” did not mean that the ideology sold was necessarily “the ideology bought by the pupils it was intended for” (229). We do know, however, that Diltz “for thirty years was virtually the only person in Ontario preparing candidates to teach secondary school English” (Stewart, drawing on Harris, 112). We know too that, as George S. Tomkins argues, “until as late as 1960 there existed a moral consensus regarding the purposes of Canadian schooling,” and that these purposes included “the development of patriotism (in imperial and Canadian terms)” (Tomkins. 1984, 48).

An additional consideration of speculative interest regarding the problem of how the material was taught comes from Stewart’s discussion of the marked influence of Diltz and the marked absence of the influence of Northrop Frye on conceptions of the teacher and the practice of English study until the end of the second of this study’s two periods.
The divided period of the study - late 1950s and late 1960s - was selected as a suitable focus for the study for three reasons. First, during the first period, the Cold War (as well as countless other wars) - was being waged. Second, while this period may have represented, in Stewart's words, "a time of relative stability and constancy in the preparation of secondary school teachers of English in Ontario and in the content of Ministry of Education Guidelines for secondary school English," (xvi) it also represents two interestingly different and equally complex phases of the Cold War. During this earlier phase, closer to the Second World War, focus on the little understood cataclysmic finale to that war could overshadow a growing alarm, coinciding with the further development in the West of nuclear weapons and the Soviet Union's new nuclear capability, about the possibility of a future, quite unimaginable war.

During the later period, the late 1960s, fears of nuclear annihilation were exacerbated by the escalation and fragile termination of the Vietnam War. This period also saw the growth of the anti-war movement, again fueled by fear of the Bomb. Was all this reflected in any way in the curricular choices regarding literary anthologies?

The third reason for choosing these two periods is a practical one: after 1967 and the last of the Ontario Departmental Examinations for grade thirteen, which were based on prescribed texts, multiple authorizations of material flowered, vastly increasing the difficulty of identifying the texts actually being used. Indeed, by 1964, Circular 14 was already a fifty-four page booklet as a result of the 1950 Royal Commission's recommendations which led to the establishment of the system of multiple authorizations. This is a complicating factor for grades eleven and twelve, for which Departmental examinations had ended by the mid-fifties, more than for grade thirteen whose material selection was constrained by the fact of the Departmentals. It is not so complicating as it might have been however. In her 1965 Epilogue to the Authorization of Textbooks for the Schools of Ontario 1846-1950, Viola Parvin notes,
It is apparent that freedom of choice in the matter of texts has not met with unanimous approval, and there is again some concern about the multiplicity of texts... the current textbook laws remain in many respects the same as they have been over the past one hundred years. (123)

Method

I studied Circular 14 (the list of authorized texts), Curriculum Documents, and the Reading Lists for the Intermediate and Senior Divisions during the two periods under discussion. These, as well as the available texts themselves were in either the Special Books and Records Collection of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education or the Archives of the Toronto Board of Education.

In each of the twenty-three anthologies I studied the Preface, Introduction, Notes, and Questions, having first read the selections themselves, identifying those which were in any way war-related. I then constructed categories for the selections which inform the Figures (1-5) and Tables (1-5) on pages 53-63. The figures then illustrate visually the presence and nature of war-related literature in the body of works taught to senior high school students. While these ten categories have been subjectively constructed, I believe a significant pattern emerges. Were others to place these selections, there might be differences in the construction of categories; however, I believe there would be agreement on the larger scheme, perhaps calling it 'War Acceptance' and 'War Refusal'.
### TABLE 1: WAR-RELATED THEMES IN ANTHOLOGIES USED IN THE LATE '50s (BUT NOT '60s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAR-RELATED THEMES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ENTRIES BY THEME</th>
<th>THEMES 1-10: PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heroism, Glory</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patriotism, Heritage</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Honour, Civilization</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Loss, Necessary Evil</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. God’s Will</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Women – Noble Sacrifice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tenacity, Optimism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Havoc</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Anti-War</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parody</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES FOR THEMES 1-10:</strong></td>
<td><strong>288</strong></td>
<td><strong>(100% -- decimals rounded off)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: War-Related Themes in Anthologies Used in the Late '50s (but not '60s)

1-heroeism 2-patriotism 3-honour 4-necessary evil 5-god's will 6-women -- noble sacrifice 7-tenacity 8-havoc 9-anti-war 10-parody
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAR-RELATED THEMES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ENTRIES BY THEME</th>
<th>THEMES 1-10: PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heroism, Glory</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patriotism, Heritage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Honour, Civilization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Loss, Necessary Evil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. God’s Will</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Women – Noble Sacrifice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tenacity, Optimism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Havoc</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Anti-War</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parody</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES FOR THEMES 1-10:</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>(100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2: War-Related Themes in Anthologies Used in the Late '60s (but not '50s)

### TABLE 3: WAR-RELATED THEMES IN ANTHOLOGIES USED IN THE LATE '50s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAR-RELATED THEMES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ENTRIES BY THEME</th>
<th>THEMES 1-10: PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heroism, Glory</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patriotism, Heritage</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Honour, Civilization</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Loss, Necessary Evil</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. God’s Will</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Women – Noble Sacrifice</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tenacity, Optimism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Havoc</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Anti-War</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parody</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES FOR THEMES 1-10:</strong></td>
<td><strong>479</strong></td>
<td><strong>(100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3: War-Related Themes in Anthologies Used in the Late '50s
### TABLE 4: WAR-RELATED THEMES IN ANTHOLOGIES USED IN THE LATE ’60s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAR-RELATED THEMES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ENTRIES BY THEME</th>
<th>THEMES 1-10: PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heroism, Glory</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patriotism, Heritage</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Honour, Civilization</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Loss, Necessary Evil</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. God’s Will</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Women – Noble Sacrifice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tenacity, Optimism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Havoc</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Anti-War</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parody</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES FOR THEMES 1-10:** 243

(100%)
Figure 4: War-Related Themes in Anthologies Used in the Late '60s

1. heroism
2. patriotism
3. honour
4. necessary evil
5. god's will
6. women, noble sacrifice
7. tenacity
8. havoc
9. anti-war
10. parody
### TABLE 5: WAR-RELATED THEMES IN ANTHOLOGIES USED IN THE LATE '50s AND '60s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAR-RELATED THEMES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ENTRIES BY THEME</th>
<th>THEMES 1-10: PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heroism, Glory</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patriotism, Heritage</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Honour, Civilization</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Loss, Necessary Evil</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. God’s Will</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Women – Noble Sacrifice</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tenacity, Optimism</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Havoc</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Anti-War</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parody</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES FOR THEMES 1-10:</strong></td>
<td><strong>531</strong></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: War-Related Themes in Anthologies Used in the Late '50s and '60s

1-heroism 2-patriotism 3-honour 4-necessary evil 5-god's will 6-women-noble sacrifice 7-tenacity 8-havoc 9-anti-war 10-parody
### TABLE 6: FINDINGS OF ANTHOLOGY STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>IN USE</th>
<th>ENTRIES</th>
<th>WAR-RELATED</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada Book Of Prose and Verse #1, 1927</td>
<td>1957-61</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Book Of Prose and Verse #2, 1930</td>
<td>1957-61</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Book Of Prose and Verse #3, 1935</td>
<td>1957-61</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Book of Good Essays, 1944</td>
<td>1957-61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty One Modern Essays, 1941</td>
<td>1957-61</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Poems, 1924</td>
<td>1957-61</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Book of Modern Prose, 1938</td>
<td>1957-61</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prose Of Our Day, 1940</td>
<td>1957-61; 1964-67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Selection of English Poetry, 1947</td>
<td>1957-61; 1964-67</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essays and Short Stories, 1948</td>
<td>1957-60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass of Parnassus, 1946</td>
<td>1957-61; 1964-67</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Schoolbook of English Verse, 1940</td>
<td>1957-61</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poems Worth Knowing, 1941</td>
<td>1957-61</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prose for Senior Students, 1951</td>
<td>1956-60; 1964-67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Vintage, 1959</td>
<td>1964-67</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyric and Longer Poems, 1959</td>
<td>1964-67</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poems to Remember, 1951</td>
<td>1957-61; 1964-67</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizons, 1955</td>
<td>1958, 1960; 1964-67</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and His World, 1961</td>
<td>1966 &gt;</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for Today, 1948</td>
<td>1957-61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Anthology of Verse (Oxford), 1964</td>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Essays and Sketches, 1935</td>
<td>1957-61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry for Senior Students, 1951</td>
<td>1964-67 &gt;</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** 3382 355 196 133 174 38 11 12 7 24 30 6

*War-Related Themes: 1-Heroism, Glory; 2-Patriotism, Heritage; 3-Honour, Civilization; 4-Loss, Necessary Evil; 5-God's Will; 6-Women—Noble Sacrifice; 7-Tenacity, Optimism; 8-Havoc; 9-Anti-war; 10-Parody*
The categories are as follows:

1. Heroism, Glory
2. Patriotism, Heritage
3. Honour, Civilization
4. Loss, Necessary Evil
5. God’s Will
6. Women - Noble Sacrifice
7. Tenacity, Optimism
8. Havoc
9. Anti-war
10. Parody

Figure 1 shows graphically by percentage how the war-related entries in texts in use during the late 50s only reflect the thematic categories. Table 1, by showing the number of entries in the late 50s’ anthologies by theme, further explains the Figure 1 graph. Figures and Tables 2-5 show the same relationship for the different periods as set out in their titles. Table 6 is a master list of all twenty-three anthologies, showing the dates in use, the total number of entries, the number of war-related entries and the occurrences of the ten war-related themes among those entries in each of the anthologies.

Works appearing on the several Reading Lists for the Intermediate and Senior Divisions do not appear on the graphs, as there was no way to tell how these were used or how closely they were followed, and as they would not have been materials on which students were examined. However, I did note, weigh, and comment on the presence and nature of war-related works appearing on the Lists as readings suggested for students to supplement the core material.
“Instead of facing up to the realities of power, class, culture, social order and disorder, literary critics and editors of literary anthologies hide behind the universalist vocabulary that only mystifies the true nature of reality” (Mukherjee, 26). Through prefaces, notes, critiques, and questions, and in secondary school teaching of these anthologies, students have been directed to penetrate beneath the surface of particularity to grasp a “universal human” feeling and condition. The social, political, and historical forces which make up the particular ‘surface’ are not supposed to be considered, by these students, of lasting and therefore of any real importance. Perhaps too, because of the active, lively, conflicting nature of the forces at play, students see in the works of these anthologies, at some level, the potential for what they might deem propaganda, and an even more dangerous call to action. Perhaps this is the subversive dimension perceived by those agents (editors and anthologists) of a society intent on maintaining the status quo and on the requisite ‘nation-building properties’ examined by Morgan and by Murray in her discussion of George Grant. Murray refers to Pierre Bourdieu’s social reproduction theory, “the tendency of the educational system and its component parts to reproduce themselves” (229). She cites Grant’s statement that “the need to ‘keep technology dynamic within the context of the state capitalist structure’ [is] the ‘primary purpose’ of Canadian culture” (229). For the interest of this study we might validly shift the technological, economic purposes of society noted by Grant to include and focus on patriotic, military purposes. The process of training students to concentrate on ‘universals’ and individual characters in literature at the expense of genuine consideration of the reality of socio-political exigencies results in what Richard Ohmann calls “the prophylactic view of literature.” In this view, even the most provocative literary work when seen from such a perspective, is emptied of its subversive content. After such treatment...[it] will not cause any trouble for the people who run schools or colleges, for the military-industrial complex, for anyone who holds power. It can only perpetuate the misery of those who don’t. (cited by Mukherjee, 27)
Turning to some of the relevant anthology prefaces, thoughts on teaching by the practitioner and theorist, Diltz, and some Ministry directives, it is helpful to keep in mind the following observation by Robert Morgan:

It is impossible ... to divorce the rise of an aesthetically and racially organized English Studies from the zenith of British imperialism (which of course rests on military strength and a profound conviction regarding the Just War theory in which justice is seen to equal British will) whose school editions of ‘Standard Authors’ served as its literary armature. (205)

Morgan notes the critical role of textbook editors, school inspectors and superintendents, university and Department of Education professors in the implementation of the ‘policy’ of civilizing through English cultural imperialism.

W.J. Alexander, first Chair of English at the University of Toronto, editor of several secondary school anthologies, including one in this study, made the claim with whose legacy Arun Mukherjee struggled in her classroom in the eighties. “The student’s task [is] to attain to the state of mind which the writer intended to embody.” Similarly, among its suggestions for the study of English in secondary schools, the Department of Education announced.

There must be as direct an effort as possible to lead the pupils to exact comprehension of the writer’s ideas and to a personal response to the emotional and imaginative elements of his work...[The function of the teacher is] to point the way to the discovery by the pupils of the living meaning of great literature and to enable them to gain through precise habits of thought, sensitivity of imagination, and emotional responsiveness, an increasing power to understand and enjoy the masters....The study of biographical facts about the writer...should not be overstressed. (Curriculum 1 and S4B 1956, 1960-61)
This advocacy of a strenuous concentration by teachers on developing in students an emotional response to the imaginative elements in literature must lead, surely, under the teacher’s guidance, to an increased power to understand not life but ‘the masters’ and rather than changing the conditions of life, enjoying ‘the masters’. As to the selection of ‘the masters’, E.F.Kingston points out in his Preface to Essays and Short Stories, 1948, (prescribed for grade thirteen from 1957-1960). “The school day is too crowded to waste time on inferior authors or on material that inherently has little permanent value...the eternal verities remain” (iv). Stewart’s citing of Frye’s vision of the task of the teacher seems pertinent here as a voice speaking against the grain:

The task of the teacher in a program in which the intent is to educate the imagination is, in Frye’s view, a militant one, intended to disturb. If the teacher’s first duty is to attack the repressive elements in an individual, the elements absorbed from the cultural mythology, that is a task designed to alter the way things are, to transfer existing loyalties ‘from ready-made responses to the real world of human constructive power’. (Stewart, 1985, 99-100)

While Frye’s vision here may not be so far from the deep mythic as opposed to popular culture patterns, the duty Stewart cites here can be seen as a definite step away from the older, entrenched vision represented by Diltz.

Interestingly, in his 1944 Preface to A Book of Good Essays (authorized and recommended for grades eleven and twelve from 1959-1967) E.M.Sealey writes that many of the selections “belong to a time which a very great man has described as ‘our finest hour’ and hence will not soon lose their significance. They have in fact been chosen for that very significance” (iii). The implication that the significance is single, obvious, and absolute (because Churchill gave voice to it) invites closer inspection. Of the eight essays concerned with war, three are by Canadians (Matthew Halton, Greg Clark, and Ross Munro) and one by another colonial, R.G.Menzies. Thus the outreaches of empire rally to its defence and we
recall Ohmann’s observation, which begins this section of the study, about the “need to inculcate in colonial youth an absolute and unquestioning loyalty combined with an equally fervent belief in the necessity, indeed glory of war.”

Each of the eight works overlaps into four of the thematic categories (set out in Tables 1-6), reflecting the need to boost morale of those in Britain and support of those abroad, intertwining the threads of heroism and glory, patriotism, honour and civilization and the evil necessity of war. Thus, while Munro gives an eye witness and shocking account of the landing at Dieppe, he does not dwell on the slaughter but on the bravery of the Canadian troops. nor does he even remotely question the orders of the British Government that led to that slaughter. These troops were presumably like the fodder of English essayist Barryman’s “Humble Folk the Strength of Great Britain” who climb “heights of glory as if born to sacrifice and heroism” (60). Even the children, according to Barryman, offer their lives “unflinchingly”:

Like soldiers they [“clean little boys and girls politely calm and grimy ones whose language splits the ear”] have borne the shock of fire and bombs; like sailors they have gone down unflinchingly to their deaths in shattered ships. and like aviators they have given their strength to rise ‘by Labour to the Stars’. (68)

The groundwork for this ‘willingness’ to sacrifice was laid, as Morgan suggests, by the “nineteenth and early twentieth century editors, anthologists, superintendents etc. in the scrupulous selection, annotation, and suggested modes of presentation of suitable ‘classics’ of the English heritage” (218). Thus alongside Scott’s “Lochinvar,” “Robert the Bruce,” and “King Richard and the Soldan,” in one anthology we have Hubbard’s “A Message to Garcia,” which pronounces,

It is not book learning young men need, nor instruction about this or that, but a stiffening of the backbone that will cause them to be loyal to a trust, to act promptly, concentrate their energies: do the thing. (Canada Book of Prose and Verse, Book One, 333)
The conscription crisis in Quebec in 1917 and again in 1939 illustrates what can happen when the curriculum has been the ‘wrong one’ for the State’s purpose. Although, as Morgan describes, anthologist George Ross’ proposition that “imperialism and Canadian nationalism were fully compatible,” it should be no surprise that French Canadians saw things differently. Morgan cites J.H. Fowler, at the League of Empire Conference in Toronto, who recommended “literature as a bond of Empire” (225) as indeed for English Canadians it was. The French Canadian history with the motherland was quite different from that of English Canadians with theirs, ties having been considerably weakened over the two hundred years since the Plains of Abraham. Furthermore, the Catholic character of Quebec determined to a large extent non-interventionist behaviour. The French Revolution had decisively breached the bond between France as motherland and the Quebecois. French Canadian clergy were terrified of the possibility of events being repeated at home. The vast majority of French Canadians lived in rural areas which, being priest-dominated, were kept ‘protected’ from corrupting outside influences. These included English, English Canadian, urban and European influences. Therefore, even had there been on the French Canadian curricula a poem called ‘France, My France,’ a counterpart to Henley’s “England. My England,” it is doubtful whether the Quebecois heart would have been roused to such demonstrations of loyalty to the motherland that the conscription crises would never have arisen. Morgan refers to Henley’s verses, among others, as epitomizing “the long historical interweaving of language, race, and empire” (220)....for England and English-speaking colonies.

Two years after Sealey’s collection, however, in the Introduction to Modern Essays and Sketches, J.W. Marriott claims,

[...]he essays in this collection are modern and therefore representative of the post war world... What are the characteristic features of our own day? ...we have less reverence for authority and none for pomposity... The pre-war man thinks the youth of today is lacking in the traditional virtues
of strength and consistency, the young people accuse their elders of acting by rule of thumb...the modern world has a fierce dislike for the man who tries to impose his will upon others. It objects to the tyranny of the Victorian father, whose rhetorical fireworks neither dazzle nor impress the post-war generation. The essayist of today does not lecture nor preach; he offers suggestions, expounds ideas, makes tentative speculations. (1935, xiv)

An example of the ‘new’ brand of ‘tentative speculation’ appears in “The Legend of Buffalo Bill,” a study of the relentless making of a hero, taken from the Times Literary Supplement, author not given. The piece concludes with an almost defiant wistfulness for the allegedly departed days of real heroics:

Contemporary history becomes more and more insistent that in a prolonged conflict with Nature and the Indian there was little of romance or heroics. And yet the spirit of imagination is full of betrayals. [Buffalo Bill’s] burial place may even - for want of another - stand as a symbol of the intrepid spirit which, during three centuries, pierced the impenetrable forests to the Mississippi, braved the frontiers of the Missouri, and, crossing the great plains, united the American people from East to West. (15-16)

In 1938 and 1940 two anthologies appeared. They were authorized and recommended for grades eleven and twelve from 1957-1961 (these are the ‘authorized use’ dates relevant to this study; obviously, these, and others referred to here with earlier publication dates, were in authorized use or recommended earlier). They are notable here for the seeming contradictions they contain between statements of intent in the prefatory remarks and the works themselves. The earlier text, A Book of Modern Prose, offers thirteen pieces related to war, five woven through with concepts of glory, heroism, questions of identity, adventure or manhood; eight associate war with patriotism, nationalism, and the defence of a heritage. Of these, three overlap to associate war with honour. one expresses the view that war is a necessary evil and of the thirteen, one. “Our Savage Mind” by
James Harvey Robinson could be said to be anti-war in the sense that war involves intolerable loss and slaughter. In his Preface, and in marked contrast to the works themselves however, editor W.L. MacDonald claims a radical change in the post-World War One attitude to war:

...war means more to this generation than it ever meant to any previous age, and a new point of view has evolved which really worships at the altar of peace rather than that of Mars. Fighting, which now means mass murder, has been kept in the background in these selections, but in one remarkable piece forms the actual background for the study of wild life. War again has always, for some perverted reason, been associated with the idea of patriotism, but two selections have been chosen which seem to present the love of country from another, more sane, because more fundamental point of view. (1938, vii-viii)

That Churchill’s dramatic flourish, “Victory.” carries undercurrents of sober caution is unarguable, but that he does not associate war with patriotism and glory is arguable: “Victory had come after all the hazards and heartbreaks in an absolute and unlimited form. All the kings and emperors with whom we had warred were in flight or exile. All their Armies and Fleets were destroyed or subdued” (53). He refers to the “unarmed and untrained island nation, who with no defence but its Navy had faced unquestioningly the strongest manifestation of military power in human record” (53). The fact that this piece was selected in 1938 and particularly in 1940 is interesting. In the Foreword to Prose of Our Day, the editors explain why they are including more modern writing in their anthology: “Apart entirely from literary justifications is the fact that modern writing is the key to an understanding of modern living and has all the interest and urgent importance of our world to each of us.”

If it is true that English curricular decisions constituted an “ideologically loaded and exclusionary set of practices” (Morgan, 205), and that “the expansiveness of the claim that English literature embodied the essential truths of ‘the human condition’ is no more than the cultural counterpart to the military domination of a global empire,” (205) then we can perhaps assume that the phrase “urgent
importance” in the passage cited above, is itself urgently important in the minds of these editors as of those of the other anthologies of the 1940s. So that J.B.Priestley, reflecting in “Battalion Reunion” on the carnage of World War One and then on the emotions it kindled in his battalion, loyalty in particular to one man, a natural leader (school teacher) known as ‘Daddy’. writes.

Are such emotions impossible except when we are slaughtering one another? It is the men - and good men too - who answer YES to this who grow sentimental about war. They do not seem to see that it is not war that is right, for it is impossible to defend such stupid long-range butchery, but that it is peace that is wrong. the civilian life to which they returned, a condition of things in which they found their manhood stunted, their generous impulses baffled, their double instinct for leadership and loyalty completely checked. Men are much better than their ordinary life allows them to be. (160)

Priestley’s is the strongest voice deploring war in this collection. It follows a piece by John Buchan on T.E.Lawrence in whom he says was “an Odyssey and an Iliad combined completed before the age of thirty...a miraculous story” (140). Yet, whichever is right or wrong, peace or war, war it seems must go on. In Twenty-One Modern Essays (1941, authorized for grades eleven and twelve from 1957-1961). Priestley sets out very simply the eponymous ‘fundamental issue of the war’ in a section entitled “Britain speaks”: “…the fundamental issue...is that the Nazis must be stopped or we simply can’t get on with our lives” (34). And the colonies are inextricably involved: “It’s no more a European issue than a world outbreak of cholera would be” (34).

Two statements stand out from the Preface to the 1947 A Selection of English Poetry (authorized for grades eleven and twelve from 1959 - 1960 and from 1964 - 1967; I have found no reason for the gap between these two periods of authorized use). Considering schemes of classification for their anthology, the editors chose not to employ any which might introduce “an element into the study of poetry
which is undesirable where young readers are concerned - literary history, which involves ideas not necessarily connected with poetry at all” (v). They also write:

[t]he First World War, the Russian Revolution, the Great Depression, the rise of totalitarian states, the Second World War, the conquest of the air, and the use of the atomic bomb, are only some of the striking incidents in the making of a new man in a new universe. These world-shattering episodes have induced new modes of political, social, and scientific thought...(vi)

Of the fifteen war-related poems (including “Ulysses” and his “delight in battle with [his] peers”) three could be said to offer ‘new’ ways of looking at war. For the first (and only) time in the study’s range of anthologies, Herbert Read’s ironic portrait of Wordsworth’s “Character of the Happy Warrior” appears as “The Scene of War: The Happy Warrior,” which ends on a previously unheard note:

I saw him stab
And stab again
A well-killed Boche.

This is the happy warrior,
This is he …

The other two are C.Day-Lewis’ ironic “I’ve Heard Them Lilting at Loom and Belting” and Auden’s “Refugee Blues,” with which Canadian readers might have felt uncomfortable given their government’s policy of non-admittance of Jews during the Second World War. It is unlikely however that secondary school students in the 1950s and 1960s would have been aware of this passage in their very recent history since it was kept from public awareness until Irving Abella’s historical expose, One is Too Many, appeared in the 1980s.

Another example of contradictions, which create a gap of credibility, between prefatory claims and the actual body of works can be found in C.E.Lewis’ 1941
Poems Worth Knowing (authorized for grades eleven and twelve from 1959-1960). In wording appropriate for an era of empiricism, Lewis writes, “The function of poetry is to make the life of man more full and real. It is to make him an independent hunter of the facts by which men live - the facts of the world and the facts of the universe” (xxviii). While war is, arguably, rather one of the facts by which men (and women and children) die than live, and there are many other diametrically opposed facts by which they live, almost half of the collection is composed of war-related poems (fifty-one of one hundred and twelve). Lewis observes.

The truth is, there has never been a greater variety of moods among poets than during the past two generations. The poets of war may be regarded as a group by themselves; but even among them what has Mr. Sassoon, or even Mr. Nicholls, in common with Grenfell and the Rupert Brooke who wrote, ‘Now God be thanked Who has matched us with His hour’... and: ‘If I should die, think only this of me: That there’s some corner of a foreign field That is forever England.’ (xxxvi)

Of the fifty-one, three might be called anti-war and these with one exception (Amy Lowell’s “Patterns”) are borderline (Hardy’s “The Man He Killed” and Housman’s “Reveille”). The great variety of mood Lewis refers to is not evident in this anthology which still offers Kipling’s “Gunga Din,” “Fuzzy Wuzzy,” “Recessional,” and Binyon’s “For the Fallen.”

For The Schoolbook of English Verse (1940, authorized for grades eleven and twelve from 1957-1961), Guy Boas claims two objectives: “… to include only such poems as really appeal to the young, and to make the selection sufficiently comprehensive for no poem to be omitted with which a pupil by the time he or she leaves school should be acquainted” (Foreward, vii). Given that of fifty-seven war-related poems, not one speaks against war save possibly Housman’s “The Lads that will never be Old,” and given that they include Newbolt’s “Vitae Lampada,” “Gunga Din,” “England, My England,” “Juggling Jerry.” “I Vow to Thee My

In his Preface to Pierian Spring (1946), a work of pedagogical thinking and practical application, B.C. Diltz would seem to be going against the grain of contemporary editors in one respect at least; that is, he argues against the trend of modernity, relevance to youth (no matter how interpreted or followed through) advocated by other editors: “The urgent need in education today is the resurrection of the truth of sound values as revealed and recorded through the ages rather than the indiscriminate following of the ‘trends’ of modern socialistic opinion” (vii). Pierian Spring, aimed at secondary school English teachers,

recommends that one of the chief aims of education is to transmit our heritage through our experiencing of it rather than to subscribe to descriptions of contemporary society as conceived by theorists and explained by those who naively suppose that what appears to be practical today will perforce be practical tomorrow. (vii)

In a tightly-knit Socratic lesson on Wordsworth’s sonnet. “It is not to be thought of.” Diltz guides his pupils rigorously through the military glories of English history, making ‘with’ them ‘necessary’ connections to freedom. An excerpt follows:

T. What does armory symbolize?
P. It represents the physical prowess of a people brave enough to be free. (153)

........
T. What was Wordsworth’s chief complaint?
P. The people were soft and selfish.
T. What contemporary parallel of this condition can you recall?
P. A parallel may be found in the pacifism and indifference of many people in the thirties and forties of this century. (153)

........
T. How can one defend this poem against the charge that it is only an expression of British ‘imperialism’, of national pride and smugness?
P. Only a shrewd little political mind would attempt to twist the meaning into that narrow channel. (155)

Sealey’s modern essayists chosen in 1935 may not ‘preach’, but educational thinkers, teacher trainers, and anthologists in 1946 are clearly still at it.

Even more interesting and significant than the lesson plan itself, however, are Diltz’ subsequent comments. He recognizes the danger faced by English teachers (of mistaking, for example, “the by-path of personal interest or impulse for the broad highway of objective meaning and truth”) but fails, as most if not all ideologues do, to recognize his own participation in that mistake:

It is easy to imagine what a rabid nationalist or an indulgent internationalist would do with the material of this poem. It could be distorted to support the prejudices of either camp; but this is not the proper use of poetry or of this poem. It is an evil thing to taint the minds of youth by exposing them to the selfish prejudices or propaganda of any social or political group. To guard against this kind of mischief is one of the duties and responsibilities of the teacher of language and literature today. (156)

But clearly some values are to remain unchallenged, while others, like socialism and pacifism, are to be absolutely extinguished.

In his book of observations on the teaching of English, Patterns of Surmise, Diltz acknowledges and celebrates the capacity of literature to shape the character both of an individual and of a nation. His touchstone is the Soldier:

How many millions of boys and girls have found in literature…a host of thoughts, feelings and suggestions that have left an indelible imprint on their minds and characters! The literary allusions and the manner of expression, the sincerity and the terseness, the moving honesty and the touching frankness found in published letters of young men at the battlefront are proof enough of the lasting values of the study of literature and composition in the schools. Many of the sentiments and attitudes which contribute to the sum total of the young soldier’s character can be traced to the faithful and enlightened efforts of his teacher of English. The proper classroom study of a few literary masterpieces is nourishment
for the human spirit...universal values remain because human nature remains essentially the same. (53)

In the same book, Diltz presents a detailed plan for the teaching of Sir Henry Newbolt’s poem, “He Fell Among Thieves.” As in another of Newbolt’s poems, “Vitae Lampada,” with its famous opening, “There’s a breathless hush in the close tonight,” and the exhortation to “play up, play up and play the game!” this poem, and Diltz’ teaching of it, make explicit the interconnections among class, honour, race, manliness, schoolboys’ games, training, war and the proper attitude towards violence and violent death. The hero’s laughing insouciance in the face of murder at the hands of a far less worthy race than his own (Diltz refers in his lesson to the Afghans as a “deceitful and treacherous people”) is tempered by his poignant memories of a privileged childhood, his father, schoolmasters, games, competition and personal glory. Diltz explains to his students that Newbolt found inspiration for his poems “in two fountains that are subterraneously joined and rise from the same source ... the deeds of the English heroes and the character of the English schoolboy” (151). To Diltz’ question, “Why do you think the poet was drawn to the incident that gave rise to this moving poem?” his hypothetical Canadian students reply:

Evidently he believed that the chain is no stronger than its separate links. The welfare of the British Empire rests in the hands of its individual members. Responsibility for the Empire is a duty incumbent on each one of us. [The hero] played his part nobly. The manner of his sacrifice was tangible evidence of his training and set a diamond not a blot upon the escutcheon of the British Empire he served, despite the fact that he had fallen into the hands of thieves and murderers. (152)

Those who fear atomic energy have perhaps lost the love of God. Wars and rumours of wars may quite consistently be beyond the control of His creatures (Prerian Spring, 318).
Diltz refers, in another passage, to “isolationist professors, pacifist preachers, and socialist schoolteachers” as pitted against “our warriors” who “should be an inspiration to all compatriots.” Warriors and, even better, warrior poets are a type of Christ figure for Diltz, who says their “serious act of self-denial … puts to shame the self-righteousness of little moralists” and is “the beginning of the way that leads to supreme surrender” (Poetic Pilgrimage, 18). The connection to the choosing and teaching of, for example, “He Fell Among Thieves” is direct and obvious. Here is the arena for heroism: military struggle; here is heroism: a soldier’s passion; here, in sum, is morality, spirituality and aesthetics all in one and the agents and voices presenting are white, male, and British. As curriculum, as pedagogy, this is highly political and exclusive. It must be with great difficulty that those who have asserted an aesthetic criterion only (in this view, the “Great Works” studied from English Literature are said to have risen like cream to the top) guiding the course of what has historically, and, to an extent, currently, been curricular selection, can confront Diltz’ conflation of “universal human values” with the “character of the English schoolboy.”

How does progressivism in education threaten all this according to Diltz?

Since the last war, a whole system of education has been built up on this continent in support of the isolationist and those who consider self-interest first to be served. Up to the outbreak of the war in 1939 the so-called ‘progressive education’ which is based solidly in the old self-centred humanism, was regarded by educational engineers and socialist teachers as the hope of the world, and it spread rapidly everywhere with devastating effect on the character and the culture of the people. But this ‘progressive education’ that would dare to build a new social order [emphasis mine] had failed to take into account the emergency of war and the numerous other exigencies that beset us in a very real world. (Diltz, 1942, 20-21)

Clearly, Diltz perceives both that a ‘new social order’ is in the works and that such an order as he sees coming would be a profound challenge to the tradition he has served and perpetuated. Tomkins speaks of this tradition as “a secularized
Christian morality wedded to a British classical ideal, of which Matthew Arnold in England was the chief advocate. This morality served as the underpinning of a curriculum suffused with imperial-nationalist sentiment” (Tomkins, 1984, 49).

Morgan defines Englishness as a “set of ideological suppositions, images, and fantasies fostered by language, theories of language and the literary - what Said refers to as ‘the imaginative geography a discourse stages’” (Morgan, 208), and points out that “school texts always exist in relation to social text, and school English with Englishness” (208). Further, those who, like Diltz, have been responsible both for the selection of curricular materials and for the ‘transmission’ of them in the classroom either directly as teachers or indirectly as teachers of teachers, follow the tendency Murray points to, of the educational system’s various parts reproducing themselves.

What Dewey recognized and Diltz resisted was the epistemological and political circle that such a tendency as a concept of education presented - the unthinking but deeply felt perpetuation of a cultural hegemony. It precluded the possibility of “rethinking educational projects on their own terms, of developing an academic self-reflexivity” (Murray, 230). This transmission or reproduction theory of education would seem to account, at least in part, for the delay in impact of Northrop Frye’s theories of literature, the imagination, and education. These theories, so powerful and influential in Frye’s university classes and on his graduate students were kept from having a similar impact on secondary school English teaching, largely, it would seem, because of the antithetical concepts of Diltz and the remarkable hegemony they enjoyed. Deanne Bogdan refers to Frye’s “truly humanist position” about literature (Bogdan, 374): a red flag to a bull if recognized by Diltz, whose reference to “self-centred humanism,” is cited above. Frye’s concept of the task of the teacher of English moreover must have been equally menacing to Diltz:

... to keep fighting for the liberalizing of the imagination, ultimately to encourage students to come to the point where they can realize the nature
of the stock responses and the reasons for the passivity that keeps us
from constructing the society we want to live in. The route for this attack
is through the myths and metaphors of the body of imaginative
expression ... encouraging a displacement of the cliché and passive
response, the powers of repression of everyday living. (Frye, cited in
Stewart, 100)

Diltz' concern, seen in the light of Frye's theories, seems to have been to teach
for transmission rather than to teach how to learn for liberation and creation.
Stewart accounts for the triumph of Diltz over the potentially transforming
influence of Frye by pointing to two facts: the first is that of course not all who
went on to the Ontario College of Education from university had been taught by
Frye; the second was the current nature of teacher-training itself, the practical, even
urgent exigencies of day to day, text by text teaching, conceived of as 'delivering a
curriculum' which was the driving motive of College work. For the teacher in the
classroom, of course, even one trained to some extent in Frye's ideas, would find it
all too easy to fall back on Diltz' readily-available lesson plans when confronted
with the pressure to teach unfamiliar poems from a prescribed anthology (Stewart,
205).

In 1955, New Horizons appeared (edited by Diltz and McMaster and prescribed
for grade thirteen in 1958 and again in 1960 and for grades eleven and twelve from
1964 - 1967). Indeed the notes and questions suggested at least some "new
directions." This is the only anthology studied here to contain works in all ten
categories, which suggests the possibility of greater inclusiveness of perspectives.
To Binyon's "For the Fallen," which had appeared in many earlier anthologies
without comment, there is added the note, "Binyon's reflections on the death and
sacrifice occasioned by the Great War contrast sharply with those of Owen who
served with the troops in the line and was killed November 14, 1918, seven days
before the Armistice was signed" (280). The note for Owen's "Anthem for
Doomed Youth" quotes the poet only, with no further comment: "This book is not
about heroes. Nor is it about deeds or lands, nor anything about glory, honour, or
power, except War. The subject of it is war and the pity of war. The poetry is in the pity. All the poet can do today is to warn, that is why the true poets must be truthful’(282).

Nevertheless, there is more often a discrepancy between the aim as stated in the introduction and the nature of the notes to the poems. In their Preface, McMaster and Diltz assert their aim to “stimulate mental growth...to [get students to] think more as they read...to preclude the possibility of mere busy work on the wrong things in literary study. A poem of genuine quality can speak for itself” (xxviii). To suggest then, as the note does, that Reed’s “Naming of Parts” is merely “an amusing parody of a sergeant instructor’s diction and callous lack of concern with the raw recruit who is a person with feelings and imagination.” is, at the least, not letting the poem speak for itself and at worst, misleading the student about what the poem is doing. Indeed, the direction of the notes tends not towards encouraging students to see anew, or rethink, or “think more” about early works such as Lovelace’s “To Lucasta.” The note for this poem tells students “in this song, he pays her the compliment of identifying his love and honour for her with the love and honour he bears for his country and his king” (298).

War dominates the 1957 “Senior Division Reading List” of the Department of Education. Of thirty-six titles, thirty-three are about war. ‘Peace’ is mentioned once in all the descriptions: of Osbert Lancaster’s Saracen’s Head, the annotation reads “Faint-hearted, peace-loving Sir William Littlehampton becomes the unlikely hero in this satire on knighthood and chivalry.” For the rest, the words ‘thrilling’, ‘epic’, ‘gripping’, ‘rousing’, ‘love and adventure’, ‘heroic’, ‘glorious example of the indestructibility of the human spirit’, ‘brave men display the utmost in courage’ recur throughout. In 1964, all twenty-two “Famous Historical Novels” on the Intermediate and Senior Division list are war-related. This despite the pronouncement in the same document (Curriculum RP-S4) that “The study of English literature in its variety and richness can stimulate thought and imagination,
broaden experience and deepen understanding.” (129) or as George Grant put it, “interrupt the cycle of the already known” (cited by Murray 231).

What remains disturbing is the gap between the theoretical commitment (to the exposure of students to a wider range of literary works, an exposure that would lead to a “fuller life”) as expressed in Prefaces and the often implicit values of the actual selections made, combined with the continued exclusion of certain perspectives and voices from those selections. This observation might serve as a warning to 1990s analysts regarding claims made, for example for a gender or a race-balanced curriculum to verify closely what actually happens in the materials themselves.

Absent from all the literature considered in the study, both primary (anthology selections) and secondary (prefaces to anthologies, notes and questions regarding the works, and curriculum guides and suggestions for teaching), are certain voices and perspectives. There are no works by or about writers proposing alternatives to war; that is, there is no pacifist document of any kind. No anthology includes, for example, Blake’s powerful “Lullaby” which begins, “O for a voice like thunder, and a tongue/To drown the throat of war!”. There are no voices of women writing about women’s experiences of war, the loss of child, parent, sibling, the helplessness of the woman’s traditional position in war. No anthology includes, for example, the poem by Celia Whitehead written in 1900:

I am ‘wanted to go in the army.’
Well, what would they give me to do?
‘You’ll have to be killing your brothers
If one of them doesn’t kill you.’

I am ‘wanted to go in the army.’
Say, what is there in it for me?
‘You’d help to be saving your country
From brother-men over the sea.’

My country? Who says I’ve a country?
I live in another man’s flat
That hasn’t as much as a door yard -
And why should I battle for that?
I haven’t a lot nor a building.
No flower, no garden, nor tree.
The landlords have gobbled the country -
Let them do the fighting, not me

Nor does any anthology include that work by Virginia Woolf which offers a response to the question in this poem. “Who says I’ve a country?” and an analysis of its deep background: Three Guineas, first published in 1938: “In fact, as a woman, I have no country. As a woman I want no country. As a woman my country is the whole world” (108).

Absent too is the remarkable diary of the years from 1939-1945 by Frances Partridge, A Pacifist’s War, in which she attempts to convey her feeling, and that of her circle, of hatred for the war and violence bred by war. The Sunday Telegraph’s comment on the book is significant: “Apart from the admirable writing, what distinguishes A Pacifist’s War from so many other diaries of the period is the unexpected light which it throws on events that have almost been done to death” (from the 1983 edition. Robin Clark).

There is no sense of a colonial perspective other than that of the response ‘ready, aye ready’, and specifically in the Canadian context, there is no sense of the world as seen by the large French Canadian population.

There is no recognition of the surely remarkable fact that many of the authors included in the anthologies - poets, historians, dramatists - participated in a vast organized propaganda campaign in service to the Allied cause during the First World War. As Peter Buijtenhuis describes in The Great War of Words: British, American and Canadian Propaganda and Fiction, 1914-1933. H.G. Wells, G.K. Chesterton, Arthur Conan Doyle, Arnold Bennett, Rudyard Kipling, John Buchan, John Galsworthy, James Barrie, and Thomas Hardy, among others, “wrote glowing reports in praise of the Allied soldiers and generals and concealed the truth of the appalling conditions of trench warfare, inept leadership, tactical errors and casualty figures” (cited by Adachi, 1988, A4).
Masefield whitewashed the disaster of Gallipoli; Buchan turned the defeat at Somme into victory, and Conan Doyle, unlike his skeptical Sherlock Holmes, simply believed what the generals told him. The trenches, he wrote, were ‘the most wonderful spot in the world.’ Visiting Canadian soldiers camped on Salisbury Plain. Kipling went into rapturous flights of fancy over their demeanor: ‘They were all supple, free and intelligent; and they moved with a lift and a drive that made one sing for joy... They were young, they were beautifully fit, and they were all truly thankful that they lived in these high days’. (cited by Adachi, 1988. A4)

This is an example - in its most benign reading - of what Parker referred to as the “higher dottiness” in which Diltz also indulged as editor, anthologist, and pedagogical master.

“A serenity of spirit was born of high resolve and earnest discipline. The essential nobility and dignity of man were made manifest. Then came the ‘peace’ to wreck this fellowship of self-surrendering knights” (Diltz, 1942, 1953, 12).

These are some of the missing categories which constitute what Doyle referred to as “repressed” or “eliminated.” What is absent is as important as what is present. The absences point to what Elshtain calls the “textually mediated acceptance of war as option” (92).

To the question posed earlier of whether or not the volatile character of the two periods concerned in this study (the late 1950s and the late 1960s) was reflected in curricular choices and guidance, the answer would seem to be a qualified ‘no’.

Students were not, it appears, offered a multiperspectival view of the phenomenon of war; they were not, at least through the selection of materials (whatever happened during the presentation and interpretation of these remains, as has been suggested earlier, a matter of speculation), stimulated to reflect, reconsider, reconceive the nature and impact of war, nor alternative means to conflict resolution. As Edward Said points out,
Culture is a system of exclusions legislated from above but enacted throughout its polity, by which such things as anarchy, disorder, irrationality, inferiority, bad taste, and immorality are identified, then deposited outside the culture and kept there by the power of the State and its institutions. (cited by Morgan, 205)

And to this list we can add pacifism, which Diltz explicitly, and other editors and anthologists implicitly, dismissed.

This study ends just at the point at which considerable change began to occur in secondary school English curricular matters, partly as a result of the end of the Departmentals which produced a flowering of multiple texts. One new phenomenon was the slow and difficult beginning of Peace Studies materials, designed mostly for History courses, at the start of the 1970s. Presumably, this timing can be attributed to the highly visible and controversial debacle of the Vietnam War, the simultaneous growth of the “anti-war” movement and the “second wave” of feminism. The fact remains that Peace Studies are optional while English Studies were and have remained mandatory. A second, relevant, phenomenon was the introduction, in 1989, of Media Studies, forming a required one third of Intermediate and Senior English courses.

Figures 1 (1950s non-overlapping) and 2 (1960s non-overlapping) on the following pages show most dramatically an observable downward trend in the inclusion of all war-related works between the late 1950s and the late 1960s. They also show within this context an upward trend in literature which either questions war or is anti-war. The first two categories (Heroism, Glory and Patriotism, Heritage) remain markedly constant in their dominant rank. As to range, only one anthology, New Horizons, includes literature which spreads across all ten categories.

Clearly, by the end of the 1960s a need for the inclusion of questioning voices not only existed, but also had begun at least in theory to be felt - though in practice this study has shown it had not yet received a substantial address in the emerging new collections. I have mentioned some of the voices which had not yet been heard on the issue of war, which remained up to that point largely the preserve of the
dominant white, male, British imperial voice. Unless I am much mistaken, in spite of the appearance of Peace Studies in a few pockets, separate from English Studies, and in spite of several decades of the current wave of feminism, little has yet been done to include, in secondary school curriculum, the voice of women, for whom war must almost always have been - at least until their ‘natural’ response was, at least partially, co-opted by the dominant ideology - a completely negative experience, and for whom - if some feminist theorists are correct - war and enthusiasm for war are not construed as a natural part of the female world. The question of ‘essentialism’, still in debate, must remain outside the scope of the present discussion, but it also must be acknowledged that some women have always supported men’s wars, if only in the singing of their ‘songs’, and particularly in Third World countries they have often been, and continue to be active participants.

This reading of a part of the curricular history of war-related literature in Ontario senior high school courses in the middle years of this century ends with the 1970s. While new anthologies appear yearly and are incorporated into curricula, curricular selection is under the aegis of individual high school principals in consultation with English Department Heads (I note that the current provincial government is in the process of instituting changes in this area, but these are incomplete to date), and there has been no documented systematic revisioning of materials for teaching towards a ‘culture of peace’ per se.

Overview of Aims and Descriptions of Senior English Courses in Several Ontario High Schools 1980-1999

(These schools were chosen randomly and presumed to be loosely representative of trends in Ontario high schools over the past twenty years.)

There has been some change in Anthology selection during this period, though not noticeably in core text selection. Likewise, new aims have been added to older ones in the course descriptions and curriculum documents; though while these
reflect radical rethinking on issues of nationalism (anthologies now tend to be produced in Canada and determinedly address the issue of Canadian content. very much alive since the 1970s), multiculturalism. anti-racism. and gender-inclusiveness, they do not reflect a similar concern with issues of violence, war and peace. Moreover, as with the anthologies, discussed in the previous section, in which there were contradictions between stated intentions in the prefaces and introductions and the selected works themselves. I found contradictions between the aims stated in the curriculum documents and the selection of core texts.

It is interesting to note here a recent article written by a young high school English teacher who is at the same time a doctoral student in English. His observations point to an alarmingly familiar break in the teaching of English between these two levels. He says the expressed intention of the editor of the 1983 anthology of short stories is to present “timely and timeless” stories whose values are universal. He suggests that high school teachers are still teaching literature without historicizing it:

If high school teachers emphasize the close reading of literary works (the dominant mid-century method of interpretation), it is because of the lack of time and resources needed to ‘historicize’ texts in the way that current scholars do. If they pass on outdated ideas of ‘classics’, it is because they must teach what is available in the book room. If they teach students to believe in objective standards of excellence in writing (as opposed to teaching that such standards are historically ‘contingent’ and politically loaded), it is because their students need to believe in the value of their own struggle to articulate themselves, otherwise they will not show up to class. (Jason Kunin. Globe and Mail. Nov.1, 1999)

There seem to me to be dangers in Kunin’s acceptance of these three material constraints on high school English teachers; none would seem to warrant the turning away from new. and not so new scholarly thought about the nature of literary works, our reception of them, and our negotiating meaning with them. To deprive students of this approach seems regressive.
Among the aims of a grade 11 course description for 1980 in a western Ontario city high school are the following:

1. To enable students to increase their awareness of literature as a mirror to society, and develop their awareness of parallels between characters in literature and themselves.

2. To enable students to increase the confidence with which they respond to literature. The “organization” section of the document states that “comparative treatment of literature is desirable.”

These aims reflect a ‘humanist’ and a ‘response’ version, respectively, of English study. (The remaining seven aims address language skills mastery.) While one can readily see the Canadian content in the text selection, it is less obvious how the list might satisfactorily address the stated aims, even allowing for creative classroom pedagogy. Core texts selected for this curriculum were Lord of the Flies, Animal Farm, Henry IV Part One, Lost Horizon, The Watch That Ends the Night, and Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town. In 1993, in the same school for the same course, and following the same aims set out for 1980, the core texts were Lord of the Flies, Animal Farm, Henry IV Part One or Romeo and Juliet, and A Man For All Seasons. It would have been interesting to see laid out the perceived connections between the aims noted above and the criteria for the selection of each core text; however, such a discussion was not available. It seems to me that aesthetic or ‘teachability’ might have been the operative criteria.

To the aims section of a grade 12 course in a second, south-eastern city school in 1993 have been added the following:

1. To develop multiculturalism through the study of beliefs and lifestyles of various cultures;

2. To study human behaviour under various situations of stress.

   Leaving aside the use of “lifestyle,” in the first aim, where “ways of life” would have been more in keeping with the thrust of the overall aim, we can see the
emergence here of a concern for increased multiculturalism. In the second, rather vague aim, we can see a possible invitation to engage with works dealing with violence and war in ways that might break with 'traditional' approaches. Both these aims, moreover, seem to invite a 'new' body of literary works into the classroom. However, the list of core texts seems to work against these possible new ways, resting largely on older standard texts. Core texts include the anthology of short stories and essays, *Man and His World*, *Hamlet*, *Death of a Salesman*, *Lord Jim*, the *Anthology of Canadian Literature in English*, *Twelve Angry Men*, *Romanoff and Juliet* and *The Pearl*. In teaching Faulkner's essay "On Receiving the Nobel Prize," the teacher is to discuss "verbal irony, review of formal essay style, and the use of repetition for effect." In teaching *Romanoff and Juliet*, the teacher is to focus on "a study of fantasy, atmosphere, and structural analysis." Had there been an aim addressing the issue of war, suggested approaches for teachers might have broadened and deepened for these last two works.

For a grade 11 course in a south central city high school in 1995, a course aimed at leading students into a "realistic discussion of some of the world's major problems," the aims included the following:

1. To awaken awareness of various types of government and culture found in other nations;
2. To develop a sense of freedoms and privileges which students enjoy in Canada;
3. To develop not only a sense of his/her self-worth but the desire to contribute in a positive way to the society in which he/she lives;
4. To show that man's attempts to get freedoms were hard fought and difficult in the past. To reveal how valuable these freedoms are especially when taken away. To suggest that students guard their freedoms and exercise their rights but not to the point of abusing these privileges.

The study of English appears here as citizenship training, with a theme of standing on guard expressed in "garrison mentality" language. Absent from these aims, and apart from what might happen in individual classrooms, are any which might encourage
students to challenge the "hard fought and difficult past." Nor do the core texts readily suggest a challenge to the ways in which that fight was waged.

The core texts for this course were Othello, Fahrenheit 451, Inherit the Wind, Nineteen Eighty-Four or Obasan, Brave New World, Caesar and Cleopatra.

In 1999 the "outcomes" of a grade 11 course in southeastern rural high school include the following:

1. increased knowledge and understanding of the human condition;
2. development of further interest in and appreciation of English Literature through the study of a varied selection.

Core texts include Lord of the Flies, Death of a Salesman, Old Man and the Sea, Of Mice and Men, Wild Geese, Ethan Frome, and Romeo and Juliet. For the study of Lord of the Flies, teachers are to "identify key themes, focusing on good versus evil and the pessimistic view of mankind."

Among the aims (based on Ministry of Education Guidelines for 1977) for the grade 12 course at the same school are the following:

1. To foster students' awareness of the concept of Canadian identity and the diverse values of the racial and cultural groups that have contributed to Canada's literature;
2. To encourage the use of language and literature as a means by which an individual can explore personal and societal goals and acquire an understanding of the importance of such qualities as initiative, responsibility, respect, precision, self-discipline, judgment, and integrity in the pursuit of goals.

Core texts include Tess of the d'Urbervilles, Nineteen Eighty-Four, Leaven of Malice, Macbeth, Canadian short stories, and twentieth-century poetry.

Among the aims (based on Ministry Guidelines, 1984) for the OAC I course in 1999 at the same school are the following:

1. To increase the degree of independence in reading, thought, and expression;
2. To develop some greater understanding of life, culture, historical period, self, and various traditions through extensive reading in various genres and periods;

3. To explore intellectual, philosophical, social, and personal values, ideas, and systems through the study of language and literature;

4. To encourage students to develop a questioning approach to literature and language studies;

5. To further the enjoyment of the mimetic function of literature and the appreciation of the great age, variety, and significance of this type of human activity.

Core texts include King Lear, Heart of Darkness, Gulliver's Travels, Hard Times, and poetry of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.

The gap between aims stated and core texts selected over the time period of the survey is perhaps more evident in this high school than the others. From concerns with nationalism, with citizen education, with humanism broadly conceived, with literary tradition, the aims, particularly those of the last course, point to an opening up of the English curriculum. Such an opening, it might be imagined, could have led to different, or at least more core texts. That is, there might well have been more of a complex array of materials, an array that might indeed have invited students to move around in versions and visions of "the human condition."

Nowhere, moreover, is there an aim that points to an exploration through literary study of relations among the countries and cultures mentioned in the multiculturalist aims, nor of how conflicts among them might be approached other than through war.

Teaching English as a discipline involves, as most course rationales agree, teaching a discerning enjoyment of literature, independent judgment, an appreciation of literary heritage, and the sophisticated use of language. Frye’s notion too of the teacher’s duty to challenge students’ preconceived ideas, to act as a question mark to the values and assumptions of society, finds a potential reflection in the aim, noted above, to "encourage students to develop a questioning approach to literature and language studies"; at least it would if we read "literature" as including the ideas informing it and not just matters of form and structure. A few
of these aims suggest this deeper reading. If we are also ‘teaching for democracy’, so that students are learning not only to become literate, discriminating, autonomous appreciators of literature, but also these values modified by the context of a democratic community. and it might or might not go without saying, a peaceful community, then some notions would seem to be missing from English course rationales and curriculum choices.

Among other things, democracy is about choices. Building “the defences of peace in the minds of men and women...founded upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of humanity” (UNESCO Culture of Peace, 1995. Preface), would require a careful, profound and wide-ranging search for all the voices available in literature needed for participation in such a solidarity.

Text choices for students’ core, supplementary, and independent study units exist to a remarkably unchanged degree among the mentioned courses from 1980-1999. While some of the aims address issues of multiculturalism, anti-racism, and gender-inclusiveness, none reflects a rethinking on the issues of violence, war and peace to include pacifist or alternative views, a rethinking that would require a radically changing consciousness working towards transforming our culture from one of violence and war to one of peace. The inclusion of new aims and the nature of these aims seem to offer great potential for such a transformation, but one that has so far not been fulfilled.

Federico Mayor suggested that

we should disarm history ... there are too many battles in history. too much power, generals and soldiers ... we must provide our children and peoples with a different vision of history ... [we need] a systematic review and renovation of the teaching of history, to give as much emphasis to non-violent social change as to military aspects of history, with special attention given to the role of women in history. (1995, 48)
I am suggesting here a similar path for the study of our literary heritage(s). In an attempt to find an alternative approach, one that potentially integrates social concerns and educational mission, I was led to study the Quakers.
CHAPTER FOUR

Mind the Light: The Quaker Peace Testimony

All bloody principles and practices we... do utterly deny. all outward wars and strife and fightings with outward weapons, for any end or under any pretence whatsoever. And this is our testimony to the whole world... And our weapons are spiritual and not carnal, yet mighty through God to the pulling down of the strongholds of sin and Satan... And our swords are broken unto ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks... And therefore we can learn war no more nor rise up against any nation or kingdom with outward weapons. (George Fox, Declaration of 1660)

The time has come for us to take an unequivocal public stand on the question of violence. We totally oppose all wars, all preparation for war, all use of weapons and coercion by force and all military alliances; no end could ever justify such means... We equally and actively oppose all that leads to violence among people and nations and violence to other species and to our planet... This has been our testimony to the whole world for over three centuries. We are not naïve or ignorant about the complexity of our modern world... but we see no reason whatsoever to change or weaken our vision of the peace that everyone needs in order to survive and flourish on a healthy, abundant earth... What we advocate is not uniquely Quaker but human and, we believe, the will of God. Our stand does not belong to Friends alone - it is yours by birthright. (New Zealand Quaker Yearly Meeting Statement, 1987)

As Quakers we believe that where the means are flawed, so too are the ends. Not only that, but the means will fail to achieve the desired ends. (Toronto Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, 1996)

Although The Religious Society of Friends existed before George Fox made his famous Declaration to Charles II in 1660, it was this formulation of pacifism that
defined, for themselves and in the public mind, the essence of Quakerism (the term 'Quaker' was coined with ironic intention by Fox in reference to those Friends who shook before the courts while nonetheless standing their ground. The term 'Friends' comes from John 15:14-75: "You are my friends if you do whatever I command you."). The religious underpinning of the Testimony most widely accepted by present-day Friends is expressed by Sandra Cronk in her booklet, *Peace Be With You: A Study of the Spiritual Basis of the Friends Peace Testimony* (date not given, but in the second half of the twentieth century). The peace testimony of 1660, perhaps the most distinctive element of the Society of Friends, is a witness which grows out of a profound understanding of life in Christ.

The fruit of the peace testimony is love manifested in countless ways: refusal to take part in military endeavors, finding a manner of living that does not exploit the labor and resources of others, working for a more just and equitable social, political, and economic order, and sacrificial giving to those in need ... In a world which desires the fruit but does not understand the root of the peace testimony, we who would live this witness must take care not to succumb to the notion that the fruit can exist independent of the root. (Cronk, 3)

While Cronk acknowledges that "[in] a world threatened with nuclear annihilation, the peace witness is most often understood as a social testimony promoting the abolition of nuclear war and, more broadly, the abolition of all war (3)," her purpose is to articulate the religious essence of the testimony which, understood in this light, means reconciliation in all areas of life, as embodied and enacted in the life, ministry, and death of Jesus Christ. This endeavour finds reflection in the New Zealand Statement. It is reflected also in the life of Quaker schools. One Quaker teacher of English speaks (in response to the questionnaire discussed in Chapter Five of this study) of her understanding of the Quaker Peace Testimony (hereafter, QPT) in action:
Creating an environment of Peace, non-violence and acceptance is important as it lays the groundwork for all the Testimonies to work. Violence, a state of non-Peace, is not always obvious. Teachers have tremendous power in the classroom. They have control of grades, rules, the setting of the room, what is taught, what books are read. Manipulation and exercise of power over students is an ever present danger. This can be done overtly, and we see that in public education where a child has little or no say in education. But it can also be very subtle. Once a teacher decides what is ‘best’ for students without including them in the process, the classroom is no longer a peaceful place, even though there is seeming ease... I do not think we teach peace, I think we ARE peace to our students. I strongly believe pacifism, conflict resolution, mediation, etc. should be taught, but if we do not create a school system where children are equal, free, healthy and EVERY part of the learning process, our lessons on peace are dust in the wind...

There are five central Quaker testimonies: Equality, Truth, Doctrine, Simplicity, and Peace. Each has a cluster of consequent beliefs and actions. From the Testimony of Equality follows the belief in "plain speech", anti-slavery, and penal reform; from the Testimony of Truth follow the refusal to swear oaths ("If we let our yea be yea and nay, nay, then we can’t swear at all"), and integrity in business; from the Testimony of Simplicity follow plain dress, temperance and moderation, and the refusal to bet or gamble; the Testimony of Doctrine makes every Friend a minister so that there is no 'hireling priesthood'; finally, from the Testimony of Peace follow opposition to capital punishment, conscription, and taxation for military purposes, an active witness in relief of suffering, non-violence, and efforts towards reconciliation in all areas of life.

A testimony in the Quaker sense is a consistent body of actions and words which gives witness to somebody about something, primarily a form of communication, an outward witness ‘to the whole world’, actions and words intended to proclaim, demonstrate and convince. Also, it is meant to be a witness to truth. The truth is absolute but the nature and manner of the witness may change. "The spiritual root remains the same, but the practical, social and political consequences [change] ... thus testimonies, though
constant, are changing, living, growing” (The Quaker Peace Testimony, 1993, 13). What one finds, then, is no authoritative statement of what the testimonies are, only “hallowed examples of their implications in particular circumstances … religious, ethical, collective, demanding, developing - and vague” (13). Testimonies are “a means of engaging us with the world, not of separating us off into some holier-than-thou elite … by living out the practical consequences of our own spiritual vision, we are seeking to provoke new vision, conviction and change (both spiritual and practical) in others” (The Quaker Peace Testimony, 17). The movement outwards from their own community to the world is reflected in the statement that all the testimonies “must continue to be tested - by ongoing dialogue and questioning, not only within the Society of Friends but also between Friends and others in the kingdoms of this world” (18). The Peace Testimony is considered to be the foundation of the others and is the most visible; but “[Friends] need to remember that it is quite specific - it is about war and killing and violence” (18). It is foundational in two senses: first, historically, as Quakers consider themselves to have come into being as a Religious Society with George Fox’s 1660 Declaration (when asked why he would not fight for Cromwell against King Charles. Fox answered, “I live in the virtue of that life and power that takes away the vocation of all wars… I shall never hereafter be a user of a temporal sword more, nor a joiner with them that do so” (in Bainton, 1960, 157-8); and secondly, the other testimonies seem reasonably to rest on the establishment of right and peaceful relations among people. To put the matter in a slightly negative cast: if violence is denied one as a means of negotiating personal, social, and international relations, and if this is in part because one acknowledges the existence of truth (or of the ‘light’ or of ‘god’) in everyone one deals with, then the call to simplicity (which would negate greed and materialism, traditionally causes of war), directness, truth, and equality seem to flow from the QPT.
A ‘testimony’ differs from a creed or dogma in at least two important ways: being essentially pro-active, a call to stand and witness, rather than an article of belief; it can be and has been historically a provocative kind of action; secondly, it is less fixed or rigid in meaning and import. “Action requires discernment of God’s will” (Cronk 16); this discernment can only take place in intensive and extensive silence, an essential part of all aspects of the Quaker experience: in Meeting for Worship; at periods throughout the day; as part of the educational day; in times of stress and tension during ‘Threshing Meetings’ where issues of moment are explored.

The ‘purpose’ of silence, briefly, is that it be the surround in which ‘mindful discernment’ can take place, of both the ‘inner light’, a way of referring to ‘God’s will’, and of the spirit of the Meeting, gradually becoming manifest through brief thoughts spoken into the silence. “The corporate judgment thus reached was regarded as having greater validity than the often imperfect and clouded light of an individual” (F.B.Tolles, in Allen, 169); or as the poet William Blake puts it, “God us keep from a single vision.”

The ‘call’ that comes through the ‘mindful waiting in quiet’ is one to bear active witness to the world. Further, with regard to the Peace Testimony in particular, “[s]uch witness requires knowledge of the specific causes of injustice and war in our contemporary society” (Cronk 17). The response to this call is thus an informed and a political one. As Roland Bainton says. “To a degree they [Quakers] have sought peace through politics. While separating the kingdom of Christ from the kingdom of the world, they have not utterly despaired of the world” (1960, 157). Interestingly, Friends retain the battle imagery deriving from the bible, specifically, the Book of Revelation, transforming that often bloody physical battle between the forces of Good and Evil into a spiritual one, the Lamb’s War, fought with spiritual weapons. And it goes deeper than external affairs.
"By our choice, we contribute to the Lamb’s War which is going on in the larger social order" (Cronk, 18). Cronk quotes from the eighteenth-century Quaker, John Woolman, who urged Friends to “…look upon our treasures, the furniture of our houses, and the garments in which we array ourselves. and try whether the seeds of war have any nourishment in these our possessions or not “(in Cronk, 18). The Testimony of Simplicity arises from this acknowledgment. John Wilhelm Rowntree, writing in The Friend in 1900, expresses his belief about the nature of the Testimony:

Our testimony against war, if it is to be vital, must not be mere testimony against the use of armed force - it must cut at the roots of war, at the pride of Empire; the narrow popular patriotism rendered ignoble by its petty hatreds and the insatiable hunger for wealth visibly threatens our ruin. (in Brock, 1990, 292)

As Cronk expresses it in late twentieth-century terms of reference: “The Lamb continues his struggles as long as the earth bears people who must cry out for the basic necessities of Life: food, water, and clothing, while a few spend their resources buying diet soft drinks, designer jeans, and whipped lipstick” (18). The fruits of the Peace Testimony, suggests Cronk, will not be present while people do not challenge the blocks to peace in their own lives. In other words, they are to be found not only in peace-as-cessation-of-hostilities, but also in attention to global and local issues of social justice.

The Testimony of Direct Speech derives from an understanding of Jesus’ life and ministry as clear, unequivocal, and profoundly informal examples of how to enact right relations among humans and between humans and the divine. For example, the injunction to ‘love thine enemies’ assumes, as Cronk explains, that “closing off our love to an antagonist carries no possibility of change in our relationship, while continuing to love holds out the possibility of transformation” (22). “True religion”, said William Penn, “does not turn men [sic] out of the world, but enables them to live better in it”(from taped discussion of English Department
meeting, Germantown Friends School, in response to the questionnaire in Chapter Five, 1997).

The notion of closing off or keeping open love vis-à-vis an enemy underlies Gandhian as well as Quaker philosophy. In his interpretive summary of George Fox, Jones asks, "How can I live my life so as always to preserve the full humanity and personhood of my associates and antagonists?" (Jones, 74).

If the complicated truth is that many of the oppressed are also oppressors, having internalized the values of the oppressors, and many of the oppressors are also oppressed - nonviolent confrontation is the only form of confrontation that allows us to respond realistically to such complexity. In this kind of struggle we address ourselves always both to that which we refuse to accept from others and to that which we can respect in them, have in common with them - however much or little that may be. (Deming, cited in McAllister, 1982, 31)

Deming's is a secularized expression of a common understanding of the Quaker Peace Testimony, based on Fox's call to 'answer that of God in every man'. The corollary that the means are the ends in process, or, as in the Quaker A.J.Muste's words, 'there is no way to peace; peace is the way', leads seamlessly into a pacifist position against an ever-transmogrifying nuclear arms race. It particularly refuses the thrust of the 'mutual assured destruction' theorists regarding the alleged 'balance of terror' policies which still drive the world. It quietly makes explicit the fundamental opposition between the nuclear-tipped warhead and the 'cross'. Use or the threat of use, equally, loses the Lamb's War.

Neave Brayshaw, an English Quaker, established what Thomas Kennedy calls "the high water mark for pre-war [First World War] Young Friends" at the Swanwick Conference of 1911 when he reaffirmed that "mere passive resistance ... would not suffice, for the Quaker witness must be vital, not simply against the act of war but against the spirit that makes war possible..." (Kennedy, 1996, 291).
Further, Brayshaw claimed, that "the sole justification for the survival of Quakerism was doing work ... not being done elsewhere... We Friends are something more than a social or semi-religious club... We exist not for ourselves but to make our contribution to the world in bearing witness to our belief" (291).

This contribution has taken more than one form. Resistance to militarism, in the form of Alternative Service, has been an influential one. After the Franco-Prussian War.

Friends chose as their distinguishing mark the red-and-black star; the star became in our century a symbol of the Quaker relief that seeks to help the victims of war regardless of the side to which they belong. Such activity Quakers now regard as an essential element of their peace testimony.  
Brock, 1990. 295

By this means, which focuses on the intolerable suffering occasioned by war and on the desirability of a more rational solution to conflicts than that provided by war, Quakers have continued their opposition to state-sanctioned armed force. "More than offering a prophetic vision of an ideal, pacifism...came to symbolize reconciliation and the priority of questions of conscience in a changing...society" (Brock, 1990, 297). Nor is a stand against war taken by Quakers with the deluded notion that by this stand, "he [sic] can avoid inflicting all hurt. Yet, if he dissociates himself from the use of war to advance a cause however noble he is not for that reason irresponsible, and he may not be irrelevant" (Bainton, 1960, 251).

"The choices which confront the pacifist are almost as grim as those which confront the soldier" (Bainton, 251). Another form of opposition to war has been resistance to the War Tax. Acceptance of the opposition of the nuclear warhead and the 'cross' expressed above, and acceptance too of the nature of the call to bear witness to the Christian pacifist message leads often, in the contemporary social
order to a political /personal impasse. It becomes a community matter rather than solely an individual’s decision to refuse the draft; so that a family choosing to withhold payment of its military taxes (in the manner of Thoreau for example) would require various kinds of community support: “…accompanying members to court, visiting IRS officials, helping to decide how to use withheld tax money, care for families and prisoners in case of imprisonment might all be ways that the Meeting is called on to offer support to contemporary peacemakers” (Cronk. 30-31).

Many Friends feel a responsibility to present their witness in as public a way as possible [the burning of draft cards in U.S. parks during the Viet Nam war being no longer an option]. Along with reporting their actions to their friends, business associates, congressional representatives and the media, Friends may approach the IRS directly in an attempt to be clearly understood. (Friends Committee on War Tax Concerns, 1988, in Allen, 1996, 117)

Again,

No person can decide for another what his or her witness shall be. But it has always been the practice of Friends to act upon the leadings of their conscience and to support each other in their right to do so. The conscription of tax money to build weapons of destruction is something many Friends find immoral. William Penn, in refusing to send money to England for war with Canada, said, ‘No man can be true to God and false to his own conscience, nor can he extort from it a tribute to carry on any war. nor ought true Christians to pay for it’. Therefore, we stand in loving support of any of our members who are called by conscience to oppose and refuse taxes that are to be used for military purposes. (Minutes of the Iowa Yearly Meeting, 1983, in Allen, 145)

As the Leaflet on War Taxes of the Cambridge Friends Meeting, 1989, explains,

The problems posed by taxes collected for military expenditures have long troubled Quakers and other Christians. The U.S. federal government currently spends about sixty percent of its budget on war
preparedness; this spending has established an enormous industrial and scientific complex directed toward highly lethal violence. Voluntarily contributing tax dollars to the federal Treasury has proved impossible for some Friends. (in Allen, 1996, 27)

These are some of the issues with which contemporary Quakers are struggling in order to keep the Peace Testimony vital and relevant in a changing society. How is this struggle manifested in the domain of education? What has been the history and nature of Quaker education?

I

Quakers and Education: “Bathed in the dew of Quakerism”

The history of Quakers and education is a long and noble one. Quakers were early initiators of public education. Following the work of John Lancaster in early nineteenth century London, education became free and universal for boys and girls as well as for rich and poor. From the earliest vision of George Fox and Margaret Fell, the purpose of education was to prepare students through learning and service to change the world, consistent with the Quaker notions of witness as a call to action and of enlightenment as both a personal or individual event and a community event with social exigencies and consequences. This vision is still discernible in many Quaker educators:

I have come to distrust any pedagogy that does not begin in the personal...[and] any pedagogy that does not conclude in the communal: subject to the checks and balances of the others, the teacher, the tradition, and the texts. (O’Reilley, 1993, 60-61)

The Friends Council on Education, the national American Quaker organization which is primarily interested in primary and secondary education, works to nurture Quaker goals for all schools. The FCE says that “Friends see education as inescapably religious regardless of age, subject matter, or setting” and that “a
Friends school offers the chance to share in a community’s struggle to transmute an ideal into human fact” (FCE. “What Does a Friends School Have to Offer?”. 1998. 1). Contemporary Friends schools have not broken with tradition in that these precepts completely accord with those of George Fox and Margaret Fell in the seventeenth century.

Since Friends education is religious at heart, it therefore tends to be socially responsible. A person’s training and heightened gifts extend to neighbors as well. Peace and war, racism and brotherhood, ignorance and poverty, justice and law and violence, all these are both subjects for study and issues for commitment now as students and soon as effective citizens. (2)

II

Quaker Schools and Colleges

There is only one remaining Quaker-founded school in Canada: Pickering College in Newmarket, Ontario. There are several in England. In the interests of manageability, I restricted this study to the Canadian school and to the thirty Quaker secondary schools in the United States.

There are thirteen Quaker-related ‘colleges’ (the American term for the Canadian equivalent of ‘universities’ but without graduate studies; American ‘universities’ refer to institutions with graduate studies) in the United States: the Friends World College in New York; Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore in Pennsylvania; Guilford in North Carolina; Wilmington and Malone in Ohio; Earlham in Indiana; William Penn in Iowa; Friends University and the Friends Bible College in Kansas; Whittier in California; and George Fox in Oregon.
There are over seventy Quaker institutions in the Friends Council on Education, nearly thirty new schools having been opened in the last few years, most of them for young children. These are all private, or independent schools; but, consistent with the Quaker history of educational concern, Friends are active too in promoting and supporting public schools as administrators, teachers, Board of Education members, and officers and active participants in Parent-Teacher Associations. There has not been a study of the role of Quakers nation-wide (in the United States) in public education; such a study would no doubt reveal a vast contribution (Leonard Kenworthy, 1986, 20).

Furthermore, Friends have established schools around the world, including one in Ramallah in the West Bank. How the QPT might help in decisions about what to do in the Middle East may be the single biggest issue in many schools on the east coast. They tend to have a substantial number of Jewish students, faculty and staff, for whom the safety of Israel is crucial, but that does not mean, according to Paul Lacey, Quaker professor of Religion at Earlham, Indiana, that the schools do not look for opportunities to explore both the Arab and Israeli positions, as a way of working for peace.

George Fox and Margaret Fell intended education to be for both boys and girls "in whatsoever things were civil and useful in creation" (Helen Hole, 1978, 5). Hole recounts the process of Quakers moving into a more inclusive curriculum:

Slowly, painfully, the Quaker mind began to open to the arts, but it was a long drawn-out process. As late as 1865, a Westtown girl was refused permission to recite a piece in a meeting of a literary society because it contained a reference to a lute. (Hole, 1978, 59)

This decidedly narrow vision of "whatsoever things are useful and civil" would exclude, until later in the century, the study of most English Literature as it was considered equal in its frivolous, even pernicious nature, with the "decorative arts" such as music.
The concept of a “guarded education” informed curricular and pedagogical strategies for the better part of a century in North America. As late as 1915, the Yearly Discipline was saying, under the heading “Pernicious Literature,” that

Friends are desired to be careful not to select school books that will exert an influence in opposition to our principles and testimonies. …… It is incumbent on parents and heads of families to prevent as much as possible…[the pursuit by their charges of] publications which may tend to weaken their confidence in the Christian religion…which tend to corrupt the mind. (88-89)

Also in 1915,

Friends are pressingly advised to maintain our testimony against war in every respect, and to endeavor, on all proper occasions to exert an influence in favor of peace principles and the settlement of all differences by arbitration. (28-29)

…[they were further enjoined] not to participate in the celebration of victories obtained in war, nor in the observance of any customs or practices which conflict with our testimonies. (67-68)

The 1950 Yearly Discipline reflects at length on connections between the testimony and formal education in the formation of attitudes (although these reflections are not discipline-specific):

History provides evidence that armed preparedness is not only futile in preventing war but is actually conducive to it. Friends are urged to uphold the better preparedness of a just and generous national policy.

We encourage parents and teachers to instruct their boys and girls carefully in the principles and practices of peace and of the numerous successful settlements of disputes between nations by arbitration and other peaceful means. Friends should endeavor to eliminate from schools and colleges all military drills, and to avoid connection with military organizations of all kinds. Such associations have serious effect on those who take part in them by creating a spirit of militarism which destroys calm judgment on international issues and retards the growing sense of brotherhood in the world.
Since there may be conflict between our ideals and the commands of the State, we urge that each member consider in advance his duty and plan his conduct. Our Meetings should sustain those who are in difficulty because of loyalty to our Peace Testimony. (64)

Quaker Educational Philosophy

In his discussion of Quaker education, the historian Howard Brinton suggests that the uniqueness of the Quaker educational philosophy is found in the ways it has been implemented, not in its basic assumptions. He notes the following:

- like a Quaker Meeting, the schools were to be “calm, unhurried and free from excitement and stress” (Brinton, 1949, 61);

- there is much evidence that Friends, because of the nature of their religious principles, were in some instances ahead of their contemporaries in superseding the law of force by the law of love...[they] were the first to put aside the rod” (58-59);

- Friends followed a testimony against rewards and punishments and for the non-violent treatment of prisoners, the insane, children; “the historic Quaker position is between the extremes of Calvinism and Progressivism. A child is not naturally good nor is he [sic] naturally evil; he is simply innocent” (63);

- the teacher “should be only a silent spectator and overseer” (60) with a strong appeal made to conscience “as informed by the Light within...a collective as well as individual phenomenon” (62).

Teaching and Attitude Formation

Of perhaps greater immediacy here are Brinton’s comments on attitude formation: he speaks of the Fourth Quaker Educational Policy as seeking “the creation in the student of non-belligerent and peaceable habits and attitudes based
on a spirit of understanding and cooperation;” and he observes most pertinently that “pacificism is as much a matter of feeling and emotion as of thought” (93).

According to Lacey, (Head of Religious Education at Earlham College, Indiana) Quaker teaching need not always be sweetness and light; but (as Fox would agree) can be and needs be “piercing and discomfitting”. When an individual (or a nation) is being selfish, the Quaker teacher addresses the witness within, throwing the adversarial part into confusion. The task is to help students to persist in what is ‘essential’, to resist the invidiousness of the culture, to develop the balance of silence and attention (‘paying attention’, Lacey argues, is what Fox meant by ‘answering that of God in every man’). He asks, ‘at what point in my teaching am I doing what I don’t believe in? Where is my ‘truest knowing’ being violated? The touchstone here is what Lacey says is at the centre of being a Quaker teacher: finding the voice which comes with one’s true story and making courageous action possible. Patience, waiting with expectation, firmness, silence and respect for the silence of others, finding the appropriate ways that we reveal ourselves, test our voices and prepare to have our voices challenged, enlarged, these will determine the choice between what he sees as two ways of teaching: making them afraid and making them brave in the face of the ‘invidiousness’ of the culture (from Presentation at the Second Annual Conference on Quaker Education, Westtown, 1997).

Of the Mission Statements of Quaker schools. and of the particular case of English teachers in these schools in relation to the Statements. Lacey has this to say:

The statements speak of a regular meeting for worship (or reflection, or centering), shared participation in decision-making, and the testimonies of equality, simplicity, harmony (peace-making, social justice) and community, deriving those testimonies from Howard Brinton’s Quaker Education in Theory and Practice. The individual school will find its own equivalent for some of those, but I can’t think of anyplace that doesn’t have some statement about peace and justice, peace-making, working for a peaceful and just social order. Those schools that have a service component in their requirements - and they are many - seem to me to link that always to the relevant testimonies.
I would have said, in fact, that Quaker schools stress the peace testimony as part of their identity, and it draws prospective teachers as a cornerstone of the school ethos. That is to say, a lot of the non-Quakers, as well as the Quakers, hold political, social, ethical positions which make them think of themselves as concerned with peace, though not all will be pacifists. A number of schools have connections with AFSC [American Friends Service Committee] programs, and there was that schools’ observance of the AFSC Nobel Peace Prize last year (organized by a non-Quaker head of school). How to interpret the peace testimony may be a problem but it is for Quakers and non-Quakers.

That being said, English teachers may be a special case for thinking about the peace testimony. (Paul Lacey, in conversation, August, 1998)

III

The QPT and the Teaching of English

The overall aim [of the UN] is not to suppress conflicts - they will be inevitable and, indeed, necessary - but to inoculate societies against using violence as a means of conflict management. (Jackman 1995, 38)

The question of whether the teaching and study of literature is an appropriate site for the ‘inoculation’ against the use of violence is perhaps a deceptively simple one; although our education systems surely could be said to aim at the inoculation of students against ‘uncivil’ behaviour. The latter amounts to a ‘given’, while the former remains problematic. From one extreme standpoint, that of some gatekeepers of the status quo for example, those who still argue for the ‘value-free’ nature of the ‘great works tradition’, no, it is not. The project would be merely one of replacing an apolitical ‘ideology’ with a highly politicized one. From a middle ground, the answer would still be ‘no’, that the project would be merely one of replacing one ideology (one that asserts the acceptability, even the inevitability of war in some circumstances) with another (one of anti-militarism, even pacifism in all circumstances). From the other extreme standpoint, that of absolute pacifists
and many postmodern critics, the answer would be 'yes': it is not only an appropriate but a fundamental site.

But despite the theoretical answer, the history of the English curriculum in practice suggests an affirmative answer. As Robert Morgan has pointed out, "the expansiveness of the claim that English Literature embodied the essential truths of the human condition is no more than the cultural counterpart to the military domination of a global empire" (1990, 205). This military domination, accomplishing and sustaining the British Empire, "drew justification from an unshakable interpretation of Just War theory: that Justice was the equivalent of British will" (205). (Chapter Three of this text examines how this vision played out in the English curriculum of Ontario high schools for the greater part of this century.)

In Questions of Integrity: A Quaker Perspective, the Committee for Truth and Integrity in Public Affairs comments on the periodic calls to remove politics from education, suggesting these are unrealistic because "politics is about a sense of vision, the power to translate that vision into practice" (1993, 71). However, it continues: "Political control of curriculum content must ... be an unacceptable form of social engineering and not only for the constraints put upon the development of a questioning approach to social issues" (75). If we read 'political control' from a postmodern standpoint, which understands everything to be political, the last statement begs the question of whether curriculum, specifically that of English, has been (and is) 'politically' controlled.

"Literature is one of the fields in which many of the tenets of Friends can be promoted best" (Leonard Kenworthy, Quaker Education: A Sourcebook, 1987, 173). Andrew Crichton, Head of the English Department at an old Pennsylvania Friends school, Westtown, says "There is at least an implicit value system that drives the curriculum forward and gives it its 'committedness'" (in Kenworthy,
These statements reflect the political nature of curriculum, specifically, English.

In the last two decades, critiques of the 'canon' have generally addressed imbalance in matters of gender, race, and culture; further, by examining the 'canon' from various postmodern standpoints, from assumptions of 'situated knowledges', of relativism, contingency, contexts, critiques have also addressed imperialism, colonialism, and their corollary, militarism.

Academic theorizing, however, has generally not filtered down to mainstream Ontario secondary schools; at least, it has not appeared substantively in departmental course discussions. Textbooks and anthologies tend to be selected for race, gender, and genre inclusiveness, for practical teacher editions and guides with a range of contemporary and historical content. No doubt, there are exceptions in individual schools, and individual teachers. Indeed, several Ontario teachers I have spoken to claim an unsettling autonomy in their 'when I shut that door, I can do what I want' approach. However, as a conscious, comprehensive rethinking of curriculum in the context of creating a culture of peace and of how English Studies can play a significant if small role in that project, the discourse of postcolonialism, and of the possibilities for postmilitarism have not demonstrably affected secondary school curricular thinking. What is Quaker thinking on this matter?
CHAPTER FIVE

The Quaker Peace Testimony and the Teaching of English in Friends Schools

There is an absence of research on this specific topic both inside and outside the Quaker community. While one can find discussions among Friends, in various interest areas, of the Peace Testimony - its origins, history, reception, influence on political activism and individual stands with regard to conscription and war taxation among other topics - I found no research specifically addressing the influence of the Peace Testimony on the teaching of English in secondary schools.

The subject, introduced by way of the question, 'is it possible to teach English in such a way that people stop killing each other', informs Mary Rose O'Reilley's work; however, two things I would note about her book, The Peaceable Classroom: first, it addresses university, rather than secondary school, English classroom experience; and second, her interest seems more diffuse perhaps than my own, so that it includes non-violence in classroom management, teacher-student relations (including evaluation: she is concerned to find ways of responding to students' work in English composition so as not to inflict verbal and psychological violence), group discussions, as well as interest in the content of the curriculum. When O'Reilley reflects on her earlier experience in elementary and secondary classes it is again from a perspective which asks how can one reduce or eliminate those things which make for violence on all levels of the English classroom environment. Further, O'Reilley is not teaching in or writing about specifically Quaker educational settings; nor does she claim to be thinking exclusively of the Quaker Peace Testimony as the defining
instrument in her quietly transformational pedagogy, though it is present in her discussion. Her self-identification is with Quaker, Roman Catholic and Buddhist philosophies.

Faced with the absence of research, I recognized a need for materials on curricular and pedagogical practice gathered from teachers qua teachers (not purely curriculum writers, nor consultants) in their English classrooms, department discussions, and curricular selection processes. This would enable me to arrive at a picture of how the Mission Statements of Friends schools and the several expressions of the Peace Testimony are put into practice in English curriculum design and teaching.

Rather than presenting the teachers with a pre-ordered, multiple-answer questionnaire into which they would be slotted, I tried to design one which would invite respondents to reflect on the questions in their own context and in their own words.

I therefore decided to pursue my inquiry in part by means of what might most closely approximate a personal interview with a significant sampling (roughly twenty) of those teaching English in Quaker schools: an open-ended, extended-response questionnaire which I intended to be a flexible instrument, one both intensive and extensive. I hoped to invite deep and speculative reflection on the questions, and so organized these around personal, professional, collegial, and societal perspectives.

I wanted these practising Quaker teachers of English to talk at length about what it was like and what it meant to teach the same works of literature I had been teaching (forming a recognizable body or canon), from inside a community founded on a statement of pacifism, and all of whose testimonies seemed to call on Friends to witness at every opportunity to the moral essence of the testimonies - through action.

The logistics of conducting individual interviews with the significant sampling of teachers across the United States being prohibitive, I chose to
design the questionnaire instead and send it to English Departments in Friends schools which were either only secondary schools or included the secondary level with the elementary level. Thus it was by level rather than region or other factors that I chose the schools in the study. I recognize that the early years of learning the culture’s stories are of great importance in the formation of emotional and moral attitudes, but inclusion of that period of development is beyond the scope of the present study. The principles involved are the same: the stories that we tell our children, and that we are seen to valorize above others (through, for example, the construction and continuation of the notion of canonic texts - however evolved that notion may be - starting with nursery rhymes and fairy tales) enter viscerally first and are addressed critically afterwards.

Students at the secondary level are generally closer to the issues of violence, war and peace. Music, films, newsmedia, video games, organized competitive sports, and the literature they read in schools present for their consumption ‘stories’ of conflict, personal, societal, and international. They see their peers and people close to their age acting in these stories. They are being offered a picture of the society of which they are naturally already members, as well as a range of possible choices for belief and action as they prepare to participate as adults in that society, and, if they are offered a sufficiently wide range for choice, to change it. For the will to change society, they need a sense that the world as it is does not exhaust the possibilities. Thus, the range of choices we present them with needs to be as wide as possible.

Currently in Ontario, Media Studies is an optional course in grade eleven and a required component of English courses from grade eleven to OAC. It has generally been delivered through the English Department. Under the new Ontario curriculum, Media Studies will be separate from English, still optional, and the required component in English will be reduced. However, changes in this area are again underway with the present government.
By grade eleven, most children have been watching television, videos and films for at least eleven, and in many cases, more years. They have been doing so in a largely unstructured way (save by parental discretion). In light of the studies cited in Chapter Two, the range of ‘stories’ of conflict and its resolution, of notions of courage, heroism, and honour, offered by various media is less than wide. The potential of Media Studies, in a school setting, for taking up the ‘problem’ of violence and of war in the context of first seeing and then changing the culture seems useful, since at this educational moment, pedagogy is focusing on popular culture. The potential seems as yet untapped systematically.

I began this study with four assumptions: first, that the Quaker Peace Testimony which, by all surface accounts (meeting house pamphlets, historical references, popular understandings, histories of pacifism), is a fundamental principle of Quakerism, would have a demonstrable, direct influence on the curriculum, specifically the English curriculum of Friends schools; second, that the QPT was universally understood (within Quakerdom) as a statement of pacifist principle derived unequivocally from George Fox’s 1660 Declaration.

Observation of the ways in which various influential Quaker organizations work with quiet persistence in the application of the several Testimonies, particularly the Peace Testimony, suggested there would be an equally dedicated, corporate understanding of the Peace Testimony among teachers in Friends schools which would lead similarly to some kind of active witness to that Testimony.

For example, I considered the work of the Quaker Office at the United Nations (which I visited) in their effort towards constructive, co-operative reconciliation among representatives from hostile countries; the work of Quakers in the movement for the abolition of the death penalty; the work of Quakers in the area of conscientious objection, in resistance to war.
preparedness taxes; and in general, the Quaker persistence in 'speaking truth to power'.

From my readings in historical Quaker documents, I expected to find evidence of a continuance, however slight or transformed by contemporary influence, of the old notion of a 'guarded education' derived from the Quaker sense of community, of being somehow both apart from as well as active in the larger society. I developed the questionnaire in the light of these assumptions, which I believe to be significant.

Participant Schools

For purposes of this study, evolving as it did from my earlier study of anthologies in the English curriculum of senior English courses in Ontario high schools during the middle years of the present century, and because my own professional experience has largely been in senior high school English studies, I approached only secondary schools - usually grades eight to twelve.

Participant schools were drawn from contacts at the Friends Committee on Education in Philadelphia and from their listing of national Friends schools. These contacts were suggested by the Archivist Librarian at Pickering College in Newmarket, Ontario. An American Quaker, she had attended the Seminar for Teachers at Westtown, Pennsylvania which I attended in 1996. Her archives are extensive and unique in Canada. I used them for my preliminary historical research as well as for names of American organizations and contacts. In addition, I used listings in the Quaker Historical section and the Peace Collection of the Swarthmore library in Pennsylvania. This library keeps copies of the Yearly Meeting papers of Quaker Meetings throughout the United States.
The questionnaire, appended to this chapter, consists of three sections: the Peace Testimony, curriculum, and teacher education.

Section One  The Peace Testimony

This section addresses five matters:

1. individual teachers' understanding of the Peace Testimony;
2. possible distinctions between personal and professional understanding;
3. possible differences in understanding of the Testimony among teachers in the same department;
4. the nature and extent of historicizing of the Peace Testimony by individual teachers;
5. teachers' perceptions of the potential impact of the Peace Testimony on education in Friends schools, with particular reference to the teaching and study of English.

Section Two  Curriculum

The second section aims to discover attitudes and praxis in four pertinent areas. The first area is that of canonic texts and various postmodern critiques of them. These works represent a tradition of English Literature (a looser and broader use of 'tradition' than that given by the English critic and theorist, Leavis). From this body of works, educators have drawn for their curriculum works which it has been thought students ought to know by the end of their formal secondary education, because of these texts' assured place in our cultural heritage as repositories of the 'eternal verities' of the human
condition'. The concept of the 'canon' has been under siege for at least two decades. One of the reasons for this siege, and the one I believe least attended to, is the war-dominated nature of the works.

The questions in this section address three matters:

1. whether and how Quakers, who have historically valued and acted upon their Testimony of Peace, might order things differently from mainstream educators;

2. whether and how Quakers embrace the emergence of the critique (by, for example, a number of feminist writers, including Stiehm, Huston, Brock-Utne, Whitehead, among many others) which describes the 'canon' of English Literature as war-dominated;

3. how ‘Friendly’ is Postmodernism (the term as used here will be clarified below)? Are there points of contact or even larger conceptual spaces in which intercourse between Quakers and postmodernism can and does take place?

Starting from individual teacher autonomy with regard to curricular decision-making in mainstream Ontario high schools, I asked the questions in this section to discover possible differences in Friends Schools. Whereas Ontario high school English departments vary in curricular choices within Ministry Guidelines, and particularly post-1967, when the province-wide Departmental courses and hence standard Examinations ended, Friends Schools, according to all their Mission Statements, operate within a philosophy, expressed with only minor variations, of Quakerism. The philosophy is informed by various Testimonies, of which the Peace Testimony is theoretically the foundation. How autonomous would Friends Schools teachers be in the matter of curriculum?

Questions in this section also ask how Quaker teachers, given an assumed accord in philosophy, specifically, the Peace Testimony, act within a department with regard to curricular thinking?
From the issues raised by respondents' answers to the above questions, I looked to find potential strategies for entering the kind of rethinking and restructuring I assumed to be necessary in teaching for a culture of peace. If the Quaker Testimonies provided both a common vision and a set of common teaching strategies, then those related to the Peace Testimony might prove useful in the Canadian mainstream context of teaching English. If the Peace Testimony were the perspective, or one of several perspectives, from which the works of English Literature were studied, what would happen, what new readings and understandings would there be of these texts? Would war, and the complex of notions surrounding it, be somehow decentred as a 'taken for granted' though it might never explicitly have been named that?

Section Three  Teacher Education

The third section aims to discover the 'special' nature, if such exists, of Quaker teacher education in general, and in particular of the education of teachers of English literature in a Quaker school. Are there pedagogical and curricular developments running parallel to those of teacher education for non-Quaker schools? If so, are there valuable notions and strategies to be learned from these in the context of the education of those who would be teaching for, helping to construct a 'culture of peace'?

Respondents

One third, or ten, of the (approximately thirty) English Departments responded to the questionnaire which follows this chapter. Those who did not fill in the questionnaire pleaded lack of time. Additional responses come from discussions with Quaker teachers at Westtown Seminar on Teaching,
led by the Quaker Superintendent of the U.S. National Association of Independent Schools; the Second International Conference on Quaker Education at Westtown Friends School in Pennsylvania; contacts made through the Swarthmore Peace Collection and the Quaker Historical Peace Archives in the same library; Pendle Hill Quaker Centre for Contemplation and Study, Pennsylvania; and with individual Quaker teachers and historians over the course of three years. I have included these additional sources of response because of what I came to feel was a less than satisfying response to the questionnaire. That is, some questions were not answered at all and some were not fully answered. I speculate in the final chapter on possible reasons for this felt inadequacy.

Preliminary Data

In 1997, the Friends Council on Education published a Summary of Selected Data for all Friends Schools in the United States. These include numbers which help put the findings which follow in some perspective.

Numbers and percentages of Quakers in all Friends Schools in the United States (1997):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Quaker Students</th>
<th>Total All Students</th>
<th>Percentage Quaker Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>17,096</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Quaker Teachers</th>
<th>Total All Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage Quaker Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Quaker Administrators</td>
<td>Total All Administrators</td>
<td>Percentage Quaker Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>24.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because I assumed that there would be a majority of Quakers - students, teachers, and administrators - in all Friends schools, the questionnaire did not ask respondents to give these figures for their individual schools. In their responses, however, they mention the imbalance frequently enough for me to think that they are not outside the average profile.

While some Friends schools have a strong Quaker presence in terms of both numbers of staff and students and of philosophy (as will be seen in the following section) the data here show a marked minority status overall of Quakers in their ‘own’ schools. This fact causes concern amongst many Quakers and has been a matter of discussion in Yearly Meetings, as I note elsewhere.

While the Questionnaire was directed to teachers of English, several responses gave a picture of the larger ‘culture’ of the particular school, with regard to the QPT as well as to some of the other Testimonies such as that of Simplicity. This last Testimony which encourages simplicity in dress and material possessions, relates, as will be seen in more than one response, to the financial backgrounds of students and to the ever-present problem of funding for the schools.
Manner of Response

Most departments of English to whom the questionnaire was sent chose to assign it to one teacher. One department, however, answered it as a group: this took the form of a taped discussion of selected questions.

Several respondents conflated some questions and ignored others, whether because they were judged inapplicable or for some other reason was not indicated. Many responded anecdotally. Not one respondent went through the complete questionnaire answering each question. I think this was because, as some respondents indicated, the questionnaire was long, dense, and complex.

The flaws in the instrument notwithstanding, I believe a relevant, significant, and to me surprising picture emerges, one which will be helpful in some ways to thinking about the development of curricular strategies for creating a ‘culture of peace’.

All but one respondent chose not to use a pseudonym and to remain anonymous. It was agreed that I would not name the schools, but might identify their general geographic location.

Respondents offered unsystematic reflections for the most part and I present them here in sections loosely held together by topic, rather than following the exact lay-out of the questionnaire itself. This seems a reasonable approach since several of the questions were not addressed by any of the respondents. I will speculate at points throughout the presentation of the data on some of the possible reasons for these omissions. I include, with the responses to the questionnaire, data from conference papers and discussions, a symposium, and personal correspondence with Quaker educators. Some of these ‘findings’ are contrapuntal to the questionnaire findings and suggest lacunae or inconsistencies in practice on which it is interesting to speculate.
The following page is a covering letter sent to the respondents with the questionnaire.

QUESTIONNAIRE

I have drawn up this set of questions to help me discover whether, and in what ways, the English curricula of Friends schools are influenced by the Quaker Peace Testimony. Thank you for agreeing to participate.

My earlier research has been into secondary school English anthologies authorized for use in Ontario public high schools from 1940-1970, with particular attention to war-related literature in the 'canon'. I was interested in the rationales for selection, editors' introductions, selection notes and questions, and any pedagogical guides. How were teachers being encouraged to think about the teaching of the 'canon'? This research led me to wonder how these matters might be ordered among Friends, whose Peace Testimony is acknowledged to be a foundation of the Society.

The questions are being answered by English teachers in Friends secondary schools across the United States and in the one remaining historically Quaker-affiliated school in Canada.

I have not selected schools other than by whether the school offers grades 9-12 and is self-described as a Friends school.

You will notice that the format invites you to answer discursively rather than to fill in pre-ordered multiple-choice answers.

Please use a pseudonym if you wish; otherwise indicate whether you wish to remain anonymous.

Please indicate whether you are a Quaker or not.

Please indicate the number of years you have been a) teaching and b) teaching in a Friends school.
A. The Peace Testimony

1. Please explain what you understand to be the nature of the Quaker Peace Testimony

   a) historically
   b) for you personally
   c) for you professionally
   d) for you in relation to the English 'canon' of literature

2. Are you aware of changes in the impact of the QPT in the above aspects up to the present? Please discuss.

3. Are you aware of different understandings (among Quaker teachers) of the QPT? Please discuss.

4. How would you describe the influence of the QPT on Quaker education

   a) in general

   b) with particular reference to the teaching of literature

   c) with specific reference to the teaching of (canonical) war-related literature?

5. Please explain what you understand to be the historical nature and practice of the Quaker concept of 'guarded education'. Would you say that this concept is still practised? Please discuss.

B. Curriculum

6. Please describe the process of curriculum selection

   a) in your department

   b) in other Friends schools inasmuch as you are aware of the process
7. How free are you as a classroom teacher to add or remove texts in your teaching (core texts as well as supplemental ones)?

8. How much consultation do you engage in with
   a) colleagues in your department
   b) colleagues in other Friends schools?

9. Please discuss your attitude towards the 'canon' of English Literature (for example: repository of eternal, immutable human truths; 'the best that has been thought and said', 'apolitical'). Feel free to digress, diverge, ramble. use examples. whatever helps to convey your attitude.

10. What do you understand to be the nature and degree of influence of current post-secondary debate on 'canon' issues on secondary school teaching of English and on Quaker teaching in particular?

11. To what extent do you, in your praxis, take into account the contemporary flurry of postcolonial and feminist critiques of the 'canon'?

C. Teacher Education

12. Is there separate teacher education for Quaker teachers? If so, please describe, with particular reference to English.

13. Are there official curricular and/or pedagogical guidelines for Quaker teachers of English? If so, please describe these or send me copies, excerpts or whatever version might be convenient to you and helpful to me.

14. In your English teacher education (whether specifically Quaker or not) do you explore the history (ies) of English Studies in a political (ie., British imperial) context? Please discuss. If your teacher education was some time ago, are you familiar with any relevant developments in current teacher education (of Quakers specifically)?

15. Can you suggest the degree of continuity in the teaching of English (again, with special reference to war-related works) from Quaker elementary school through secondary schools?
16. I understand that in some, if not all, Friends schools, not all the teachers are themselves Quakers. Can you suggest whether this phenomenon is
a) common
b) fruitful
c) encouraged or a matter of necessity
d) other?

17. In her book, The Peacable Classroom, Mary Rose O'Reilley (self-described Quaker/Catholic/Buddhist educator) claims that “because teaching is some kind of spiritual inquiry, what we learn is more important than what they learn.” Can you discuss what you perceive to be the influence on the teacher of Quaker students in an English classroom with specific reference to the teaching of war-related literature?

18. Are there Media Studies courses offered by your department or separate from your department? Please describe the connection in terms of your courses of study.

19. How do other media texts at large in the students’ culture figure in your teaching of traditional genres of English Literature, particularly with reference to war-related works? Could you please discuss specific examples?

20. Finally, please feel free to comment, suggest, direct, expound or simply conclude.

Thank you once again for your welcome and valuable contribution.
CHAPTER SIX

Findings

The sample represents one third of the thirty Friends schools in the United States which are either secondary schools or have the secondary level in them. Respondents are from schools in the northeastern parts of the country although one is from the south. Teachers from Pickering College, Ontario, also responded and are included.

The Schools and the Quaker Peace Testimony

'Eudora Stein' (pseudonym), a non-Quaker, has been teaching for 29 years and in a Quaker school, one of the oldest in the United States, for 15 years. Subscribing to the Quaker philosophy and its testimonies, she understands the QPT as central to Quaker philosophy, deriving directly from George Fox's 1660 Declaration and requiring one "not to bear arms, not to participate in fighting in a war, and resolving conflicts nonviolently." For her personally, this understanding leads to "solving conflicts nonviolently," while professionally, "it means being more cognizant of non-violent resolution of conflicts among students and among faculty and staff." She is "unaware of significant differences" in understanding the QPT among the Quaker teachers in her school or of changes in the impact of the QPT up to the present. She says that

[I]n general, the QPT affects our school in that we do not invite speakers who advocate war or violence, we have a Clearness Committee composed of faculty and students to help resolve conflicts, we have a Quaker who counsels boys who are interested in becoming conscientious objectors, and physical fighting is not tolerated at all in the school. It also affects our school indirectly in that we struggle over what issues can be dealt with through consensus and which ones cannot. The climate of the school also does not condone even much verbal expression of anger. Among the faculty and staff effort is made through a variety
of grievance procedures to resolve conflicts and not allow them to progress to the stage of lawsuits.

The Quaker Studies Co-ordinator, also an English teacher, at another long-established Friends School acknowledges difficulty in responding corporately to the questionnaire in a meaningful way since there are now “only two teachers in the School who have any engagement with Quakerism.” A further impediment to a complete response is that “although the school is under the care of a Quarterly Meeting, Friends’ testimonies are not routinely taught here...there are fewer than five members of Friends’ meetings on the faculty; only five children of Quaker families are currently enrolled.” This teacher understands the QPT as being not set in stone, but a fluid, flexible ethic that has evolved and changed over the centuries. It is useful for me to understand that even George Fox’s position regarding nonviolence, while rooted in belief in Jesus Christ, developed and mutated as he himself grew in the Light. Perhaps the most important thing to know about the historical Peace Testimony is that at its root it is a commitment to God, and comes out of a belief that God will grant us the ability to treat one another lovingly and respectfully in even the most extreme and violent situations. Without this grounding, in my opinion, it is almost impossible to be a pacifist.

Essentially religious in tone and content, this statement of understanding reflects perhaps, in part, the minority status of Quakers in the school. That is, one could speculate that if Quakers were in the majority, one might find a more practically explicit expression of Quaker values as they were acted out in every aspect of the school’s life. As she says of her role in the newly created position of Quaker Studies Co-ordinator, she was appointed “to facilitate ways of returning connections with Friends.” This teacher’s personal understanding of the Peace Testimony has led her further to become a Tax Resistor and a vegetarian in response to my own understanding that God calls us to nonviolence in every aspect of our lives ... [and so] I try to examine my own speech and actions in regard to that Testimony. For me, it is not a rule but a ruler; that is, a yardstick by which I am asked to measure my own ‘performance’ as a channel for the love and will of God...the Peace Testimony serves as a reminder of the possibilities inherent in all of us.
As a reflection of a frequently mentioned condition in Friends Schools, her comments on her professional interaction with the QPT are significant:

I find the Peace Testimony to be the greatest challenge I face as an educator. I believe that I am called to be a loving and living exemplar of the Peace Testimony in a secular and violent society. This requires me to be constantly mindful of my speech, my attitudes and my behavior. It requires a willingness to fail, yet keep on trying. Surrounded as I am by children who are bombarded by militaristic and angry and contemptuous role-models, I struggle constantly to keep my own bearings and stay true to my own beliefs. Not only are most of the children here not Quakers, relatively few seem to admire or understand Friends’ points of view.

She described several incidents expressive for her of the QPT in action in the day-to-day life of the school; she concluded that “when we admit either vulnerability or culpability, we go a long way toward establishing respectful relationship - a primary requisite for peace.”

She pointed out that the schools’ other English teachers, all non-Quakers, felt the questionnaire to be an imposition, being long and complex, and felt too that they were not familiar enough with Quaker history, particularly educational history, to be valuable participants. She admitted that her “task of moving the staff and administration toward a better understanding of Friends’ history and practice is just in the very beginning stages.”

The English Department of a highly-respected and old Friends school in the middle of a racially and culturally tense inner section of a large south-eastern city answered the questionnaire together. While there is no official direction regarding the testimonies, the school is looking at designing guidelines for “good practice,” an old Quaker term.
Six women and two men, Quakers, with twelve, ten, ten, three, twelve, seventeen, thirty, and twenty years' teaching experience in Friends schools participated in the discussion which was taped and accompanied by a booklet (written by some of the group) on the teaching of poetry. An introduction included the statement that "a Friends philosophy is certainly at the heart of our curriculum and teaching, and the Peace Testimony, as one specific concept, is a natural part of our work here, whether explicitly taught or not." [The distinction here is not explained, nor what "a natural part" might be] The school is unusual, the respondents felt, in that it has to attract families who would not otherwise venture out of the comfortable familiarity of the community where they live. Both suburban and inner city children often return home from [the school] to friends who are blankly uncomprehending of or even hostile to the values and concerns which are part of the fabric of everyday life here at school. We have to provide the lure which brings those children back to the frontier and motivates them to learn once they are here. We have to provide an education which is unique in [this city].

[We combine] a very strong academic program with the values and beliefs of the Society of Friends. It is important, however, that both elements of that combination remain strong. There are many other Friends schools in and around [this city]; children can easily learn under the care of Friends without having to venture into [the area of our school]. Similarly, there are other strong academic schools in [this city]. In order for us to attract families who would not otherwise be willing to take the risk of sending their children to a school which operates across society's frontiers, we have to make sure that both aspects of our school's program remain lively and effective: its academic excellence and its Quaker idealism ... Maintaining a school attractive enough to persuade families to send their children out of their communities is also expensive. Scholarships are necessary if inner city children are to be able to attend ... The school will probably always cost more than many Meeting members and most neighborhood families can afford ... ‘True religion,’ William Penn said, ‘does not turn men out of the world, but enables them to live better in it.’ If we as a Meeting are to oversee a school which is engaged with the world’s problems and wrestles with the world’s evils, we will inevitably find ourselves wrestling also with the problems caused by the scarcity of the world’s resources.

The theme of an ongoing tension between the call of Friends schools to maintain a vision incorporating Quaker ideals in a surrounding sea of inimical values as well as to somehow attract those who are financially unable to send their children to such a school,
and the struggle to maintain sufficient funding - finds an echo in the comments of other respondents.

The respondent at a second east coast Friends school, urban and upper-middle-class, whose staff is substantially Quaker, notes that

simplicity and consensus are Quaker ways that we have only slightly incorporated, and the school is often criticized for this. It is hard to value simplicity when each family has to come up with 12,000 dollars to educate their child for one year. Consensus works, some of the time, but only with small groups and in some decisions. Sometimes it is simply not viable. efficient or safe to make consensus decisions.

Again, the Testimony of Simplicity (and by implication, the Peace Testimony, for, as eighteenth-century Quaker, John Woolman urged, Quakers must look to see that the seeds of war are not in the fabric of their households and possessions), seems confounded as it seeks expression in some Friends schools by the necessity for funding.

The respondent from a third north-eastern Friends school noted.

It is common that most teachers are not Quakers in Friends schools. It is a matter of necessity. Also, our school prides itself on academic excellence, so teachers are selected for their quality as a teacher first. The school certainly looks for teachers who are Quaker. Also, most of the teachers who teach here do not disagree with Quaker principles.

In contemporary American society, where the distance between publicly funded and independent schooling (Friends Schools are independent) is enormous and becoming more so, and where the emphasis on the (perceived) critical importance of college (university) entrance creates a fierce competition for a limited number of places at the best 'schools' (universities), Friends Schools are at the top of desirable secondary 'prep' schools. We can see how greatly implicated are capitalist relations in the tensions evident in many of these Quaker schools. The current American president and his wife sent their daughter to one of the oldest Quaker schools, Sidwell Friends School in Washington, D.C. An otherwise non-Quakerly family (see recent American foreign policy), the Clintons represent many hundreds of wealthy Americans determined to see their children
attend the best colleges for the best opportunities. So in demand have these schools become, that a 1994 Called Session of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting recorded a concern that “Quaker children are a distinct minority in Friends Schools” and a sense abroad that “Friends … need to take back our Quaker schools” (PYM. 88). “It is further recommended that the Committee on Education look at how the Yearly Meeting can increase Quaker presence and beliefs in Friends Schools” (89). Clearly, Quakers are themselves asking the question this study asks in a different form: ‘When is a Friends school not a Friends school?’

“Quaker emphasis on fairness, toleration, simplicity, and social responsibility is important in education, always a major concern among Friends. The Quaker way of life has proven attractive to non-Friends, who today greatly outnumber Friends in the large number of Quaker schools and colleges in both Britain and America” (Peck, 1988, 36). In addition, and perhaps even more attractive to some is the very high premium placed on academic rigour. In a climate of fierce competition for places in the ‘best’ colleges. Friends secondary schools are highly sought after in the wider community. Whether this fact plays a significant part in the nature of their education, particularly the curriculum, is a part of this exploration.

If a large majority of non-Quaker students are placed at a Friends school by families wanting them to make it to the best colleges and that is their sole and clear objective, it would seem unlikely that they would care much about the Quaker testimonies that do not directly pertain to, and might possibly deflect total concentration from academic rigour and achievement.

Again, too great an insistence specifically on the Peace Testimony might have consequences on the playing of competitive sports, on dealing with ‘bullies’, on attitudes towards foreign policy in History or Political Science courses. If, in other words, the testimonies drove the curriculum in explicit ways, would these schools remain as desirable to wealthy, ambitious families and therefore funded by them?

Friends schools are currently discussing the issue of competition in sports. They ask “how to compete graciously, how to lose graciously, and how to win graciously in today’s world?” One respondent notes that “in passing, we might wonder if we are as
concerned about the way our students handle competition in the classroom as we often appear to be about the way they handle competition on the playing field.” This same teacher, from one of the schools responding to the questionnaire, notes that he has “often found it useful in working with kids who shine in athletics but struggle in the classroom to compare a poor test to a bad game. They have learned from athletics that there always is another game, that failure one day may form the foundation for success the next.” He notes further what “may be cultural dynamics at work which we need to be aware of ... we have had a situation at times in which some of our parents were perceived by others as being ‘too loud’ at games. It led some of our black parents to wonder whether it was un-Quakerly to cheer and make noise ... ultimately for me it is about working with a group of people to attain a goal and working to make yourself the best you can be in order to help the group. Like so many things in Quakerism, it's all about the process." Another teacher suggests that “competition gets a bad rap by many because it is mis-understood ... what we commonly call competition is in fact a form of ‘sharing; it is a dance. Sometimes we leap higher and more gracefully than the person next to us and other times they exceed us in some objective sense. This is no crime, in fact it’s beautiful, because it’s how we learn from one another. Keeping score is just another way of adding spice to the event.”

Over against this dance to find justification (perhaps a rationalization?) consistent with Quaker principles for an arguably quite un-Quakerly phenomenon, other Quaker teachers express concern about the presence of competitive sports in their schools. the objection being that they are essentially against the spirit of Quakerism. As one respondent comments, “Competitive sports feed the ‘me against you’, ‘us against them’ animus that in turn feeds the self-serving, enemy-constructing system against which Quakers have always stood.”

Speaking to a gathering at the Second International Conference on Quaker Education in 1997, Quaker educator, Langdon Elsbree recalls that older Quaker schools
were reservations of innocence...shelters from the world, to inculcate Quaker ways and to protect their charges from secular temptations, including, one now regrets, the arts and literature. But they have radically changed since World War II. Some have become mainly elite, prestigious institutions with only a vague lingering Quaker ethos. Others have struggled to maintain a Quaker identity. They have become so inclusive that there aren’t enough Quaker youth, faculty, and money to go around. (Elsbree, 8)

Teacher Education

There is no separate, formal education for teachers in Friends Schools. Two advisory bodies serve to nurture the aims of Quaker education: the Friends Council on Education, which deals with primary and secondary education; and the Friends Council on Higher Education which deals with post-secondary education.

Some schools offer informal sessions for new teachers (non-Quakers) as introduction to the ‘Friendly’ climate of the school and the several Quaker testimonies. At one school, "we have all new teachers take a one-day course about teaching in a Friends school. No particular reference is given to English in that course." This minimal exposure of new, non-Quaker teachers to basic Quakerism is matched by minimal formal exposure of non-Quaker students to the same basics. At only one school is there a required Freshman course with a component on Quakerism. The course is historical rather than literary, and the QPT is not mentioned specifically.

At the inner-city school in the large north-eastern city, there is an optional ‘Orientation to Quaker Schools’ retreat at Pendle Hill. New teachers, however, are not officially introduced to Quakerism. Hesitant to "push indoctrination," this school has discontinued the handing out of a pamphlet called “Faith and Practice."

Neither is there a quota system for hiring Quakers in secondary Friends schools, although some mention conscious efforts to hire Quaker teachers. One respondent in the north-east says “Many teachers at my school are Quakers. Many teachers are drawn to it because of the wonderful values and anti-capitalist and creative ways of Quakerism.” (There is an irony in this enthusiastic flight when one considers the historical fact of enormous success in the capitalist system by a number of famous Friends, including the
Hersheys, Cadburys, Rountrees, and Quaker Oats family, which gave rise to the quip that ‘Quakers came to the New World and did well by doing good’. To do them justice, many of these early Quakers struggled with their consciences about the nature and extent of their material success, especially in the light of John Woolman’s urging of Friends to seek in the fabric of their lives and homes for the seeds of social conflict and war.)

While schools are ‘in the care of’ local Meetings, these have no legal or binding jurisdiction. Rather, the relationship takes the form of an ongoing dialogue with concerns being discussed as they arise.

At the Second International Conference on Quaker Education, held at Westtown, Pennsylvania in 1997, Quakers spoke of the danger, as they saw it, of mining Quaker values without following through to a genuine acceptance of these values, thus trivializing them, or at least making them only pragmatic in effect. One participant spoke, in a larger context, of some contemporary (non-Quaker) corporations which pay lip service to the consensus principle but cut it off in the interests of efficiency; thus: ‘We will try to make decisions by consensus but in the end, if necessary, we will take a vote’. This attempt to make use of a principle, deemed to be desirable, without an underlying commitment to it, seems cynical, and destined to fail, as suggested by the comments of the respondent from the east coast Friends school with regard to the Testimony of Simplicity and to the decision-making process. Is there a parallel in the matter of the QPT in the context of Friends schools’ English curricula?

Respondents for the most part spoke about the Peace Testimony as reflected in the life of their schools. They seemed reluctant to address the issue, central to my interests in the questionnaire, of its influence on English curriculum. This reluctance led me to speculate that there might not be any such identifiable influence, and that there has not been, so far, organized or systematic thinking about the matter. ‘Eudora Stein’ said that in her school, “The Peace Testimony does not affect the selection of texts; it most likely indirectly affects issues brought up in discussion. The books I teach even when part of the ‘canon’ do not necessarily glorify war or violence.”
Three Quaker teachers from the one remaining Quaker-founded school in Canada responded to the questionnaire. One says of the QPT that it,

clarifies and reinforces my own commitment to the commandment: Love thy Neighbour. It provides a perspective that helps us connect our actions with our beliefs about our relationship with God and with each other.

Professionally, her commitment requires her to “be prepared to explain under what conditions it would be permissible to kill my neighbour. The QPT gives an answer to this dilemma.”

But what exactly is the dilemma and how, since the QPT is understood in ways which range from permitting the taking up of arms for one’s country in a ‘just war’ to absolute pacifism, does it give “an answer”? The unproblematized assumption of a single, easily understood meaning of the testimony appears frequently in respondent teachers’ comments.

The QPT, far from being accepted as a clear, unequivocal statement of the principle of absolute pacifism, a still quiet centre understood and experienced by Friends everywhere and always the same, has been instead, during its three hundred year history, a site of tension, dissension, and disharmony. The excerpt from the New Zealand Quakers’ Statement on Peace quoted above is, as my research has shown me, merely one reading among many of Fox’s original Declaration. Subject alternately to vigorous debate and periods of significant neglect, the QPT’s history has been indeed fraught.

A Quaker teacher from another school in the south-eastern city previously mentioned speaks of his personal dilemma in teaching, in the context of the QPT, during the 1991 Gulf War:

[my] confusion results primarily from the fact that I haven’t established my own position on the fundamental dilemma of war - pitting the sacredness of human life against the responsibility we have to our country as U.S. citizens - let alone a strategy on how to teach it ... It may be easy for some to adopt an unyielding pacifism in this conflict [the Gulf War] based on the position that human life is sacred, whether it be American, Arab, or Israeli. My own religious society has elevated this position to a fundamental tenet of faith. And yet I wonder, at times,
how much the most vocal pacifists appreciate the fact that others fought and died
to protect the freedom of speech they themselves enjoy today.

The tenor of the above suggests something other than a Quaker wrestling with the core
of the QPT; rather it suggests mainstream Just War theorizing, based on adherence to a
centuries’-long notion of patriotism. As a teacher, this Quaker found it impossible to
guide his students through their thinking about a seminal event in American (and world)
history:

[the strategies of child psychologists] fail to provide much advice on how to
respond when students ask the most difficult question of all: ‘What do you think?’
Having taught adolescents for nearly a decade, I am aware of their idealism. I
realize they are eager to debate the morality of war and that their arguments must
be treated seriously. But that doesn’t make my position as a teacher any easier.
…I’ve tried to teach the responsibility of U.S. citizenship and, on the athletic
field, the necessity of mental discipline and physical toughness. Above all, I
hope I have taught my students to be intelligent and caring human beings since,
one day, they may be compelled to make decisions that will influence the lives of
others. Because of that potential, they represent whatever future our country has.

The important Quaker testimony of direct, or ‘plain’ speech might be expected to
facilitate the matter of “how to respond when students ask the most difficult question of
all: ‘What do you think?’” without the need to resort to a child psychologist. Moreover,
the notion that the responsibilities of national (as distinct from global or planetary)
citizenship and the mental discipline and physical toughness nurtured on the athletic field
should take precedence over the fostering of pacific principles exemplifies a tradition
fully described by Parker in The Old Lie: War and the Public School Ethos (1987) and
by Whitehead in Old Lies Revisited (1991). This teacher admits to a “confusion [that]
results primarily from the fact that I haven’t established my own position on the
fundamental dilemma of war;” yet concludes with the recognition that what teachers must
do is “teach the importance of taking a stand and adhering to it regardless of what others
think.”

In a symposium in 1996 (at the Friends school whose English Department taped their
discussion of the questionnaire) on “The Matter of Poetry: Teaching English from a
Cultural Perspective,” the (Quaker) keynote speaker discussed “the spiritual and imaginative foundation that is fundamental to the academic study of humanities at a Friends school.” and offered examples of poetry in the service of peace. This speaker addressed the confusion expressed by the teacher cited above. In an interesting resort to military discourse, she first referred to her audience, Quaker high school English teachers, as “being on the front lines and ... heroes,” and then she noted her perception of the lack of outrage at.

the fact that 50,000 children under five died in the first six months after the Gulf War as a result of our bombing of the infrastructure - the water lines and electricity - of the city of Baghdad. I say this not to promote guilt, but to make facts equivalent. Since we all love our own more, in order to make the bodies count, and to make all of them count as real, we will need to borrow the eyes of the other. If truth really is beauty, as Keats said, then beauty ain’t no Grecian urn.

And “How,” she asks with Shakespeare, “with this rage shall beauty hold a plea?” The ‘eyes of the other’ is an essential Quaker notion deriving from the belief that there is that of God in everyone, that, therefore, to kill someone is to kill part of the divine, and that, as George Fox put it, Quakers are called on “to answer that of God in every man [sic].”

How does a Quaker educator find it impossible to take a stand before his students, who, as he says, are eager to debate the morality of war, on the devastation brought by his government on 50,000 Iraqi children? He says he is confused. The Symposium speaker suggested an understanding of this confusion in her comments about the "King of the moment, Stephen" [that is, Stephen King, as opposed to the King of Kings in the Bible, “the source book of the dominant mythology in the West”] who “presents a source book for the symptoms of our moment’s: rage, and the infant’s violent fantasy wish (which all of us carry to some extent) that the mind can magically rule the world, even to the point of destroying our enemies wholesale.” One reason for the power of these fantasies, she says,

is that it is the nature of real enemies to be so often out of our reach, beyond our power, hard to recognize, or morally untouchable because conscience normally guards the borders of our actions in relation to others. Except when your government or your ideology gives you Agent 007’s ‘license to kill’. For therein
lies a great opportunity - not only for writers of horror fantasy like King - but in the real world of history and society, for the funneling of that rage into those who are defined as killable, people whom a culture sanctions for sacrifice or legitimizes as an enemy, principally by the imaginative act of removing their resemblance to us as human beings, by seeing them as if they were members of another species. Perhaps that is why animals don’t kill their own kind; they are not subject to that confusion.

As she thinks back over the tradition that produced Shakespeare’s line about rage and beauty, she poses a provocative question for the late twentieth century: “What have we meant by beauty, and how must we change what we mean so that our art forestalls rather than feeds our rage?” It is this question, and variations of it, that I had expected to, but in the majority of respondents’ discussions, did not see playing an active role as Quaker English teachers come to terms with curricular selection and delivery in the light of the Peace Testimony: how we must change what we mean by beauty, so that, for instance, a soldier would not say he hoped to “find Beauty in the morning,” and mean by that, a brutally violent death.

The confused teacher during the Gulf War was thinking inside the tradition that positioned patriotism expressed in military terms, and certain forms of prowess in the guise of courage, above other values. That tradition, as referred to by the Symposium speaker and by Parker and Whitehead and others, is, among other things, literary. But the teacher was also speaking from within his own religious society’s spiritual tradition. a tradition which has stood for, as he points out, the non-violent resolution of conflicts It is interesting that this teacher has written an essay in which he makes a hero of Nathanael Greene, a devout Quaker in the Revolutionary period. He considers Greene “a tragic hero caught between his devotion to Quaker principles and his strong feelings of patriotism whose early death prevented him from reconciling his conflict between Quaker values and worldly desires” (Troxler, 1991, page not given). It seems the source of his confusion then is the attempt to speak from two conflicting traditions. Such an attempt appears to lie behind the confusion, and the seeming reluctance to clarify that confusion, of some of the other respondents as they considered the questionnaire. The challenge is, in common
parlance. to ‘walk the talk’; unless one is prepared to change that ‘talk’, or to make it mean different things at different times.

Only two of the respondents knew of the Quaker historical notion of a ‘guarded education’. One rejected it outright as an unacceptable stricture that she interpreted as meaning that “students need to be exposed to literature and texts that support Quaker principles and kept from works that encourage the opposite.” As interpreted here, the notion becomes indeed restrictive. However, viewed from a larger perspective, a ‘guarded education’ is what always exists everywhere. Quakers, like mainstream educators, teach the literature of love, but not of pornography; they teach controversial, provocative literature but not hate literature; they teach literature that portrays abuse of women, of children, of men, but not literature that advocates these abuses. Has the only criterion for this differentiation been the ‘quality’ of the literature available?

The other set of respondents to mention the notion of a ‘guarded’ education, the English Department which answered in a group, referred to “the purpose for which the School was originally founded: to provide a ‘guarded’ education to the children of the Meeting.” They went on to say,

Friends founded the School one hundred and fifty years ago to provide an environment in which their children could learn the three ‘R’s safe from the corruption of worldly temptations. Probably no one in either the Meeting or the School community would now feel comfortable with such a restrictive - and restricting - purpose.

This school struggles nevertheless with the challenge of remaining true to Quaker idealism while also offering academic excellence and avoiding the concept, contrary to Quakerism, of ‘selectivity’, which would select some students and reject others according to financial criteria. This last however operates, as they acknowledge, in their ongoing efforts to maintain sufficient funding.

Despite their general rejection or ignoring of the notion of a ‘guarded’ education, Friends schools have that history behind them. One might expect it to follow from the
century-long notion of a ‘guarded education’ that instead of “slowly penetrating into the school library and being unquestioningly taught in English courses,” fiction and drama would be scrupulously explored, examined, and at the very least, historicized. That is, since the content of English Literature had for so long been held suspect, on moral grounds, as counter to Quaker philosophy, and on grounds of its being a distraction from “all things civil and useful,” one might expect that, as it was allowed into the curriculum of schools, it would be positioned in an historical context, studied as an expression of what it meant to be human for particular groups at particular times in a larger context than one which, paradoxically, claimed to be expressing “the universal human condition.”

“Nothing is so opaque,” as Margaret Atwood has said, “as absolute transparency” (“Helen of Troy Does Counter Dancing”). Instead, Quakers appear to have moved from a zealously guarded education in which literature and the arts were suspect in the old Platonic sense of being seductive ‘lies’ - the Poet was banished from the ideal Republic - to a liberal, inclusive education, as suggested by the responses to the questionnaire, without applying the recognition of the critical importance of the role of these areas in attitude formation and therefore of a form of curricular selection based on something other than the ‘great works’ tradition operating in the educational culture at large. If Quakers are indeed, as Paul Lacey of Earlham College, claims, “saboteurs throwing even tiny shoes into the fast-moving machinery,” then we should be able to find evidence of this ‘sabotage’ in that most critical area, education, and specifically, in the teaching of English Literature.

In a discussion of “What Quaker Educators Have to Offer in the Postmodern Classroom,” teacher-presenters at the Second International Conference on Quaker Education” (1997) did not mention the QPT. Instead, they spoke of the relation of Quaker ‘distinctives’ to a postmodern view of the world, suggesting that Quaker emphasis on “experiential spirituality, simplicity, diversity, language, consensus and community” would all resonate with postmodern thinkers, while the Quaker tenets that God is the source of ultimate, universal Truth and that “we need a centered self (integrity, conscience)...[as opposed to] the notion of people as a web of relationships” would not.
Further, there was a sense from this discussion that “Quakerism will attract many postmoderns, but we will have to be careful not to embrace that culture so closely that we fail to tell the postmodern people that there is A Truth in God.” The idea that God can speak to any person (non-hierarchical social structure), the form of unprogrammed worship, and the idea that truth is constructed in the community are likely to be popular in postmodernity. However, Quakers emphasize that they are not ‘making [truth] up’ in the community - they are listening for the voice of God. God as the ultimate, universal Truth will not resonate well with postmoderns.

Quaker values and Postmodern classroom pedagogy are in conjunction in a number of ways, argued these presenters in several workshops:

- in discussion groups and working with consensus; truth can come from any member; credentials and roles do not afford privilege;
- in the acknowledgment that there is something present in the group that is gathered that is more than the sum of its parts;
- in the acknowledgment of the importance of unity in community;
- in the valuing of minority voices;
- in the celebration of process;
- in the importance of narrative;
- in a reluctance to rush to final judgment;
- in the flexibility to follow currently-held belief or intuition.

The notion of the importance of narrative calls for an elaboration. Quakers believe that moral connection depends to a significant extent on narrative: that it is the stories we tell or are told that lead us to connect, through revulsion, sympathy, empathy with people and events. Contributions to the Meeting for Worship often take the form of stories. Here would seem to be an invitation to the kind of curricular rethinking with regard to the ‘canon’ of English Literature one might expect in the Quaker context, specifically in the
light of the Peace Testimony. This rethinking happens in individual cases, as with the self-identified "religious educator," who attempts to "tell stories from the Little Tradition, or to lift up the rare stories from the 'Great Tradition' that do bring glory to those most often neglected or maligned." Thus, the "opaqueness" is penetrated, and made to yield alternative visions. But this teacher was the only respondent who talked explicitly about the tension she perceived between sets of stories, between an English curriculum that offers for valorization, militarily-defined patriotism, heroism, manly courage in terms of physical prowess, and triumph through "might," and a religious tradition that calls through its testimonies for non-violence in the waging of "the Lamb's War." The unexamined tension and contradictions in the majority of respondents' reflections on the "influence of the QPT on the teaching of English" thus stands out in stark relief.

Quaker values and Postmodern classroom pedagogy seem to diverge, according to the presenters, over the following:

- the status of a Universal Truth; for Quakers, God is the source of Truth;
- the status of the self; Quakers value a centred, not a de-centred self; "You are known by God": a unified self not just a collection of memberships;
- the relative status of individuals and communities; Quakers must hold in tension the individual and the gathered body to avoid the tyranny of the majority (requiring conformity) and the tyranny of the individual (one standing in the way of progress).

Curriculum

Responses to the questions in this section spoke to curriculum largely in general terms, despite the fact that at least five of the questions directly sought description and elucidation of existing, and reflection on potential connections between the QPT and the English curriculum. Some texts on English courses were mentioned but references to any influence of the QPT on curricular matters remained on the level of pedagogy, how one teaches being more important, by implication, than what one teaches. My central question of whether the QPT overtly guided thinking about text selection, and how this might
happen, was not reflectively addressed. No one took up the opportunity to reflect even extemporaneously on what such a phenomenon might look like, what its implications and challenges, or problems, might be.

One of the east coast respondents, at an old school with a relatively large number of Quaker teachers, described a fairly free approach to curricular matters:

Each teacher develops her/his own curriculum. I try to combine my interests and the students’ interests. I try to combine a look at ‘classical’ literature...actually an in-depth study of classics, with modern literature. A huge part of my curriculum is looking at stereotypes, the cultural contexts of literary works, and various perspectives or interpretations of an experience. This sets the framework for critical thinking and the acceptance of a variety of perspectives. I like to combine classics (50%) and contemporary literature. I am always free to select my own material and set the entire curriculum myself.

We teach the classics at my school, but, as with all literature, from a critical context. What stereotypes are being perpetuated? What interests and cultural norms are reflected here? How can we offer a different perspective and interpretation to these events? I think my teaching of literature is consistent with the Quaker Peace Testimony because (as did the Quakers at the time) we do not ignore or condemn or even judge conflicts such as the Vietnam War. We attempt to look at these experiences with compassion and offer a differing perspective, too. (Given the point of view of those afraid of the Communist threat, what else might have been done to deal with the situation in Vietnam?)

For this teacher, pedagogy rather than curricular analysis and choice seems to be the area in which the QPT plays a role. She did not address the question about the various current critiques of the ‘classics’ and their possible implications for curricular rethinking in the light of the QPT.

In ‘Eudora Stein’s’ school,

curriculum selection is done through the department members assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the present curriculum, changing courses and emphases when deemed necessary, and evaluating the effects of the changes ... We have taught and do teach All Quiet on the Western Front, Shakespeare’s tragedies such as Macbeth, Romeo and Juliet, and Richard III, The Iliad, Antigone, and some Hemingway novels and short stories. The literature itself condemns violence or doubts its efficacy and morality. ... I am wary about any
‘canon’ of literature. I was trained in the New Criticism and treasure many of the books that would be on most canons. … Too narrow a definition of the canon can make us myopic and narrow-minded and too much opposition to whatever is considered ‘best’ can leave one without any standards.

Stein’s phrase, “when deemed necessary” leaves unanswered the critical question of criteria for change. Is the context for teaching these canonical works aesthetic excellence? Are these particular works chosen because they ‘condemn violence or doubt its efficacy and morality’ and are thus appropriate for teaching English in light of the QPT, or is this congruence a happy coincidence? Between the two options of her final statement lies a gap in which might have appeared a concrete recasting of the context for curricular choice, a context informed by the QPT.

In as close to a specific reference as she gets to the QPT, ‘Stein’ adds

It may be true that Quaker moral principles are in conflict with certain cultural forces, in regard to attitudes in popular music, in the constant assault of materialism and consumerism, and in the focus on violence in movies; but the ethos of the school tries to counter those forces or at least keep them under critique. Certainly, teaching Slaughterhouse Five, Farewell to Arms, and The Things They Carried asks students to consider the absurdity and utter inhumanity of war…. there is a consciousness that teaching any work that glorified war would not be consonant with Quaker values.

Might the QPT, if allowed to be the context in which war-related literature is taught, and to be the direct call to active witness it has historically been, ask students to move beyond a consideration of the “absurdity and utter inhumanity of war” to challenge a tradition that accepts war as a still viable means of conflict resolution, consolidation of spheres of interest, confirmation of national sovereignty, or ‘last resort’ in the stopping of crimes against humanity?

The respondent from a south-eastern Friends school, speaks of the ‘canon’ and its relation to war in rather more direct and pointed terms, though without specific references:
As I understand the term, defined by my graduate school’s New Testament professor, the Great Tradition refers to the stories that support the dominant (or oppressor) culture. Much of what I know of ‘classic’ literature glorifies violence and makes heroes of the violent. Further, it either ignores or demeans women, children, and people of colour. As a religious educator, I try to tell stories from the ‘Little Tradition’, or to lift up the rare stories from the ‘Great Tradition’ that do bring glory to those most often neglected or maligned.

Interestingly, this teacher sees herself also as a ‘religious educator’. This self-identification (the only one of its kind among the respondents) is congruent with the Quaker claim that education is inescapably religious, as expressed by the statement of the Friends Council on Education. As one of only five Quaker faculty in her Friends school, she reflects, by her own observation, an individual rather than a corporate endeavour to make the QPT somehow inform the curriculum. Disappointingly, she does not offer specific examples of the “little tradition,” nor of the “rare stories from the ‘Great Tradition’.” I found this at first perplexing. Perhaps the fact that her endeavour to wrest from the ‘Great Tradition’ those ‘rare stories’ is singular and, as she suggests, unsystematic, accounts for her not having ready examples to offer.

One teacher at the only Canadian Friends school reports visiting some Quaker schools in the United States recently where “no one referenced the QPT as a term to me. However, I did observe Conflict Resolution and Peace Education materials in the schools.” In her own practice, she is “not aware how the QPT makes a difference to the teaching of literature, nor of its specific impact on the teaching of war-related literature.” As far as curriculum in her school is concerned, “The content is laid out by the Ontario Ministry of Education and teachers of the Upper School feel very unable to deviate from that content.” With regards to more specific selection: “War-related works are part of the OAC II [final year] English curriculum (and, to a degree, the OAC I [final year] English curriculum). Six novels, directly related to war experiences are examined or studied. The Quaker view of these experiences is one vantage point.” Again, there is an assumption of a single Quaker view, but this view is not spelled out, which would be interesting, especially in light of her earlier disclaimer about the “impact on the teaching of war-
related literature” of the QPT. She does not suggest that the English Department reflects individually or as a whole about the study of English in the light of the QPT.

Her comment about the laying out of ‘content’ by the Ministry of Education and the felt inability by teachers to deviate from it is somewhat baffling. Since 1967, the curriculum of secondary schools in Ontario has been largely under the aegis of individual principals in consultation with subject consultants (although these, under the Harris regime, are a vanishing breed) and department heads so that there is theoretically a considerable amount of leeway for curricular decision-making. Likewise in the American context, independent schools are not bound in terms of particular curricular decisions by state guides.

At the inner city school in the south-east, grade 9 classes are taken to Gettysburg where both simulated war games and a reading of the QPT take place. In grade 10, whose curriculum bears (as the respondents suggest) an “undercurrent of war,” works studied include various novels and stories by Hemingway, *The Things They Carried*, *Slaughterhouse V*, *Antigone*, and the QPT as a perspective on the philosophical groundings of the literature read. In addition, students hear a speaker on the subject of civil disobedience. One discussant spoke of her perception that all the literature of World War II “feeds readily into the pacifist component of the Quaker philosophy,” without explaining more closely how exactly it does so, or what is meant here by “the pacifist component of the Quaker philosophy.” Is there only one? And is it ‘pacifist’ or peace-making? Absolute or contingent? A philosophical guideline or a religious call to direct and concrete witness? What implications does this statement have for the teaching of and responding to literary texts? The respondent does not suggest what status the QPT holds in this discourse, apart from the suggestion that it forms “a perspective on the philosophical groundings of the literature.” It would be interesting to know how both the groundings and the perspective are presented and received. There seem to be dramatic and challenging possibilities for working with the QPT and war-related literature in this unit as described.
What emerges as the major finding of this study of the QPT and the teaching of English in Friends schools is complexity and, in fact, contradictions. Friends' understanding of the QPT is not single, nor is the perception of how it does or might influence the teaching of English. Possible reasons for such complexity and contradictions lie in the history of the testimony's reception by Quakers.

As the historians Smith, Barbour, Bassett, Kashatus, Brock, and Socknat suggest, the founding statement of the Peace Testimony by George Fox in 1660 has been received from the beginning with varying interpretations and has undergone in its three hundred years' history a number of sea-changes, none of them permanent, now representing a statement of absolute pacifism, now leading to programs of alternative service and war tax resistance, now patient of a reading which allows the taking up of arms in situations ranging from national revolutions to world wars.

In light of this general historical complexity (perhaps too mild a term for the extreme positions taken in the testimony's name) it should not be surprising to find equally varying interpretations of the QPT held by any particular group such as that represented by teachers. It should be even less surprising to find complexity and tension around this testimony, or perhaps indeed any of the testimonies, in the context of independent schools which cannot rely for their funding, and hence continuance, on drawing their student body and faculty solely from members of their own Society.

All respondents mentioned the minority status of Friends as students and faculty in the schools as a factor creating tension with regard to the Testimony of Simplicity (which calls for a turning away from materialism and so too, obviously, from aspiration to success in material terms, and from adornment in dress, speech, and behaviour). None mentioned it directly with regard to the QPT; however, the current discussions of competition in Friends schools indirectly involves this testimony, as a couple of respondents suggested.

The pressure to offer the best in academic preparation for post-secondary education in a highly competitive climate in the United States must contribute to the tension around
the attempt to remain true to Quaker idealism. The Friends Council on Education asks, "What Does a Friends School Have to Offer?" and answers, "A Friends school offers the chance to share in a community's struggle to transmute an ideal into human fact." Part of that ideal is the foundational statement of pacifism, the QPT. My attempt to discover how this might express itself in terms of one part of the curriculum has yielded a partial and indistinct picture and has produced more questions than answers.

As many of the responses indicate, the QPT is present in various ways in the daily life of the schools, reflected in peaceful conflict resolution, encouragement of tolerance, and multiculturalism. How it is present in curricular decisions in the teaching of English remains elusive. Respondents seemed determined to address the question in general, abstract terms and from individual perspectives. This probably reflects the complexity and tensions at large in the Quaker community with regard to the QPT. Whatever the reasons for the apparent absence of a systematic (distinct from dogmatic) thinking about the English curriculum in light of the QPT, the end result, in terms of formal, acknowledged curriculum, seems to be not much different, at least in the terms of the respondents, from what obtains in mainstream Ontario secondary school English curricula, what happens in individual teachers' practice notwithstanding.

Further Historical and Contemporary Struggles with the Peace Testimony

The following suggests something of the nature and extent of the struggles with the QPT in the past and as they continue today in the larger Quaker community. It sheds light on some of the responses to the questionnaire by presenting the various contradictions and challenges in the life of that Testimony and perhaps explains somewhat the lack of a consistent expression and understanding of it among the teachers.

Quaker historian, William Kashatus, speaks in his book, Conflict of Convictions: A Reappraisal of Quaker Involvement in the American Revolution (1990), of the fact that on the basis of 'inner light', some Quakers supported that Revolution. While some joined the army and fought, others paid taxes, helped collect revenues to finance
the conflict, and served on committees for defense. In his review of Kashatus’ book, J. Bernard Haviland says “Their stand was, of course, a denial of the peace testimony in the interests of national freedom... The painful self-confidence of both sides in this dispute could give us pause”. Believing themselves to be a part of the ‘Lamb’s War’, the break-away group also felt part of the process of creating a United States which, as Kashatus describes it, would be “destined to be a great empire all over the world” (in Haviland). Haviland observes of this dual, if uneasy alignment: “Perhaps it is one of the ironies of U.S. history that this principle of national self-assertion should have had... at least one of its sources, in apocalyptic Quakerism of the 17th century” (1992, page not given). These so-called ‘Free Quakers’ were ‘disowned’ (that is, denied the use of meetinghouses, schools, and burial grounds) by fellow Quakers for whom pacifism by mid-eighteenth century, had become the most fundamental testimony. Nor were these ‘non-pacifist’ Quakers the first such: according to historian Hugh Barbour, some non-pacifists were to be found among the earliest Quakers. He concludes that Friends’ “growing clarity” (by which he appears to mean a crystallizing understanding of pacifism) via the ‘Lamb’s War’ did not come “from one man’s inspiration or even from a few Bible passages,” but from a consensus of Friends about the meaning of their movement as a whole and about the life and spirit [and] ...words of Jesus” (cited in Bassett, 1997, 55).

Quaker pacifism emerged not only from the experience of the Inner Light [as with Fox’ personal and intuitive embrace of pacifism]... but also from political disillusionment with the course of the English Revolution. Cromwell discovered he could govern the nation for whose liberty he had fought only by a military rule which limited the very spiritual and political freedoms for which saints had gone to war. (Marx, 1992, 116)

As the English Revolution proceeded, a new form of pacifism emerged from one of the most militant of Puritan sects, a pacifism which combined a rejection of violence with a commitment to political involvement and social reform. This was the Peace Testimony of the Quakers. (Marx, 115)
And this too marked the beginning of the unbroken Quaker tradition of 'speaking truth to power'.

The clarity spoken of by Barbour, however, was not lasting. In the years leading up to, and with the arrival of the first World War, the feminist and socialist movements were temporarily decimated by the departure of a not insignificant number of European and North American (hitherto) pacifists. Quakers were not immune to this fragmentation.

While a third of the Quaker men of military age entered the armed forces in World War I, other young Friends, including many women, exercised radical pressure. Pacifism gradually joined forces with feminism and socialism until the peace testimony, long vague and limited, became a radical and prophetic challenge recognized by the first world gathering of Friends in 1920. (Bassett, 55-6)

This coalescence too has since disintegrated to an extent. Bassett challenges an interpretation of 'the inner light' (such as that expressed by Kashatus) that might lead one to fight in a war, arguing that such an interpretation arises from misconceptions about 'the Lamb's War'. “God does not contradict God. Contradictions come from human failure to get the message...God did not tell one Friend to fight the Lamb’s War and another to fight in the Revolutionary War “(1991, 54).

Nevertheless, the Committee of the Board of Friends School in Wilmington, N.C., noted in 1948 that “[a]lmost every boy in the graduating classes from 1939 through 1944 entered national service” (Wilmington, 1948).

Allen Smith refers to the 1955 document, “Speak Truth to Power: A Quaker Search for an Alternative to Violence,” and the ‘renewalist’ movement that produced it. He argues that by creating “a new definition of peace, by altering its linguistic opposite “ (Smith, 1996, 6) from war to violence, the renewalists “changed both the tactics and the scope of peace work...the personal had become far more political” (17). Still, in 1972, dissension over the QPT in relation to the VietNam War led the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting to admit to being “torn by differences in our
understanding of the Quaker witness" (16). This struggle reflects the "spiritual struggle which is the moral equivalent of war" (George Fox, cited by Jones in Smith, 1996, 73), but also keeps alive the fundamental tension between the presentation of the QPT as a "corporate covenant, a community witness", as Fox had it, and its presentation as "a matter of individual conscience" (Jones, 73). The renewalists had believed that "a strengthened QPT could only inspire comprehensive social change if expanded to encompass the entire society" (Smith, 6). The "Speak Truth to Power" pamphlet had "asserted that militarism not only caused war but devastated democracy" (6). This thinking includes the notion that "a nation's foreign policy determine[s] its domestic structure" (6). Moreover, by 1956, "an FPC [Friends Peace Committee] leaflet declared...no longer a PT. but several [testimonies]" (12) In 1962, the FPC said that "...praying for peace and maintaining personal testimonies are not enough" (12).

The Peace Tax Fund Bill has been introduced in every session of Congress since 1972. The proposal was first introduced in Congress mostly at the initiative of Quakers. Mennonites and members of the Church of the Brethren and peace organizations. Mainline denominations like the Presbyterian Church USA and the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society later came to support the legislation. More recently, the diverse coalition of religious organizations backing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act came to recognize the proposal as a religious liberty issue. This brought the support of such organizations as the National Association of Evangelicals and the Christian Legal Society.

Many objectors refuse to wait for a law and have turned toward war tax resistance, which takes many forms and methods, each of which create different risks. Some resisters don't pay a symbolic amount of taxes, some don't pay the fifty-three percent of the taxes estimated to go to military spending. Still others, knowing that some part of whatever they pay will support the military, refuse to pay all taxes. There are also some who purposefully earn below the taxable income line each year. ("Peace and Taxes", The Nonviolence Web, March 20, 1998)
Courts have consistently ruled that the IRS is under no obligation to recognize conscientious objection status even when it is grounded in religious convictions. Based on the experience of the Selective Service from 1970 to 1971, three to seven percent of the population self-identifies as a conscientious objector to war. The National War Tax Resistance Coordinating Committee estimates that there are 10,000 conscientious objectors actively resisting financial participation in the military. (U.S.) National Campaign for a Peace Tax Fund, 1997)

In Canada to date, the Taxes for Peace Movement lags proportionately in size, momentum, and concrete action behind the American movement (Peace Research Institute, Dundas, Ontario, 1999).
CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusions and Discussion

We can best help you to prevent war not by repeating your words and following your methods, but by finding new words and creating new methods.

(Virginia Woolf, Three Guineas, 1938, 143)

To set limits to speculation is treason to the future.

(Alfred North Whitehead, in Shulman, 1981, 11)

I have tried to do two things so far in this study. First, I have tried, in the light of the UNESCO discussion of a 'culture of peace', to present what my own experience in the teaching of English and Media Studies, and research into a part of the history of English teaching in this century in Ontario secondary schools have suggested to me is the present state of the teaching of the English 'canon' with reference to war-related literature. Secondly, I have tried to present a picture, drawn from my findings in a questionnaire and historical study, of the Quaker educational community at the secondary level. This study attempted to discover the relationship between the Quaker Peace Testimony and the teaching of English, specifically war-related literature, and how this relationship might be brought to influence the selection and teaching of the English curriculum in the mainstream of education.

This inquiry has led me to consider broader questions of what it means to teach in a pluralistic, democratic society. The central question among these, it seems to me, is 'how are students allowed to recognize and understand different perspectives?'; that is, do teachers pay attention to both a dominant and accepted, possibly at times invisible, perspective and to perspectives that challenge it? What pressure does this question place on curricular thinking when the existing curriculum has been shaped by a dominant perspective? And where does a teacher's standpoint enter this process? What are the sanctions and processes for a revisioning and reshaping of an English curriculum?
Teaching during the Gulf War

Reflecting on my teaching experience during the Gulf War, I find at least two things to be clear. The first is that the criticism of current skills-based education which holds that students are being led to see through everything and owe allegiance to nothing, while valid and compelling, does not go far enough. That is, at least with regard to my experience of teaching Media Studies during the Gulf War, what was already present in the students as notions to which to owe allegiance - notions of honour, heroism, patriotism, war as justifiable and necessary - were untouched, unchallenged by the narrow range of perspectives offered by the media coverage and media studies commentary. The studies, cited in Chapter Two, of violence in the media, including video games, go some way to describing the cultural air that teenagers breathe, and suggest a significant correlation between the viewing of, and participating in media violence on the one hand, and the desensitizing towards violence and acceptance of it on the other. None of these studies took up the matter of war as an extension of personal and societal violence, nor that of the connection between viewing media violence and the development of attitudes towards war.

Further, I wondered what role the English curriculum had played in presenting stories and images that went with the cultural grain with respect to war, thereby helping to form the notions to which these students held an unchallenged allegiance.

The second thing that became clear to me was the absence of a discourse among mainstream Ontario English teachers and curriculum writers about these matters.

Anthology Study

The anthology study, presented in Chapter Three, offers a view of the history of war in English Literature as these works were selected, annotated, and taught in Ontario English classrooms during the middle and late decades of this century. Through prefaces and introductions, notes, queries and suggested teaching approaches, and the selected works themselves, English anthologists and teachers have helped keep alive a cultural tradition which has in some measure glorified war and which still accepts it as
inevitable. In Old Lies Revisited (1991), Winnifred Whitehead quotes the poet/pacifist of World War I, Siegfried Sassoon:

At the present time [1945] nobody needs disillusioning about war ... The danger seems to be that they accept it in a fatalistic way and that future generations may regard its recurrences as inevitable. (66)

Whitehead adds, "Has anything changed since then? Nearly half a century later, the view of war as inevitable is still with us" (66).

While Russell's "whole foul literature of glory" has been modified over the century, the leaven came not from a systematic revisioning of materials for teaching towards a different kind of culture, but rather from the changing sensibilities of writers as they found expression for the changing realities of war and of twentieth century life. In one way this movement seems simply to reflect how literature lives its life. The figures and tables in Chapter Three show, for example, changes in the presence and nature of war-related literature in anthologies during the sixties. They indicate a shift away from the overt glorification of war, militarily-defined heroism, and blind patriotism in the old British Imperialist manner, and a noticeable decrease in the once pervasive imperialist tone, both in selections and in editorial notes.

In another way, however, the 'movement' is defined, for high school students at least, by the construction of curriculum: the selection of anthologies, of texts, their designation as core or supplementary, and the unit and ways in which (the standpoints from which) they are taught.

Opportunities for Change in Curricular Thinking about War and Peace

This situation suggests to me that there is a continuing space between the literature and the selection and teaching of that literature which could be filled by a new contextualizing. What is new about the ways in which some writers talk about war since World War II (for example, the sense of irony and absurdity in Joseph Heller's Catch 22, the stories of Hemingway)? What voices were already talking in these ways before that time, but not taken up as significantly different; that is, how are they
different not just in degree but in kind (for example, the World War I poets, Siegfried Sassoon, Wilfrid Owen, and Isaac Rosenberg)? If one of the ways in which some writers talk about war suggests that war is neither inevitable nor acceptable, and if we take that suggestion seriously, we then take seriously the question of how to see war. “... ‘inevitable’ is a word that should be unknown to history. It implies a secularized Calvinism, a predestination of all events, and thus robs history of significance” (McNaught, 1999, 191). If one thing in history is inevitable, then all things are.

Examples of Change from Other Discourses

In the last twenty-five years, a large assortment of new anthologies have changed the face if not the heart of English courses. My sampling of Ontario high school English curricula from 1980-1999 suggests however, a much less modified tradition still represented by core texts and by the absence of curriculum writers’ and teachers’ talking about the underlying issues regarding war, the culture, and literature’s relation to both.

Likewise, new aims have been added to course descriptions and curriculum documents. However, while these reflect rethinking on issues of multiculturalism and gender-inclusiveness, they do not reflect rethinking on issues of violence, war and peace in the curriculum, despite the activities of numerous groups in the larger community who have been urging such a general rethinking for some time (Media and Values, Citizens Against Violence in Entertainment, Teachers for Social Responsibility are a few of these groups). Repeatedly, the new course aims appear to present vital opportunities for structuring frameworks of peace/war cultural interrogation; but repeatedly too, these opportunities seem to be bypassed by the directives for teaching focus which concentrate on aesthetic and multicultural considerations. The notion that “there are sanctimonies to deconstruct, amnesias to lift, stories to remember” (Elshtain, 164) is deferred, without even a discursive tremor. There seems to be a kind of twilight zone in place, in which the recognition of a culture of violence approaches and withdraws through skirmishes at the edges, rather
than confident assaults on the core. to borrow and redirect the language of armed conflict. As Whitehead puts it,

...there must be some serious consideration of the root causes of violence. and active opposition to those who, in our modern civilizations, condone its use. Though undoubtedly a small factor in the equation. literature, especially books for young people. can have a part to play either in confirming acceptance of violence as an integral and unavoidable ingredient of modern life or as something we must strive to eradicate (213).

Need to Problematize and Extend the Discourse

What I perceive to be the major finding here, given that the inquiry set out to explore ways in which to construct a “culture of peace,” is a need for English teachers, departments, and curriculum designers to problematize the issue of war-in-literature and the construction of the culture in which it has participated. For this to happen, there would seem to be a need for a concurrent raising of sensibilities in teachers of English at the Faculties of Education, and consequently a need to begin a consciously directed inquiry into ways of redressing an historical and continuing imbalance of curricular selection and theoretically grounded pedagogy.

This experience and research have shown the need to press on what it means to ‘educate for peace’ in a democracy and make that pressure yield a range of possibilities in the broader category of education. The Peace Education section of the 1996 UNESCO document on the implementation of the Nairobi Conference puts the question:

What issues related to transforming the existing culture of violence to a culture of peace would need to be addressed through public policy as a matter of highest priority, especially in terms of publicly provided or regulated services like education? (E/CN6/1996/6)

One answer to this question has produced more of the kind of studies, cited in Chapter Two, on media, family and societal violence, which in turn have produced courses in conflict resolution - interpersonal, business, legal, social - (these courses,
unlike English, are optional) and programmes in schools of peer mediation. I do not suggest, since I have found no clear evidence, that the connection is an explicit acknowledgment of the specific UNESCO document; it seems to be rather a response to societal conditions, that is, to the pervasiveness of violence in contemporary society, the extent to which, and the graphic manner in which it is presented by the media, and the saturation by violence in all forms of entertainment media. One of the problems of leaving the issue of violence on these levels, that is, of not including the acceptance of war in the discourse on violence, might be seen in the remarks of the current American president as he recently addressed the sadly extending series of murders and suicides in North American schools. He urged that we teach our young people to settle problems with their words, not their weapons. In the light of his own current foreign policy, one notices an active cognitive dissonance.

Another answer has produced an opening up of schools and curricula to embrace multiculturalism and a range of sexual orientation. Yet another answer has been to approach the teaching of history from texts offering a wider range of perspectives, even a new understanding of the nature of history itself as partial, fragmented, contingent.

What is the possible role for teachers of English in the project of re-imagining and then re-directing the existing violent culture? Any such project of course would be too big for a single subject to accomplish, but perhaps not to initiate and undertake. What might be the kinds of research required for such a project? Who is and is not asking these questions? UNESCO is obviously asking the questions in the larger context of education in general, as have been peace groups, including the Voice of Women and Educators for Social Responsibility for decades. Individual teachers and departments of English seem not to be involved in a discourse which would articulate the issues and frame the inquiry necessary to proceed with the project.

Processes of Curricular Change

In considering how the curriculum is shaped, Eisner points out that
[t]here is a political process that inevitably must be employed to move from ideological commitment to practical action ... the more public the school and the more heterogeneous the community, the less likely there will be ideological uniformity in schooling. [However,] if one believes that the truth resides in a particular conception of humanity, compromising that conception for political expediency is not necessarily an asset. Perhaps the major virtue of a democracy is the instantiation of a process that allows individuals to exercise choice, even out of ignorance. (Eisner, 1992. 304)

The political process he names as existing “in democratic and pluralistic societies, requires deliberation, debate, adjustment, and compromise” (305). In this way, curriculum resembles the Law in that they can both be seen as processes in which society conducts a dialogue with itself, or selves. So that the matter becomes one, not of whose ideology wins, in which, as Peshkin describes it, “good guys [do] battle with each other as they contend for the right to define what goes on in school” (Peshkin, 1992, 250), but perhaps a matter of how conflicting ideologies are challenged, interrogated, and tempered by contact with each other. And as Tomkins concludes, “we still expect the school to serve overriding moral purposes and...we all retain an enormous faith in the socializing power of the curriculum. The difficult question before us is what or whose moral purposes we believe should be served” (Tomkins, 1984 60). The difficulty increases when the political nature of all this is recognized; that is, as Peshkin notes, “Education is in the political domain of society, and, accordingly, schooling is subject to change in response to new political alignments” (Peshkin, 261).

Further Research Possibilities

Possible research in the area of English might involve two stages: first, an inquiry, broadly conceived at the Ministry and Board levels, as well as at the level of teacher education, into the nature and implications of a project to shift educational thinking towards a democratically more inclusive curriculum in the context of violence, war, and peace. The inquiry at this stage would be a cross-disciplinary analysis. What has been and remains the visible or invisible context, with respect to the culture we have
built and are sustaining, in which we teach all subjects? How might we reframe this context to reflect a conscious intent to transform that culture?

The second stage might consist of subject-specific inquiries into curricular reformation from that new standpoint, at the same levels but including the school department level. Projects in the area of English might include further explorations of the relation between historical forces and canonical/anthological activity, to provide some account of the values implicit in the data and the ways in which value in literature has been and can be negotiated. In other words, what have we taught, how have we taught it (from what acknowledged or unacknowledged standpoints) and what might we valuably be teaching in addition to it? This stage would lead to research into historical and contemporary sources of materials for teaching. Examples of the former might be collections such as the Swarthmore Peace Collection; examples of the latter might be Winnifred Whitehead’s work.

A Model for ‘New’ Anthologies

It is in our schools, suggests Henry Louis Gates, that the reproduction of values occurs; in this he is in agreement with social and educational philosophers such as Dewey, educators such as Diltz, curriculum theorists such as Peshkin, Tomkins and Eisner. Indeed, it is this notion which drives the challenges to the ‘canon’ in contemporary critical commentary. “The teaching of literature goes hand in hand with the teaching of values. Teachers of literature are professors of a human and a diverse culture” (Gates, cited in Rabinowitz, 1988, 29). The goal of examining the ‘canon’ for Gates, and of examining changes in literary study, is to “mobilize and revitalize the institutions that buttress the ‘Western Civilization’ tradition, the status quo…” (29). Gates’ concern has been with “a predominantly all-white, all-male literary canon,” and his perception is that “it is through the existence and the perpetuation of this literary canon that there exists a firmly entrenched racial domination in the selection of literature to be studied” (29). His project therefore has been to produce, in 1990, The Norton Anthology of Afro-American Literature, hoping that
with the creation of this anthology, builders and defenders of curricula will no longer use the unavailability of texts as a reason for not including these literatures in their courses ... the anthology will make these texts accessible to all and will suggest methods of incorporating them in the curriculum alongside our 'favorite' books to teach. (Rabinowitz. 29)

It is perhaps through the vision and work of English scholars like Gates that we might find models for the project identified in this inquiry, with its focus not on racial domination, but instead on a ‘firmly entrenched attitude towards war’, to paraphrase Gates. In his work here, Gates corresponds to Peshkin’s notion (1992) of curricular-change-agent as representative of a subculture, “with subculture conceived loosely as one of the numerous alternative expressions of cultural behavior that contemporary nations harbor” (252). As such an agent, Gates has sought “to have some aspect of culture become manifest in school activity” (252). Drawing on his anthology, teachers will be able to bring to light for students whole areas, through a range of hitherto excluded voices, of American history, in all its complexity and diversity. What it means to be human in the past two hundred years in America will assume a multi-dimensional character, to include aspects of race as well as the already existing, to varying degrees, aspects of class and gender. Similarly, an anthology which compiled works of literature covering the range of experience, belief systems, emotional and intellectual responses, and attitudes towards war might serve students well in their endeavour to make authentic choices regarding the society they will inherit, and may choose to change.

Further Sites for Initiating Curricular Change

Scholars, educators and anthologists like Gates, however, form only one of several categories from which curriculum construction and change derives, and of course he is working at the post-secondary level. Other elements in the public system at the secondary level are boards of education, subject conferences and committees, and curriculum theorists. Yet other elements in the process of curriculum change are community interests and political interest groups, politicians and educational civil
servants. (Peshkin, 252). From whatever group initiative for challenge and change comes, there seems to be a synergistic, if sometimes piecemeal action amongst the elements. Would it be possible, for example, to tease out the precise point of initiation that has resulted in substantial revisions of school curriculum to accommodate and embrace multi-culturalism during the past twenty years, a curriculum that Diltz would be hard put to recognize, let alone condone?

In his discussion of culture, curriculum and fit, in the course of which he describes agents as “conscious activists” (253), Peshkin refers to a study whose statement of purpose takes the form of a rationale: “Given that we live in a multicultural society and a world that is becoming increasingly interdependent, multicultural education is an imperative” (253). He calls this formulation an “if-then type of reasoning …if this type of society and world, then that type of schooling.” The agent’s choice of cultural activity is meant to fit the cultural facts of consequence to her, choosing as she does from a vast array of cultural facts about American society and the world available to her. [Her choices] came not from out of the blue but, rather, from the complex of her personal cultural and subcultural orientations. They represent the cause she wants served by some aspect of curriculum; they are the warrant for the curricular means she endorses” (253). I see my present work as fitting easily into this category of curricular activity.

Model of Research for Anthology Compilation

One study that might be considered exemplary for an inquiry in the area of literary study, is Mark Van Wienen’s exploration of the collected miscellaneous poems by women associated with the Women’s Peace Party during WWI, housed in the Swarthmore University Peace collection.

“More than the introduction of individual writers into the canon, this mass all in some way entering into dialogue with pacifist politics, undermines our confidence that the literary history of modernism is something we already know” (Van Wienen,” 1992, 687). Recognizing that, as John Guillory notes, “the value of the work as representative of a given constituency and its ‘values’ can always be set against the
value of the work as aesthetic artifact” (Guillory, 1987, 486), Van Wienen reminds us that.

[whether or not we appreciate the aesthetics of these poems [many linked directly to the Women’s Peace Party’s anti-American intervention in WWI] written in traditional forms or in prosy free-verse lines, we need to credit the contribution they made to modern American culture. In fact, poets affiliated with the Women’s Peace Party confront the cataclysm of modern war more directly, with a more self-consciously formulated politics, than most better-known writing of the 1910s and 1920s. (688)

In his discussion of Olive Tilford Dargan’s poem, “Beyond War,” Van Wienen claims that the poem “sees poetry not merely as an aesthetic object, nor simply as a reflection of political and social realities, but also as a form of political action” (692); that is, it sees earlier poetry of war as “part of the rhetoric and ideologies by which people ‘sing of their scars’ and thereby justify or even glorify wars” (692). Her poem aims to “concretize and exploit” the connection between poetry and ideology (692).

Van Wienen refers to poet Katherine Blake, from the same collection, who wrote a pacifist stanza which was endorsed “from the beginning of [World War I] up to the United States’ intervention, [by] the president of the New York City Board of Education, “for use at Peace Day celebrations...but probably also for general use” (696):

O say can you see, you who glory in war,
All the wounded and dead of the red battle’s reaping?
Can you listen unmoved to their agonized groans.
Hear the children who starve, and the pale widows weeping?
    Henceforth let us swear
    Bombs shall not burst in air,
Nor war’s desolation wreck all that is fair,
But the star spangled banner by workers unfurled
Shall give hope to the nations and peace to the world.

Van Wienen notes that Peace Day Assemblies continued even after World War I, becoming in some New York schools “occasions for dissent, with their effects felt not
merely in the education of future generations but also in the present political landscape ... an expression of grassroots war opposition" (696). Presumably, the Depression (it is by now a truism to say that dissent is tolerated more in good times than in bad), the large non-pacifist majority in the American population, and the lead-up to World War II, with its gradually decreasing isolationist sentiments, account for the falling off of activities like the Peace Day Assemblies. While there was an inter-war pacifist movement in the United States as in Great Britain, it was "organizationally weaker...its orientation was in some respects more religious; its involvement in active politics - the sense of party politics and not the struggle of the Kingdom of God on earth - was less" (Brock, 1970 156).

Studies like Van Wienen's might usefully be replicated and their discovered works ("set of actively excluded works," Guillory, 199, 484) made available for classroom study as part of our literary tradition, offering as they do, "ways of construing literary politics which diverge from usual treatments" (Van Wienen, 692).

In a fascinating reading, Steven Marx traces the parallel development of vision by Quakers and by Milton. Of Paradise Lost, he suggests that "perhaps the most prominent of all its losses is faith in a military-heroic ethos" (Marx, 1992. 119). Paradise Regained, he argues, sets out Milton's vision of the rejection of this ethos by Christ, and his embracing of the pacifist outlook. An interesting project might be to seek and trace a line of literature from this reading of Milton to the present.

Literature and Peace Research

In their dialogue on peace research, which asked 'what is it, what can it do, what is needed', Kenneth Boulding and Milton Mayer arrived at similar formulations.

"I need peace research to tell me how - other than by standing in the street and getting hit by an egg - to influence politics" (Mayer, in Mayer and Boulding, 1967, 16).

We need studies of how we got personal disarmament in various societies. Read Romeo and Juliet if you want to see a world in which individuals behaved towards each other in the way nations do today; it was a very disagreeable world...We have achieved personal disarmament almost everywhere, except in the wild parts
of the world like Sicily and Texas [and Colorado and Alberta] ... it was a disarmament race ... just because it paid off to disarm. Everybody wore their swords as long as they could. But the historians haven’t written history this way at all; a school of Quaker historians is badly needed. In 1817 was the Rush-Bagot Agreement: this was the Test Ban, this was the partial and incomplete disarmament of the Great Lakes, and this was the beginning of the whole development of the security community in North America but nobody ever asks how. These people. Rush and Bagot, ought to be our national heroes. This is mature conflict behaviour. (Mayer, 23)

By the same token, to get a seldom heard version of heroism, we might valuably look at the joint Macedonian-British film, Before the Rain, in our English courses, in conjunction with Romeo and Juliet, for example. Taking up the central themes of Romeo and Juliet, and set in contemporary Macedonia, the film introduces the possibility of alternative heroism in the hero’s sacrificial turning from the cycle of violence. The image of the photographer-nearly-turned-soldier thrusting aside the rifle offered by his compatriot is a powerful one. As Boulding says, “... the decisions which people are going to make depend on their image of the social system and the way it operates” (18). But it also depends on their image, or range of images, of individual responses to the operations of that system. New heroes, new values, new stories (or recovered heroes, values and stories) can create a ‘new’ history: “these are the things which ultimately affect politics” (Boulding, 16). We might also read the English novelist, Pat Barker’s trilogy, whose first book, Regeneration, tells the story of Siegfried Sassoon’s journey from member of the fox-hunting English aristocracy to officer in the First World War, to pacifist threatened with court-martial, to inmate in a Scottish psychiatric hospital whose administration’s chief task is to make him ‘fit’ to return to the trenches and renounce his pacifism.

Boulding offers the diagram of the “phase system” of ice and water as analogy to our situation of war and peace. The world war industry applies pressure; the warmth of the system is provided by “the level of the community, identity, cultural exchange, commonality of interests” (22). The two ways of moving from war to peace, from ice to water, are by decreasing the pressure through disarmament and by increasing the
temperature, through the devoting of efforts to the range of warmth factors, the category title of which is "education."

"[Literature] of war can have a uniquely powerful impact on the individual reader: but what can it do to change the course of history?" (Whitehead, 270). If it has been, in part, the inclusion in literature curricula of war and war heroes, of militarily-defined courage and honour and patriotism, that has constructed our culture's notions of these things, one could answer the question with one word: much. Among several books Whitehead suggests for readers in the teen years are A Long Way to Go, by Marjorie Darke, and An Inch of Candle, by Alison Leonard. Of these books, whose protagonists are conscientious objectors during WWI, she writes,

Though pacifism is clearly a less exciting and compelling theme than active service in a novel for young people, both writers have made a praiseworthy attempt to involve their readers in the fortunes and difficulties experienced by their protagonists ... [these are lively stories] in which the arguments on both sides make their impact through the events and characters in a way which invites sympathy, and so opens up debate. (Whitehead, 45)

A third novel, The Middle Parts of Fortune, by Frederic Manning, offers, according to Whitehead. "a ready empathy with events and characters, but also, for those who can encompass it, a deeply disturbing analysis of the temptations to battle and the role of war in human history" (61). That is, one of the ways in which we expand our moral imagination is through imaginative literature which causes our sympathies to flow and recoil in ways sometimes unexpectedly, even painfully enlightening.

An interesting related project (though a complicated one because of the several variables that would have to be involved) might be to conduct an inquiry into the responses to this literature, the works discussed by Whitehead and Van Wienen, for example, from different groups of students and teachers. Groups might be selected from mainstream, Mennonite, and Quaker schools. Criteria for selection of student groups might include formal reading history and personal reading preference, involvement with the world of video games, the self-identified approach of the particular school to the
English curriculum (conservative, progressive, experimental). This kind of inquiry might fall in the category of “quasi-experimental” in Shulman’s term (1981), since students would not have been “originally assigned to those schools at random” (Shulman, 7). For teachers, criteria might include professional training background (what was addressed in courses of preparation for English teaching?), exposure to and engagement with the critical discourses around questions of the ‘canon’, postimperialism, feminism, and multiculturalism, which take up implicitly and explicitly issues of violence, war, and peace.

The Quaker Peace Testimony: a Problematical Influence on the Teaching of English

The second thing I have tried to do in this study is to look at one community which has a founding principle of pacifism - the Quakers - with a view to discovering the connections, if any, between their Peace Testimony and their teaching of English. My question at the outset was whether there would be a discernible and, as a potential source of strategies for non-Quaker English teachers in their thinking about a re-visioned literature curriculum, a usefully suggestive influence of the QPT on the teaching of English. Would this be an influence that could help mainstream teachers come to see what Eisner describes as a tendency for a particular ideology, in this case a societal acceptance of war, when it becomes pervasive, to also become invisible (Eisner, 1992, 303)? What I found suggests both flaws in my instrument of investigation and a challenging complexity, several contradictions, and many possibilities in the thinking about and application of the QPT to the teaching of English in Friends schools.

Were I to reshape the questionnaire, my primary instrument in this inquiry, I would try to avoid what was probably a steering effect in the introductory section and in the first five questions concerning the QPT. That is, my assumption that the QPT was understood univocally by Friends to be a statement of absolute pacifism as expressed by George Fox in 1660, led me also to assume that there would be a definite and direct influence on the teaching of war-related literature. I think that these assumptions, submerged but present in the formulation of the questionnaire, led to a confusion or at least an uncertainty in the
respondents as to how to answer the questions. That uncertainty was perhaps compounded by other factors working in the schools. In addition, the questionnaire was too long and complex for teachers to answer satisfactorily. Again, my assumptions no doubt contributed to this problem, as I asked respondents to articulate their reflections on theoretical, ethical connections and pedagogical strategies, personal and religious understandings and professional applications which I assumed were already present, but which are in fact in a state of conflict for them: personally, professionally in their mixed school settings, in their religious community, and in the society at large.

I think too that the sampling of respondents might have been larger had the questionnaire not been problematical in the manner described above. Some to whom I sent it said that they simply did not have the time to work through it. Several asked if I might visit their schools and lead them through a discussion of the questions, which, given my resources, was not possible. This would no doubt have proved a fruitful way of carrying through the inquiry, bringing to life and relating to their practice a complex of what turn out to be problematical issues. From none of the responding teachers or Departments of English did I sense a philosophical reluctance to consider the questions posed to them personally or professionally. Rather, I observed the uncertainty I have mentioned as to how to proceed and an absence of formal address of the issues in their individual and corporate curricular deliberations. In many instances, a clouding factor seems to have been a still-dominant historical set of aesthetic criteria for selection and valorization in relation to the English curriculum.

Some factors compounding the uncertainty mentioned above likely include first, the minority status of Friends both on faculty and in the student body of Friends schools; second, the desirability of Friends schools by both Quakers and non-Quakers, as rigorous preparation for places in the ‘best’ colleges; third, the consequent presence and pressures of the larger, non-Quaker, violence-permeated culture in Friends schools; fourth, the need for funding; fifth, the range and contradictions in interpretation of the QPT in the wider community of Friends; and sixth, the apparent absence of a conscious, articulated, and systematic attention to the ‘problems’ in the ‘canon’ with regard to war.
The first four factors, closely related, seem to be compounded by the fifth, while the sixth could be seen as a consequence, in part, of the fifth, but also as reflective of a larger reality in English teaching.

In his discussion of ‘subculture’ in relation to ideology and curriculum, Eisner refers to the Amish,

whose views of life ripple throughout the curriculum their schools provide. The congruence between their general view of the world and the worldview into which their children are initiated is virtually isomorphic. Curriculum ideology shaping Amish schools is essentially an extension of the relatively consistent worldview of Amish parents. (Eisner, 1992, 303)

While a superficial application of this description might be made to Friends schools, my research suggests that, because of the factors mentioned above, the cases are significantly different. While the Amish, and the Mennonites in Canada, have historically been segregationalist, particularly in the context of education. Quakers have been integrationalist to a marked extent. That is, their originating principles called on them to be active witnesses to the world of their testimonies. They have been in the forefront of bringing about and reforming education systems, reforming and humanizing prison systems and vitalizing and giving momentum to political movements. They maintain a strong and valued presence at the United Nations. They have served on public school boards and have welcomed into their own schools non-Quakers.

The latter has led to a mixing of inimical values from the larger society in their schools (as noted by several respondents), and while this in itself might, in theory, produce a healthy tension and creative dialogue (as it does in a different way in the mainstream context), since these schools depend for a large part of their funding on the support of non-Quaker families, bent on their children achieving purely academic success, it seems from this research to be the case that the mix has worked to inhibit the flourishing of a wholly Quaker educational ethos, specifically of a Quaker-conceived English curriculum. By this I do not mean to suggest that the curriculum is un-Quakerly; rather that it is difficult to find evidence that the Peace Testimony, for example, informs curricular thinking in English teachers and departments, or that it does this to the extent that it might
in a Friends school composed more completely of Quaker students and staff. I found no example of such a school in my sampling.

These factors go some way to explaining the apparent absence of a similar attention to the notion of English teaching as a potential site for the application of the QPT, whatever its interpretation, to exploring what it might mean to create a different culture from the existing one.

Respondents to the questionnaire seemed insistent on speaking in personal and general terms about the QPT; that is, they spoke of what the testimony meant to themselves and they spoke of it as it is acted out in the daily life of the individual school. But when they came to try to address the questions about how it might affect thinking about the English curriculum, there was a marked absence of focus and of specific reference. Thus, the findings, in terms of quantity and focus, were disappointing; but that is perhaps itself a significant finding.

It would be interesting to pursue this line of inquiry in the mode of Action Research, a form of practitioner inquiry which would involve the research practitioner in this case working with Quaker teachers as they plan curriculum, whether individually or in departmental meetings, and as they teach English in the classroom. Setting the QPT in juxtaposition to the actual curriculum and perhaps to experimentally additional material might be one way to bring the 'problem' into relief. What are our limits in reading literature? What are the reading strategies which will allow students to identify and challenge represented values? For not only is the studying of different representative texts important; students must be able to assess what values are being portrayed in these texts. Making the struggle part of curricular thinking and part of the curriculum might be an effective strategy for change. Indeed, the presence of the 'outside' culture 'within the gates' perhaps offers a clear and immediate challenge to those called to an active witness to the Peace Testimony. This would seem to be a cultural moment for Quakers to demonstrate a creative, radical resistance to trends in the larger society which point to an increasing rather than a decreasing acceptance of violence and war.
As the research in Chapter Three suggests, Federico Mayor's 1995 call for the creation of a culture of peace, pre-supposing a culture of 'not peace', seems not to have yet produced, at the mainstream secondary school level, a radical rethinking of English curriculum or pedagogy. This is not to say that changes have not occurred, that the Vietnam War, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the 'end' of the Cold War, the Gulf Wars, the War against Yugoslavia have not had their influence on individual teachers' thinking about the place of war in the tradition of English Literature and in the English curriculum. Nor does it ignore the trend, suggested by the graphs of the Anthology study, away from a preponderance of literature glorifying war and towards a more inclusive view of the phenomenon.

In his conclusion to War, Gwynne Dyer points to the need for an expansion of what he calls our "moral imagination ... to embrace the whole of mankind, or else we will perish" (Dyer, 1985, 261). He speaks of the soldier's sacrifice as conferring a dignity on him: "It is a deeply entrenched notion in any culture with a military tradition" (Dyer, 262). One of the entrenching tools has been the study and teaching of literature. The rhetoric of war continues to connect human thought and discourse through imagery and reference.

When the truth of diversity is embraced, the humanities are understood as a great collection of stories that we humans tell to each other, hoping to make some sense of our lives, hoping to make connections in both space and time, hoping to resist and counter those forces which stifle our humanity, spiritually and physically ... to keep faith with a story is to grant it authority and to give it new shape within the context of one's historical moment. (Warehime, 1993, 169)

Questions and Possibilities

Questions remain: how might things be ordered differently in a totally Quaker secondary school setting? What if the QPT were given a priority status in all aspects of a Friends school; that is, if the non-violent settling of disputes within the school, within the society, and among nations were given a central role in the formation of not only pedagogy and the running of the school, but also in the setting of curriculum? Would
such a move lead to a democratizing of the curriculum, specifically the English curriculum. ensuring that all perspectives, including a range of pacifists, were examined?

The real question before us as a religious society is how are we going to integrate our religious insights into...knowledge...There is no Quaker Academy of Arts and Sciences, there is no Quaker Rand Corporation; the Devil has all the money and buys all the brains, and we come out with insights and that’s about all. (Kenneth Boulding, 1966, 27)

One answer to this question might be to look at the school curriculum, specifically the English curriculum, and find what ways might serve to integrate Quaker “insights into knowledge.”

Further, what is the possibility that such a revitalized, transformative phenomenon could have a similar influence on mainstream schooling? This last question might best be answered by entertaining the notion of further interaction, in the form, for one example, of Action Research, between the two ‘communities’. The encouragement of such an intention is a large part of the aim of the present study. The Quaker educational community remains for me the likeliest site for experimental application of alternative visions and approaches to a widening and deepening, a democratization of the literature curriculum. I think that in a successful instance of such interaction, between teacher or teachers from inside one community and teacher/researcher from another, with a shared commitment to democratic education and to the subject matter, and between these representatives and students, the dynamics can ‘stir up trouble’, bring to the foreground previously unrecognized issues and problems, lead to personal and professional insights, invite teaching moments of epiphany, produce new patterns and directions.

In this inquiry I have used a number of methods from the realm of qualitative research: a study of historical documents, a study of literary anthologies, a questionnaire, personal interviews, a specific period of classroom teaching experience; and I have drawn on a substantive knowledge and teaching experience of English Literature and Media Studies, and scholarly work in Peace Research. This intersection of the Humanities with the Social Sciences, while not immediately nor entirely an easy fit, as I have suggested, has shown me an exciting set of possibilities for further inquiry.
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