Peace and Social Justice Education on Campus

Peace and Social Justice Education on Campus:

Faculty and Student Perspectives

Edited by

Kelly Concannon and Laura L. Finley

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

I dedicate this book, as with all my previous efforts, to my husband Peter Finley and daughter Anya Finley. They both love me despite my continual inclination to take on way too much, this book included. I love you both with all my heart.

—Laura Finley

I dedicate this book to my daughter, Gracie Estelle, whose beauty and intellectual curiosity continuously inspire me to remain hopeful, as we find meaningful ways to make the world a better place.

—Kelly Concannon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SERIES INTRODUCTION

PEACE STUDIES:
EDGES AND INNOVATIONS

Peace Studies: Edges and Innovations is a book series edited by PJSA Board Members Michael Minch and Laura Finley. The intent of the series is to fill in gaps in the conflict, peace, justice, and reconciliation literature while presenting texts that are on the cutting edge of the discipline. The series includes both edited collections and solo-authored books that combine academic rigor and accessible prose, making them appealing to scholars, classrooms, activists, practitioners and policymakers.

Books in the series focus on re-conceptualizing and expanding peace education, looking to and drawing from communities that have been marginalized, overlooked, or forgotten; identifying new understandings of the roles that gender, multiculturalism and diversity play in the creation of a sustained peace; promoting innovative peacebuilding strategies and movements related to positive peace and justice; exploring the relationship between peace studies and other contemporary problematics, such as climate change and the rights of indigenous peoples; addressing the overlap, interpenetration and symbiosis between peace and conflict studies and other disciplinary areas; and analyzing current issues in criminal justice, with an emphasis on restorative alternatives. Due to the breadth of the topic matter, the series is appropriate for readers of all disciplinary traditions.

In sum, the series aims to promote the most interesting and promising trends or movements in the field of peace and conflict studies. It is also intended to render more visible the unique contributions of peacemakers and to promote the mission and goals of the PJSA.

The Peace and Justice Studies Association is a binational nonprofit organization with the mission of creating a just and peaceful world through research, education and action. PJSA **is dedicated to bringing together scholars, K-12 teachers and grassroots activists to explore alternatives to violence and share visions and strategies for**

peacebuilding, social justice, and social change. The organization serves as a professional association for scholars in the field of peace and conflict studies, and is the North American affiliate of the International Peace Research Association. Additional information about PJSA can be found at www.peacejusticestudies.org.

Books in the Series

Amster, Randall, Finley, Laura, McKutcheon, Richard and Pries, Edmund. (Eds.) 2015. *Peace Studies Traditions and Innovations*.

Standish, Katerina. 2015. Forthcoming. *Challenging Cultural Violence in the Classroom in Israel.*

Finley, Laura and Concannon, Kelly. (Eds.) 2015. Forthcoming. *Peace and Social Justice Education on Campus: Faculty and Student Perspectives*.

INTRODUCTION

LAURA FINLEY AND KELLY CONCANNON

Today's undergraduate students are faced with many challenges. From growing societal inequality to global and local violence and unrest, students more than ever must leave college equipped not only with the skills and knowledge to lead, but also with the wisdom, maturity, and vision required to make the world a better place (Astin and Astin 2000). Such preparation can be accomplished when institutions allow faculty to model and help students engage in critical examination of social issues, reflection on their role as part of the problem, and identification and support for engagement both inside and outside the classroom. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) (2002) has implored institutions of higher education to make serious efforts to not only educate but also to prepare students to be active contributors in their communities: "Institutions should foster intellectual honesty, responsibility for society's moral health and for social justice, active participation as a citizen of a diverse democracy, discernment of the ethical consequences of decisions and action, and a deep understanding of one's self and respect for the complex identities of others, their histories and their cultures" (AACU, xii).

Although liberal arts colleges have long integrated curricula that emphasize peace, social justice and human rights, and many campuses have at least one student group focused on such efforts, in recent years there has been a surge in more specific, formal programs that are tied specifically to the college or university mission (Calderwood 2003). This is perhaps in response to research showing that, while students are likely to say they received coursework on multiculturalism, they are much less likely to report having received specific coursework on what social justice means, what a socially just society would look like, and how they can go about being part of the solution (Singh et al. 2010). Many private schools and even some public universities like Arizona State have added graduate programs in social justice (Smith 2012). Colleges of Business, too, have begun to integrate social issues in their curricula, although the focus is

often largely on corporate social responsibility rather than specifically
social justice issues (Toubiana 2012).

Yet, as many have noted, higher education's rhetoric far exceeds its
actual performance in regard to true peace and social justice education
inside and outside the confines of classrooms (Calderwood 2003; Harkavy
2006). Simply adding a program is not enough. Students and faculty must
also be afforded opportunities to engage in peace and social justice
activism on and off campus. Bok (1988), Boyer (1996), Marullo and
Edwards (2000) and others have criticized higher education for continuing
to privilege the "scholarship of discovery," rather than pedagogy,
application, and engagement (Marullo and Edwards 2000, 895).
Institutions often say they are devoted to peace and social justice but fail
to provide the institutional support for faculty, staff and students to grapple
with precisely what that means and how best to achieve the aim of a more
peaceful and just society (Concannon and Finley 2015).

The following section offers a brief overview of the key definitions,
concepts and theories in social justice and peace education.

Defining Social Justice and Peace Education

Social justice can be defined in many ways. Calderwood (2003)
explained "social justice works to undo socially created and maintained
differences in material conditions of living so as to reduce and eventually
eliminate the perpetuation of the privilege of some at the expense of
others" (302). Bell (1997) defines social justice as being both a goal and a
process, while Marullo and Edwards (2000) refer to it as an "attempt to
alter the structural or institutional practices that produce excessive or
unjustified inequalities or that treat people unfairly—for example,
discriminating against people on the basis of race, sex, social class,
religion, nationality, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disability status"
(899). Building on these definitions of social justice, "The goal of social
justice education is full and equal participation of all groups in a society
that is mutually shaped to meet their needs'' (Bell 1997, 3). Further, "the
process for attaining the goal of social justice . . . should be democratic
and participatory, inclusive and affirming of human agency and human
capacities for working collaboratively to create change'' (Bell 1997, 4).
Thus, the focus is on both the end of *what* is to be achieved—addressing
structural inequalities—as well as *how* one achieves it.

Social justice education draws from a variety of pedagogical traditions, such as peace education, critical pedagogy, multicultural education, civic education, anti-oppressive education, and partnership education (Bajaj and Brantmeier 2011; Eisler 2000; hooks 1994; Kushamiro 2009). It also draws from multiple disciplines, including sociology, psychology, composition and rhetoric, women's studies, educational studies, and conflict analysis and resolution. Most definitions of social justice education integrate the notion of praxis, as offered by famed Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (1970). To Freire and his followers, praxis is the combination of reflection and action, all with the intent of challenging and reducing inequalities by offering voice to those who are marginalized, and improving communities (Cipolle 2010). Hackman (2005) explains that "social justice education does not merely examine difference or diversity but pays careful attention to the systems of power and privilege that give rise to social inequality, and encourages students to critically examine oppression on institutional, cultural, and individual levels in search of opportunities for social action in the service of social change" (104). Hackman (2005) has identified five essential components of social justice education:

1) Content mastery;
2) Tools for critical analysis;
3) Tools for social change;
4) Tools for personal reflection; and
5) An awareness of multicultural group dynamics (104).

Social justice and peace education should include examination of power and privilege. That is, social justice education must acknowledge and address the historical and current power differentials among students, between teachers and students, and between academe and the community. Students sometimes feel powerless when they learn about social inequalities, as they are taught in ways that fail to highlight the social structural roots of the problem. Students are often led to believe that there is little, if anything, that they can do to address these larger issues (Concannon and Finley 2015). Likewise, communities often feel as though academics live in the so-called "ivory tower" and don't understand the real issues they face (Finley 2004). Examinations of power differentials and active attempts to reduce them are essential if higher education is to have any role in eradicating social inequalities.

Similarly, peace education is rooted in the notion that education is necessary for peace. Education for peace is characterized by an attention to

human dignity, and dignity is inextricably linked to social justice (Ragland 2012; Ragland 2015; Reardon 1988). Peace educators are concerned not just with what is taught but also the methods of instruction. As Kester (2010) explained, "peace education as a practice and philosophy refers to matching complementary elements between education and society, where the social purposes (i.e. why teach), content (i.e. what to teach), and pedagogy (i.e. how to teach) of the educative process are conducive to fostering peace. Accordingly, peace education is a dialogical experience conducted through participatory learning, where learners communally and cooperatively grapple with contemporary issues (i.e. talking points) related to local and global contexts" (2). Kester (2014) explained, "Peace education does not pour knowledge into the minds of students or tell students what to do. Nor does peace education utilize a system of experts who come into the classroom and tell students what to think. Peace education helps learners begin to raise questions and gives students the tools they need to direct their learning. It is an education about how to learn, not what to learn" (2). Jing Lin (2006) noted that peace educators should seek to inculcate students with "peace intelligence." Peace intelligence is "a form of intelligence that is associated with a deep love for all lives, a deep compassion for all existences, a courage and a conviction for unconditional forgiveness and reconciliation. It is the ability to see others' losses as our losses, others' pain as our own pain. It is cultivating the ability to coexist in a peaceful, respectful manner" (68). Critical peace educators call for emotionally-engaged education, a pedagogical approach that "can leave a long lasting, even transformative impression on students that outlives the details of course content" (Murphy-Geiss 2008, 378).

Giroux (2014) argues for political pedagogy. Distinct from politicizing pedagogy, "which insists wrongly that students think as we do," political pedagogy "teaches students by example and through dialogue about the importance of power, social responsibility, and of taking a stand (without standing still) while rigorously engaging the full range of ideas about an issue" (43). He explains, "What is important about this type of critical pedagogy is the issue of responsibility as both a normative issue and a strategic act. Responsibility not only highlights the performative nature of pedagogy by raising questions about the relationships that students have to teachers but also the relationship that students have to themselves and others" (44).

Transformative teaching is a type of peace and social justice education. Transformative teaching involves asking students to critically question and

assess the beliefs and assumptions that shape how they interact in the world. It is a type of teaching that promotes social change. Transformative teaching reaches students cognitively as well as affectively (Taylor 2006). Through reflective writing and engaged dialogue, transformative teaching prepares learners at all levels and in a variety of locations (not just the classroom) to make personal and social change (Taylor 2006). As Brown (2006) explains, it is a "see-feel-change sequence" that will result in personal and societal transformation (732).

Additionally, students better understood social justice issues and became more committed to working as allies when they were asked to participate in perspective-taking exercises coupled with structured opportunities for personal reflection (Broido 2000; Nagda, Gurin, and Lopez 2003; Mayhew and Deluca-Fernandez 2007). In her research about how college students become social justice allies, Broido (2000) found that students were most impacted by serious and sustained dialogue about social justice issues. In their study of five social-justice-oriented classes, Mayhew and Deluca-Fernandez (2007) found that students were most likely to report greater understanding and commitment to social justice when they are taught from a sociological approach that emphasizes societal structures and inequalities. Smith and Lau (2013) found that students in programs that explicitly endorsed social justice goals develop more interest and commitment to taking action. In sum, students must understand how social injustices are socially constructed and, consequently, can be socially deconstructed.

One of the most effective means of helping students and faculty engaged in peace and social justice education is the utilization of dialogue and narratives. In a project supported by the NCTE Commission on Social Justice entitled *Narratives of Social Justice Teaching*, Miller, Beliveau, DeStigter, Kirkland, and Rice (2000) discuss the need for a "fourthspace"—a space where teachers can reflect on pedagogies and practices (1). Just as students need opportunities to reflect on what they are learning, faculty need to share their work, find ways to support one another, and identify new opportunities for collaborative activism (Rodriguez, Chambers, Gonzalez, and Scheurich 2010). Calderwood (2003) has called for the development of a "professional community for social justice," in which those engaging in social justice education can provide support and encouragement for one another and can celebrate achievements and small victories.

Peace and social justice education can be integrated into any class, but must take place outside of the classroom confines in order for true social change to occur. Educators must share with students their work and can invite students to join. In Broido's study, students also noted that the social justice activism or advocacy in which they became involved was rarely self-initiated (2000). Rather, they were "recruited" by professors or by peers (Broido 2000). In addition to discussing their own social justice activism, guest speakers can inform students of local opportunities, especially if these opportunities are not part of the overarching structure of the course. In sum, professors must not only use a variety of creative and engaging tactics to teach about and for peace and justice, but they must also introduce students to opportunities for activism outside of the classroom boundaries.

Service-learning has become a popular method of peace and social justice education occurring outside the classroom. This form of experiential learning allows students to better understand course content while helping to meet an important community need. In ideal service-learning initiatives, students, faculty, the university and the community organization all benefit. Through service-learning, students better understand social inequalities and can become part of reducing or eradicating them (Alberle-Grasse 2000; Astin and Astin 2000; Dale and Kalob 2006: Harkavy 2006; Koliba 2000; Mayhew and Deluca 2007; Osanloo 2009; Roschelle, Turpin and Elias 2000). In *"Writing with the Community: Social Cognitive Rhetoric, Intercultural Discourses, and the Community Literacy Center,"* Thomas Deans (2000) acknowledges the importance of reflection in service-learning that integrates course materials, dialogue, and action. He explores the significance of the Community Literacy Center, where participants work directly with urban residences on issues related to language and literacy.

Community-based research (CBR) is another form of peace and social justice education and activism. "CBR is collaborative, change-oriented research that engaged faculty members, students, and community members in projects that address a community-identified need" (Strand et al. 2003, 5). By participating in CBR projects, students understand the causes and consequences of social inequalities, and the research process allows them to see themselves as change agents. CBR simultaneously helps communities address critical social issues while it aids universities as they seek to build positive relationships in the community (Strand et al. 2003). CBR offers a challenge to the typical power dynamics of higher education,

as it involves equally students, faculty, and community partners (Cox 2009; Strand et al. 2003).

Social Justice and Peace Activism

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970)*,* Paulo Freire offered "a blueprint for resistance to oppression as well as for empowerment of the individual to become an active member of society and overcome discrimination, poverty, and inequality" (Print et al. 2009, 118). The idea is that in order for people to really "live" the values of peace, justice and human rights, they must be involved in real or life-like situations that can be emancipative—both individually and collectively. Participants should learn that human rights, peace, and social justice must be the work of everyone in a community, not just governments or state actors (Print et al. 2009). In essence, the call of Freire (1970) was one of activism.

According to Gorski (n.d.), there are five phases of social justice activism. Stage one is referred to as "food, festivals and fun." This type of activism focuses on celebrating diversity through cultural activities. Such events bring people together and make them feel good, but are little more than surface-area social justice activism. Stage two involves charitable giving, whereby activists want to support an issue or organization but don't want to get involved in a commitment deeper than donation. At stage three, social justice activism involves individual advocacy. Passionate individuals take action as advocates or allies, but don't necessarily risk their own privilege by lobbying for systemic change. Stage four involves service and volunteerism, whereby individuals work with oppressed communities. Finally, in stage five, activism involves systemic reform. Activists focus on unjust laws, policies and conditions.

Research has shown that most teaching at the K-12 and college levels focuses on the rational, rather than the emotional or relational (Brown 2006; Taylor 2006). A study conducted by researchers Keith Yoder and Jean Decety (2014) from the University of Chicago found that the brains of passionate social justice activists actually operate differently. That is, an emotional trigger to an injustice like racism prompts social justice activists to access the parts of their brains that are responsible for logic and reasoning. To activists, social justice *is* rational and logical. To remain silent and inactive is to remain complicit.

These and many other creative tactics can and have made real change. The following section provides a short description of the historical importance and achievements of campus activism in the U.S.

The Importance of Campus Activism

Students have been active participants in organizing and activism, both on and off campuses, since the Cold War. During Cold War-era protests, student activists were, like their counterparts off campus, generally labeled communists and traitors. Hoefferle (n.d.) has documented the existence of student groups like the Student Peace Union (SPU), Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) and Americans for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) since the 1950s. Such groups held meetings, vigils and rallies and organized letter-writing campaigns to raise awareness about the futility of nuclear weapons and to prompt the government toward nuclear disarmament. A true student-based antiwar movement formed in the years following 1965, largely in response to the commitment of combat troops to Vietnam, the escalating draft calls and diminishing draft deferments for their peers at colleges and universities, and the increased visibility of off-campus antiwar protests. Southern college students formed the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in 1960, which became a pivotal force in the civil rights movement, working with other organizations to hold sit-ins, demonstrations, voter-registration drives and more (Best, Nocella, and McLaren 2010).

Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was the largest of the student organizations, in large part due to their highly organized, large protest in Washington D.C. in April of 1965. The organization came to be known for its anti-Vietnam work, although it was also involved with anti-poverty and other efforts. The large turnout in Washington D.C., an estimated 20,000, received significant media attention, and resulted in a growth in SDS's membership from 1,000 paid members in June 1964 to an estimated 100,000 members in 350 chapters by 1968 (Hoefferle n.d.). SDS noted that "modern universities are little more than the training and research branches of the capitalist imperialist system" and accused higher education of merely training students to be cogs in the machine (Best, Nocella, and McLaren 2010).

Beginning in 1965, SDS worked with the National Student Association (NSA), which represents all the student governments from colleges and universities across the U.S. to oppose the draft. By 1966, the NSA

advocated abolition of the draft, denouncing "any system of forced service to the government" and the government's compelling of "its citizens to kill."

Another tactic the student groups used was teach-ins, which involved a series of workshops on campus devoted to better understanding issues of war, peace, justice and nonviolence. In the spring of 1965, 120 universities held antiwar teach-ins, with the largest at the University of California at Berkeley. Some 12,000 attended (Hoefferle n.d.). New campus groups emerged as a result of the activities of SDS and the teach-ins. Some groups engaged in civil disobedience, using pickets and sit-ins that defied campus regulations. Many were arrested and some students were even expelled (Hoefferle n.d.).

While activists in general were not always well received by the public, the response to student activism was strong and often negative. "Student activism on these issues usually met with strong resistance and criticism from authorities and fellow students. This in turn further radicalized activists. In the 1964-65 academic year, roughly twelve percent of American campuses witnessed some form of antiwar activism. By the 1967-68 academic year that number had increased to over thirty-five percent" (Hoefferle n.d., 7).

Media tended to focus on the most extreme actions, which prompted university authorities to crack down on student activism and often resulted in alienation from family and friends. In fall 1964, Jack Weinberg, Mario Savio and other students at the University of California-Berkeley protested the university's ban on political activity and fundraising. When Weinberg was arrested for failing to show identification when requested, Savio jumped onto the police car, spawning a protest that grew to some 3,000 students. Students occupied the administration building for two months following, and eventually Chancellor Martin Meyerson conceded to creating designated free speech places and times on campus (Best, Nocella, and McLaren 2010). In March 1965, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Director J. Edgar Hoover testified before the House Appropriations Committee that the campus antiwar protests were the work of communists despite having no evidence to support those accusations. That April, the FBI began interrogating SDS members in order to intimidate them and undermine their antiwar activism. Portrayed as "communist dupes and spoiled young rich kids who used outrageous antics to rebel against their parents, student activists found it difficult to gain respect and influence the wider public" (Hoefferle n.d., 7).

As protests continued at places like Berkeley, government officials pledged to "clean up the mess," or in other words, stifle students and faculty. In 1967, SDS activist Bob Feldman discovered documents revealing that Columbia University had been engaged in weapons research for the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA), a think-tank for the Department of Defense. In response, SDS and other student groups organized protests from April 1967 to April 1968 demanding that the university end weapons-related research. On April 23, 1968, students clashed with police, which prompted an occupation of Hamilton Hall, which housed the university's administration. On April 30, the NYPD stormed the hall, dragging students from the building. 700 students were arrested, 150 injured, and 30 suspended. Not to be dissuaded, the protests continued and eventually the university agreed to sever ties with IDA as well as to some of the students other demands (Best, Nocella, and McLaren 2010). In 1969, California Governor Ronald Reagan sent the National Guard to quell protests over People's Park, an area the university had created as a baseball field but that activists were using. A melee ensued in which more than a dozen people were hospitalized and one student was killed (Best, Nocella, and McLaren 2010). The most infamous example of excessive police force against peaceful protest was the May 4, 1970 killing of four and injuring of nine Kent State University students by the Ohio National Guard, which had been called in by Governor James Rhodes to break up student protests against the U.S. invasion of Cambodia. Some 1,000 guardsmen were called to the campus (Best, Nocella, and McLaren 2010).

In sum,

> from the first nationally-publicized student anti-Vietnam war protest in 1965 to the street battles between student protesters and police on the streets of Chicago in 1968 and 1969, to the Kent State massacre, to the waves of large-scale campus protests in the early seventies, student antiwar protests galvanized the nation and forced it to confront the meaning of the Vietnam War. While the anti-Vietnam war movement was much wider than the university community, young Americans out-numbered other groups in most protests and the media quickly identified university students as the rank and file of the antiwar movement (Hoefferle n.d., 1).

Although the attention to student activism waned with the end of the Vietnam War, the work of students to oppose injustices did not cease (Best, Nocella, and McLaren 2010). Students remained active in supporting civil rights, women's rights, LGBT rights, and in challenging U.S. militarism and imperialism. The 1980s saw a wealth of campus-based

activism related to U.S. imperialism in Central America and against apartheid in South Africa, while the 1990s saw growing discontent with global capitalism, environmental degradation, and human rights violations. Student activists have challenged corporate use of sweatshops and the mistreatment and poor wages of workers, as well as animal exploitation (Best, Nocella, and McLaren 2010). As Best, Nocella and McLaren (2010) note, "Akin to tactics of bullying and termination that administrators apply to professors, so university brass often intimidate radical students and threaten them with expulsion. Even at posh and affluent ivy-league universities like Harvard and Yale, graduate students trying to organize unions (often in alliance with university staff, service, and maintenance workers), and the professors bold enough to openly support them, were met with hostile defiance" (53).

Challenges in Teaching for Peace and Social Justice

One of the primary challenges in enacting peace and social justice education in higher education is that, as Peter Katopes (2009), Henry Giroux (2014) and others have argued, college and universities have become increasingly corporatized:

> Those concerned with this trend have predominately focused their attention on the large 'research one' universities that receive the most government and corporate funding to develop intellectual commodities that advance business and strategic military imperatives…[yet] even college campuses that have historically upheld the value of a liberal arts education that transcends the immediate needs of the workplace or marketplace are increasingly borrowing architecture, priorities, and language from corporate elites in order to compete in the global knowledge marketplace (Oparah 2014, 101).

Giroux (2014) explains, "The effects of the assault are not hard to discern. Universities are being defunded, tuition fees are skyrocketing, faculty salaries are shrinking as workloads are increasing, and faculty are being reduced to a subaltern class of migrant laborers...class sizes are ballooning, curriculum is stripped of liberal values, research is largely assessed for its ability to produce profits, administrative staffs are being curt back, governance has been handed over to paragons of corporate culture, and valuable services are being outsourced or curtailed" (30). Katopes (2009) argues that "the business model, which prizes 'customer satisfaction' or 'efficiency' above all else, has led in higher education to an imbalance in the relation between student and institution, has led to a culture of

entitlement and instant gratification, and has causal ties to the current fiscal crisis." As Harkavy (2006) notes, "when universities openly and increasingly pursue commercialization, it powerfully legitimizes and reinforces the pursuit of economic self-interest by students and contributes to the widespread sense among them that they are in college solely to gain career skills and credentials" (14). Giroux (2014) explains that,

> Delivering employability has reshaped the connection between knowledge and power while rendering faculty and students as professional entrepreneurs and budding customers. The notion of the university as a center of critique and a vital democratic public sphere that cultivates the knowledge, skills, and values necessary for the production of a democratic polity is giving way to a view of the university as a marketing machine essential to the production of neoliberal subjects (56).

Attacks on the alleged "liberal bias" of universities have also contributed to the stifling of peace and justice education and activism. At the helm of these culture wars is former Vice-President Dick Cheney's wife Lynn, who co-founded the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA) in 1995, which purportedly aims to "promote academic freedom and diversity, academic excellence, and accountability in higher education," via "lofty rhetoric that masked a lowly motive to squash the 'liberal bias' in education, to attack diversity-oriented programs, to regulate classroom discourse, and to extirpate critical intellectuals and radicals" (Best, Nocella, and McLaren 2010, 61). ACTA issued a report called "Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America" that critiqued universities for failing to more vehemently support the U.S. war on terror. The report contained 117 instances of campus anti-Americanism, all of which were taken out of context or complete fabrications. In fact, the report "was a political hit list that posted online the names and affiliations of professors ACTA deemed insufficiently patriotic" (Best, Nocella and McLaren 2010, 62). Like ACTA, David Horowitz has made a career out of attacking any professor with the inkling of a radical idea. Horowitz has published numerous books and other diatribes in which he "outs" the "worst professors in America." "Like many conniving idealogues with totalitarian aspirations, Horowitz has enlisted an army of followers who do his bidding and toe the party line. On some 200 campuses, he has organized a network of Republican youth groups including Students for Academic Freedom (SAF) who join him as foot soldiers in the culture war" (Best, Nocella, and McLaren 2010, 64). Students in SAF and other groups are sent into classes, sometimes for pay, to record their "radical" professors and then to post the comments on

sites such as Campus Watch, the David Project, and discoverthenetworks .org. "Surveillance and enforcement of patriotically correct standards casts a chill and paranoia over the classroom, as professors frequently second-guess and self-censor course material and lectures" (Best, Nocella, and McLaren 2010, 77).

Another structural challenge to teaching for peace and social justice in the classroom is the short class periods that are typical in higher education. True critical and reflective dialogue that allows each student's voice to emerge takes time and can be challenging to fit in the normal 50-minute class period (Taylor 2006). Calderwood (2013) explained that educators often find their attempts at social justice education to be solitary, not communal, and to be increasingly difficult due to the heavy workloads and burdens placed on them. Further, classroom spaces are not ideally suited to transformative approaches. The standard lecture hall with its stadium-style seating is perfect for the "sage on the stage" style education, what Paolo Freire referred to as "banking education." It is difficult, however, to coordinate a dialogue in a room of 100 or more students in fixed desks, all facing front (Finley 2004; Sperber 2000). Students, too, are generally accustomed to this dominator-style teaching (Eisler 2000), and thus resist methods that are more engaging and in which power is shared. As Giroux (2014) explains,

> What sets this generation of young people apart from past generations is that today's youth have been immersed since birth in relentless action, spreading neoliberal pedagogical apparatus with its celebration of an unbridled individualism and its near pathological disdain for community, public values, and the public good. They have been inundated by a market-driven value system that encourages a culture of competitiveness and produces a theater of cruelty, the effect of which is to weaken their ability to see and act politically (72).

Student and teacher roles are deeply engrained and reinforced in popular culture that depicts the heroic teacher inspiring and saving his or her passive and apathetic students (Sperber 2000). Further, transformative learning only works when students and professors have meaningful, authentic relationships. Students must feel comfortable to share their feelings and beliefs (Taylor 2006). These relationships are not easy to develop in large classes or when the classroom timing and structure focuses on monologue rather than dialogue. As Broido (2000) found, it is essential that students feel comfortable expressing different viewpoints, as often students note that their peers are hesitant to offer divergent views in class in case they appear to be racist, sexist, or otherwise unpopular.

What is often missing from accounts of social justice and peace education is the perspective of students. As Giroux (2014) explains, "Young people are increasingly devalued as knowledgeable, competent, and socially responsible, in spite of the fact that their generation will inevitably be the leaders of tomorrow" (122). Professors often complain that students resist social justice education. Bauerlein (2010) explained that professors tend to locate this resistance in students' backgrounds, suggesting that they have not experienced injustice so do not understand it or, conversely, do see it and feel guilty and thus wish not to discuss their benefits. Yet, "these explanations prevail in spite of the oft-asserted axiom that teachers should listen to students, take their responses seriously, and avoid the authoritarian posture. How does this contradiction continue?" Such a contradiction, Bauerlein (2010) explains, is due to the monolithic way in which professors tend to define social justice, one that does not necessarily connect with students' own definitions. Further, students complain that peace and social justice education spends far more time focusing on the problems than on solutions, and is therefore depressing and decreases the likelihood that they see themselves as agents of social change (DiAngelo and Sensoy 2014). Because authorship is often considered the domain of, the privilege of, the highly educated, those who are in the process of acquiring said education are often marginalized or excluded.

What This Book Offers

This book provides important reflections by and for peace and social justice educators in academe. Importantly, it also integrates the voices of students. More than a feel-good compilation of success stories, however, this book is intended to illustrate the complexities inherent in teaching and learning about and for peace and social justice. Chapters in the book provide critical assessments of institutions, pedagogies, and practices, making visible the messy but very real spaces in which education occurs. Written by faculty and students from many disciplinary areas, the book discusses in-class and outside-of-class actions, providing a deeper understanding of both best practices and challenges faced by these groups. Albeit in different ways that are reflective of the many different pedagogical approaches to peace and justice education, each chapter integrates ideas, concepts, and reflections from both faculty and students. The Conclusion and Appendix offer recommendations for future efforts and additional resources for college and university faculty and students interested in learning more about peace and social justice.

In Chapter One, Laura Finley and Matthew Johnson offer insight into the many ways that colleges and universities stifle activism through the imposition of excessive rules, regulations, and policies. Finley and Johnson share personal stories and the stories of students from various campuses to highlight the ways that campuses make it difficult to organize, to find meeting and event space, to market activities, and to find funding support. Further, Finley and Johnson make clear that this is part of the broader influence of neoliberalism on numerous societal institutions, including higher education. The chapter notes that activist groups in general have been bureaucratized because of neoliberalist ideology, and notes that many campuses use academic repression, militarized police, and surveillance to dissuade activists.

Chapter Two focuses on the barriers faced by female activists, educators, and students. Laura Finley documents how females have long been relegated to sideline or secondary roles in activist movements. The chapter also notes the many ways that female faculty and students face discrimination and harassment, showing how this sexism continues to impact the effectiveness of peace and social justice education on campuses.

In Chapter Three, Maggie M. Werner describes the importance of critical pedagogy, focusing on how it can reduce student resistance to social justice content. Her chapter acknowledges that students may not always articulate social justice outcomes using the preferred nomenclature, but may indeed experience tremendous growth in their academic and affective understanding of social issues when afforded ample and appropriate outlets for critical reflection. Further, Werner expresses the importance of cautioning students about adopting the student role and "giving" progressive professors what they want to hear. And, importantly, Werner reflects on what she got "right" and what she did not when teaching Introduction to Gay and Lesbian Studies at Hobart and William Smith Colleges.

Laura Finley, Pamela Hall, Celeste Fraser-Delgado—all faculty members—-and students (and former students) Tamedrea Mason, Karla Rivera-Torres, Eugenia Carioni and David Zaret, provide reflections on the goals, best practices, lessons learned, and challenges involved in engaging in service-learning for social justice in Chapter Four. While acknowledging the many benefits of service-learning for students, faculty, universities, and community partners, the chapter also details the ways that service-learning can be co-opted or commodified.

Tricia Serviss shares her experience using writing to challenge social inequality in Chapter Five. She recounts the rise of anti-immigration laws in Alabama, the emergence of the Community Writing Center at Auburn University, and then provides a case study of a first-year writing course and its involvement with community initiatives to challenge such laws. As the chapter explains, both students and the community members involved face great peril, given the criminalization of undocumented persons.

In Chapter Six, Elise Yenne, Lauren Alessi, and Tobi Jacobi discuss the challenges involved when faculty and students attempt to engage in service-learning with prisoners. Students note that while there are many obvious and subtler differences between themselves and the inmates with whom they work, they are, with careful and creative mentoring, able to identify important areas of sameness and solidarity. Their reflections also document the importance of giving space and recognition to all persons, and acknowledging the many ways that literacy itself is a form of activism.

Given that some one-third of dating relationships are abusive and an estimated one-fourth of college-aged women endure an attempted or actual sexual assault, Chapter Seven, authored by Laura Finley, Stephanie Wong, Bianca Rudge, and Alexandra Hunt, offers essential insights into how campuses can craft dating, domestic and sexual violence awareness and prevention programs. The chapter provides descriptions of several efforts as well as emphasis on what more is needed.

Laura Alexander, a graduate of Hobart and William Smith Colleges who is currently teaching English in Malaysia, offers a student's perspective on both the impact of and the challenges faced by feminist student activists around issues of sexual violence. In Chapter Eight, she chronicles the course that prompted her call to action. Her exposure to social justice education provided her with the impetus not only for personal involvement but also for finding and helping to support a community of activists. Her chapter describes both the beauty and the difficulties of allyship, noting the faculty and staff who supported her efforts as well as the challenges she faced.

In Chapter Nine, Kelly Concannon, Laura Finley, Nadine Grifoni, Stephanie Wong and Brittney Bartlett showcase the potentials and pitfalls of feminist community-based research. The chapter notes that even when all parties avow feminist beliefs, structural and other barriers make