

(RE)PRODUCING A PEACEFUL CANADIAN
CITIZENRY: A LESSON ON THE FREE TRADE OF
THE AMERICAS QUEBEC CITY SUMMIT
PROTESTS

Gada Mahrouse

In this article, I argue that despite common assumptions that peace education efforts achieve social change, it is often a normalizing, nation-building project that obscures hierarchies of power. Focussing on a lesson from a popular peace education program currently used in Canadian schools, I have analyzed the convergences between peace and citizenship education and consider the implications of pedagogies that encourage peace as a personal choice and responsibility. I call for an approach to peace education that promotes critical thinking on how knowledge is produced.

Key words: peace education, citizenship, nation-building, knowledge production, non-violent protest

On suppose communément que la promotion de l'éducation pour la paix fait évoluer la société, mais l'auteure soutient dans cet article qu'elle est plutôt un projet national normatif qui camoufle des pouvoirs hiérarchiques. À l'aide d'une leçon faisant partie d'un programme d'éducation pour la paix très utilisé dans les écoles canadiennes, l'auteure analyse les convergences entre la paix et l'éducation à la citoyenneté et s'intéresse aux implications des pédagogies qui encouragent la paix comme un choix et une responsabilité personnels. Elle prône une approche qui favorise la pensée critique au regard du mode de production du savoir.

Mots clés : éducation pour la paix, citoyenneté, développement d'un pays, production du savoir, protestation non violente.

Peace education is generally framed as an approach that challenges traditional models of education by encouraging critical thinking, resistance, and change (Bar-Tal, 2002; Harris & Morrison, 2003; Shapiro 2002; Synott, 2004). Given its goals of promoting justice, caring, and non-violence, peace education is a field that has attracted little criticism and has been largely regarded as a beneficial and progressive educational intervention (Gur-Ze'ev, 2001). In Canada, peace education is increasingly being packaged together with or implemented through citizenship education (Bickmore, 2002; Canadian Commission for UNESCO, 2002). This alliance makes sense when one considers that these two fields share some key common goals. As I have argued, however, when peace education is embedded within a citizenship framework, it can easily be co-opted for promoting loyalty to the state and its institutions. Moreover, whereas citizenship education has always been explicit and overt about its nation-building aims (Evans, 2003; Glaze, Hogwarth, & McLean 2003; Mitchell, 2001; Osborne, 2005), such goals are more insidious when approached through peace education.

In this article, I have explored one popular and innovative peace education program: *Cultivating Peace in the 21st Century* (Classroom Connections, 2002) and more specifically, one of the lessons it includes called *Taking Action*. This lesson is structured around *A View from the Summit* (National Film Board of Canada, 2001), a documentary film that focuses on the 2001 Free Trade of the Americas (FTAA) summit in Quebec City. The film is meant to give students "a real life case study in political activism, demonstrating concepts such as diversity of tactics, violent versus non-violent protest, views of security, human rights, social justice and the strengths and weaknesses of democracy" (Classroom Connections, 2002, p. 12). I focus on these *Cultivating Peace in the 21st Century* materials to make three interrelated arguments. First, using a critical theoretical framework that reveals the limits of peace education, I argue that despite common assumptions about peace education efforts striving for social change, in practice it is often a normalizing project that obscures hierarchies of power. Second, focusing on the *Taking Action* lesson and its accompanying film, I use a framework for identifying different types of citizenship education programs (Westheimer & Kahne 2004) to argue that despite its justice and participatory citizenship

themes, *Taking Action* encourages a personal responsibility type of citizenship in students and that this reinstates rather than challenges relations of power. Third, I argue that encouraging Canadians to think of themselves as peaceful world citizens, an idea that is already widely adopted in the national imagination, can have the effect of reproducing hegemonic discourses and elides Canadian complicity in global suffering.

INTERROGATING *CULTIVATING PEACE IN THE 21ST CENTURY*

Cultivating Peace in the 21st Century, an innovative program with student activities, teaching resources, and a compilation of films, all promote active, peaceful, democratic citizenship in grade 10-12 social studies, history, civic, and world issues classes (Classroom Connections, 2002). The *Cultivating Peace* materials are produced by Classroom Connections, a non-profit organization that provides free learning resources to publicly funded schools.

Like most peace education programs, the *Cultivating Peace in the 21st Century* program (henceforth *Cultivating Peace*) promotes an educational approach that challenges the status quo. Classroom Connections defines its mandate as one “dedicated to instigating positive societal change by strengthening the education and parenting of Canada’s youth” (Classroom Connections, 2002, p. 5). The program sets its objectives in terms of “real societal transformation” and defines itself as a program that aims for “fundamental change” (p. 5). With its dual goals of cultivating peace and promoting active citizenship, *Cultivating Peace* also represents a current example of how the fields of peace education and citizenship education are increasingly being brought together.

The Classroom Connections organization developed the *Cultivating Peace* program collaboration with teachers’ networks and major educational organizations and in response to the “tragic events of September 2001 and the escalation of conflicts around the world” (p. 6). The educational program is extremely popular and has been very well received. On its website, Classroom Connections states that the first of the two *Cultivating Peace* modules (the one that includes the *Taking Action* lesson) was delivered to 85 per cent of secondary schools across Canada in September 2002¹ and that its office continues to be flooded with

requests for the materials. The materials gained additional prominence when the organization received a National Peace Education Award by the Canadian Centres for Teaching Peace (Classroom Connections, 2002).

At the outset of this critique, two caveats are necessary. The first has to do with the challenge of fairly representing the broader aims and strengths of the comprehensive *Cultural Peace* program while focussing narrowly on just one lesson. Overall, I believe the *Cultivating Peace* materials are useful for facilitating social and political awareness. Most impressive are its attempts to historicize and contextualize issues of violence. For example, the program addresses the interlocking causes of violence through a handout on the social constructions of masculinity (Classroom Connections, 2002, pp. 24-25). It also includes a lesson that presents a definition of violence that extends beyond direct physical forms to include the indirect mental and psychological forms of violence perpetuated through social and political systems.² The program also delves into some potentially contentious subject matter. One example is a lesson on the causes of war and violence in which a piece by ecofeminist scholar Vandana Shiva asks if terrorism could be “the human equivalent of the abnormal behaviour of ‘cannibalism’ animals exhibit under factory conditions” (Classroom Connections, 2002, p. 22). By raising such relevant yet difficult issues, the *Cultivating Peace* materials rightly estimate the contemporary Canadian high-school population as politically perceptive, possessing a capacity for more than a simplistic understanding of the social and ethical issues.

The second caveat pertains to undertaking *any* critique of peace education. Discussions I have had with educators in the field have indicated that to question the sanctity of peace education is, in effect, to align oneself with repression and violence. These interactions, though merely anecdotal, have revealed something to me about the defensiveness regarding the unquestioned righteousness of educating for peace and non-violence. By pointing to the taken-for-granted merits of peace education, I do not intend to diminish the importance of working to end violence. Rather, my intention is to show that unreflective assumptions about the goodness of peace education can foreclose any understanding of how it might perpetuate structural and pervasive inequity.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: PEACE AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

What is peace education? In their updated edition of a leading book on peace education in North America, Harris and Morrison (2003) define it as a multi-disciplinary field, encompassing diversity education, conflict resolution, civic and democratic education, and violence-prevention. Perkins (2002) stresses that the aims and approaches of peace education are extensive and vary greatly according to the socio-political contexts within which it is practised. What unifies peace education as a field are the related goals of promoting a culture of non-violence³ and contributing towards a “more hopeful and interdependent world” (Harris & Morrison, 2003, p. 227).

A great deal of the literature on peace education, particularly the writing by North American scholars, is full of praise and conviction of its merits (Bickmore, 2002; Harris & Morrison, 2003; Roche 2003). Given the objectives of my article, I was more interested in literature that offers a more complex analysis of the challenges and shortcomings of peace education. For example, some scholars who consider that the goals of peace education are too broad have critiqued its vague and elusive notions of increased tolerance, personal understanding, and the acceptance of difference as overly simplistic approaches to pressing global problems (Bar-Tal, 2002; Solomon, 2002). Berlowitz (2002) observes that “scholarly and activist peace organizations tend to remain overwhelmingly Euro-American, Christian, and middle-class” (p. 61) and therefore contradict peace education’s aims to be inclusive and diverse. Perkins (2002) offers an important critique that challenges the notion that violence and war emerge out of ignorance or lack of understanding. In his view, peace education can be effective only in the rare instances where both of the conflicted parties see it as productive. For Perkins, this points to the paradoxical and ineffectual reality where everyone can agree to peace, so long as it is on *their* terms.

A few noteworthy scholars have explored the limits of the liberal humanist paradigm on which peace education is founded to show how it depends on essentialist, universal, and naively idealistic principles of seeking equality and justice for *all* humans. For example, Synott (2004) has observed that as an educational philosophy, peace education is

formulated through a benign view of human nature as essentially good. Gur-Ze've (2001) contends that the modernist underpinnings of peace and non-violence education can only be unravelled through a postmodernist framework that transcends the usual liberal presuppositions about the unquestioned goodness of peace education. He suggests that peace education is no different from any other regime of truth that produces subjects, knowledge, and values. Moreover, Gur-Ze've argues that the moralizing politics that unite both left and right supporters of peace education are better understood as a "fortification" of the existing order and not a challenge to it (p. 320). In presenting peace education as a normalizing project that enables hierarchical and asymmetrical relations, he puts forth the bold claim that peace education is not only ineffective at challenging violence, but perpetrates violence.

The picture that starts to emerge from the critical writing on peace education suggests that, contrary to how it is popularly represented and how it is vociferously defended by those who teach it, peace education is not straightforward, not transformative, and certainly not always good in any pure or absolute sense.

As I have indicated, peace education shares some important features with citizenship education. Indeed, peace education is sometimes framed as an approach or orientation *to* citizenship education (Canadian Commission for UNESCO, 2002; Harris & Morrison, 2003; Ontario Ministry of Education & Training, 1999; Perkins, 2002). Some of the common goals they share include the promotion of an active democratic citizenship, helping students to develop to think of themselves as members of a global community, and teaching about diversity, tolerance, and human rights (Heath, 2002; Ontario Ministry of Education & Training, 1999; Sears & Hughes, 1996). As with peace education, critical writing on citizenship education also shows it to be an approach that perpetuates and obscures relations of power (Fraser, 1996; Mitchell, 2001). Furthermore, following a growing movement in the United States, Canadian schools have recently been reinstating character education under the broad category of citizenship (Glaze, Hogwarth, & McLean, 2003). Importantly, the approaches of character education set out to alleviate social problems by teaching such values and virtues as obedience to authority and patriotism. Boyd (2004) understands this

emphasis on character as a conservative move that focuses attention away from power thereby diminishing the achievements of feminist, antiracist, and anti-oppression educational approaches.

There are two additional points that can be gleaned from this literature review. First, peace and citizenship education are increasingly merging and being approached through models of education that set their aims on character building. One implication of this convergence is that the notion of peace is likely to be conceived as a virtue or character that individual citizens acquire and not a complex social and political condition that is fraught with ambiguities. Secondly, the literature reviewed for this article suggests that the overall trend in the areas of peace, citizenship, and character education, separately or in any combination, is a conservative one that enables the reproduction of the status quo.

METHODOLOGY

The analysis I present follows the methodological guidelines put forth by Michel Foucault (1972, 1982, 2000) which suggest that power is best studied by examining how discourses are transmitted and subverted, how knowledge is produced, and how subjects are formed. Stuart Hall's (1997, 2001) application of this methodology is most relevant for my purposes because it focuses on the discourses that are transmitted through visual representations. As such, I follow Hall's approach to discourse analysis by asking how the effects of representations shape knowledge to privilege certain subject positions through which viewers are likely to imagine themselves in specific ways. I also employ a framework developed by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) in which they argue for the necessity of identifying the different political and philosophical aims that underpin various citizenship education programs. In brief, Westheimer and Kahne's framework identifies three kinds of citizenship educational programs: *justice-oriented* programs, which give students opportunities to analyze and understand the root causes of social, economic, and political problems; *participatory* programs, which prepare students to engage in community-based civic participation efforts; and *personally responsible* programs, which focus on behaviours and traits such as honesty, integrity, and self-discipline.

“TAKING ACTION”: A DESCRIPTION OF THE FILM AND LESSON

The *Taking Action* lesson is structured around the *A View from the Summit* film (National Film Board of Canada, 2001). The central theme of the film is various forms of protest that are presented through different perspectives and activities that took place at the FTAA summit in Quebec City. Following the defiant wave of direct action that emerged from the 1999 demonstrations against the World Trade Organization in Seattle (Klein, 2004), the organizers of the Quebec City summit expected violent protestors to be disruptive and the event was therefore highly publicized. *A View from the Summit* addresses these tensions and examines the debate at the heart of the controversy, the use of violence in protest. It captures the fearful and charged atmosphere that surrounded the summit. The film is described by its distributors as follows:

Quebec City prepares to host the three-day Summit of the Americas... a four-kilometre fence has been erected, cutting off the Upper Town from the rest of the city... Helicopters buzz ominously overhead. It looks as if the historic Quebec capital is under siege.... Meanwhile, militant anarchists are preparing for confrontations with authorities, as well. Officials are concerned that some protestors will attack the security barricades. The local population fears the worst. Will the Quebec capital become a battleground? (National Film Board of Canada, 2001)

The cameras follow several main characters in the days leading up to and during the summit, each of whom offers a different vision of the democratic process. For instance, the film introduces the audience to young members of an anarchist movement called Convergence of Anti-Capitalist Struggles, who use a diversity of protest tactics, including obstruction and disruption. The film contrasts these activists' views with those of another group, Opération SalAMI, who claim that they will strictly adhere to a non-violent mandate and that their protests against the FTAA will not be pursued "at all costs." The film also juxtaposes perspectives and concerns of the activists with supporters of free trade who were attending the summit, and with the commander of the Sûreté du Québec, the main police unit responsible for keeping the peace. The tension builds as viewers see the escalating antagonism among different activist groups, confrontations between armed police and defiant

protesters followed by riot squads forcibly arresting and dragging away protestors who cross the line.⁴

What the film also depicts is that the protests were ineffective at shutting down the meeting. Except for the inconvenience of having to pass through some added security measures, the summit attendees in the film appear to conduct their business largely unaffected by the protests. Moreover, some of the summit attendees shown express the perspective that the protestors were troublemakers who thoughtlessly sought to disrupt the meeting rather than engage in a constructive dialogue about any legitimate concerns. According to the film, a positive outcome that resulted from the protestors' demands was the development of a "democracy clause"⁵ to protect the participating countries. However, the film ends by displaying text that states: "Human rights organizations called the democracy clause weak but deemed it a small step forward" (National Film Board of Canada, 2001).

The *Taking Action* lesson explicitly states its objectives as wanting students to adopt strategies that promote a culture of peace (Classroom Connections, 2002, p. 45). Pedagogically, the materials seek to achieve this by provoking thought and discussion on issues of democracy, violence, and various strategies of dissent. For example, students are asked to consider and discuss the following excerpts from the film:

What do you think of the following statement: "If you have a democratically elected Hitler, you have the obligation to disobey"?

At the close of the segment, the crowd is heard chanting, "This is what a democracy looks like!" Are the actions of the police in response to the protest acceptable within a democratic, open and just society? (Classroom Connections, 2002, p. 51).

Students are also asked to organize various action statements that range from letter-writing to bombing on an acceptable/unacceptable continuum (p. 46). This activity is meant to be followed up with discussion questions to allow students to explain and listen to each other's responses.

In another of the suggested classroom activities provided in *Taking Action*, students are given a handout titled "Assessing the Protest" to list

the protest actions they observed in the film and indicate on a grid whether each action is justifiable or unjustifiable and effective or ineffective. To give students some knowledge about the free-trade issues at the heart of the protests, students are supplied with a one page "FTAA backgrounder" (p. 49). This handout lists the following four specific concerns of people who oppose the FTAA, each of which is explained in a brief paragraph.

- 1) Corporate interests have been heard but public interests have not,
- 2) The agreement will undermine labour rights and cause further job loss,
- 3) The agreement will increase environmental destruction, and
- 4) The FTAA gives corporations too much power (p. 49).

This activity is designed to help students clarify their individual positions regarding different types of political actions.

PEACE AS PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) framework stresses the importance of distinguishing between the broad spectrum of approaches that fall under the heading of citizenship education. At the core of their argument is the idea that various approaches have different implications for education for democracy insofar as certain "visions may privilege some political and ideological perspectives of citizenship over others regarding the ways problems are framed and responded to" (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004, p. 263). To help identify various approaches, they delineate the defining features and important differences between "justice-oriented," "participatory," and "personally responsible" citizenship education programs.

Justice-oriented citizenship education approaches, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) argue, give students opportunities to analyze and understand the interplay of social, economic, and political forces, present students with opportunities to weigh different opinions and arguments, and expect students to address and understand the root issues of social problems. Although the information that students are supplied with on the root causes of the FTAA summit protests is superficial at best (e.g.,

the backgrounder described earlier), the pedagogical approach put forth by *Taking Action* does, in some respects, correspond to the justice-oriented citizenship model because it offers students different perspectives to consider through open-ended questions.

According to this framework (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004), participatory citizenship programs seek to prepare students to engage in community-based civic participation efforts. It could be argued that in presenting students with a range of protest tactics, the *Taking Action* lesson does prepare students in this way. Furthermore, as its title suggests, with its focus on political activism the *Taking Action* lesson is easily aligned with this model of citizenship education. Indeed, the encouragement of active, democratic citizenship extends beyond the *Taking Action* lesson and is a recurring theme that runs through the entire *Cultivating Peace* program. A salient example is an activity called “AA (anti-apathy), a 12-step program for recovering apathetics” designed to get students actively involved in community and political organizing⁶ (Classroom Connections, 2004, p. 34). As such, the entire program can readily be considered to be primarily aimed at participatory citizenship.

I contend, however, that despite these important links between *Taking Action* and justice-oriented citizenship or the participatory citizenship models, it is best described as a personal responsibility citizenship program. This model, which is the most conservative of the three, focuses on “teaching individual virtues, values, and behaviours such as honesty, integrity, and self-discipline” and often overlaps with character and moral education approaches (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004, p. 241). In particular, the pedagogies that the *Taking Action* lesson proposes for encouraging students to adopt a personal position vis-à-vis various strategies of protest clearly situate it within a personally responsible citizenship model. This becomes evident when one reflects on how students might judge the various forms of protest presented in the film. It is significant, for example, that the images in the film make clear the consequences and risks to individuals partaking in violent protest. By centrally positioning violence and the sanctioned use of force to contain it, the film not only serves to show young people the range of tactics available to challenge injustice, but also displays the power of the state’s police enforcement thereby teaching students that not adhering to

state-sanctioned methods of peaceful protest results in harsh consequences. Similarly, images of gas-masked, counter-culture activists, most of whom appear to be young middle-class students taking pleasure in being defiant make it difficult to imagine that militant protest tactics would seem justifiable to most students. My point here is that a non-violence subject-position is being privileged through these representations and that the lesson's activities are not as open-ended as they first appear. In effect, students are required to make a simplistic individual choice between the lesson's implicit violence/non-violence binary⁷ rather than engage in complex analyses of the issues. Understanding that students (and teachers) exercise agency and resistance in how they interpret such lessons, it is fair to assume that through this lesson, many, if not most, students will come to think of themselves as freethinking individuals who *choose* to exercise their democratic rights peacefully. In *Taking Action*, peace is thus presented as a virtue or trait acquired, indeed cultivated, through individual choice and a personal orientation to which individual students will commit.

What difference does it make if, as I have been arguing, *Taking Action* is an example of the personally responsible model of citizenship education, rather than justice-oriented or participatory? After all, some would argue that the goal of promoting peace is a worthy one, regardless of what aims are behind it. The important difference is that in the personal responsibility approach the onus is on individual shifts in consciousness rather than substantive structural change. *Taking Action* should, therefore, not be assumed as a lesson with the potential to affect significant or transformative change.

RE-PRODUCING A PEACEFUL CANADIAN CITIZENRY

That the *Taking Action* lesson falls into the personally responsible model of citizenship education has significant implications for questions of nationalism as well. The film, *A View from the Summit* (National Film Board of Canada, 2001), depicts a government / people separation through images that highlight the spatial and ideological divisions between the public, represented by the protestors outside the barricades on the streets, and the state officials inside meeting and mingling at the Quebec City Hilton. In addition, the representations of the federal and

provincial police suggest they did use some excessive force to contain the crowd. The film makes this assertion repeatedly not only via the adversarial protestors but also by the peaceful ones who remarked that the large police presence was akin to those of totalitarian regimes (National Film Board, 2001).

Despite these unflattering and controversial representations, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Canadian Heritage, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police have all sponsored the *Cultivating Peace* program (Classroom Connections, 2002, p. 6). Taking into consideration that the process of sponsoring such a program involves extensive consultations and meetings to debate the use of these materials in public schools, the decision to provide funding for the *Cultivating Peace* materials is a curious one. It implies that the program was ultimately deemed complimentary to the government's mandate.

It has been argued that subject-making practices and motion-making practices are mutually constitutive (Foucault, 1994; Goldberg, 2002). With this in mind, governmental sponsorship of *Cultivating Peace* warrants further critical reflection on how the lesson, which encourages students to think of themselves as peaceful, might contribute to the Canadian project of nation-building. When one considers that educational materials in Canada already teach that peacefulness is a characteristic that Canadian people and the Canadian nation possess in abundance (Montgomery, 2006), it becomes apparent that the *Cultivating Peace* education program is very much within the dominant frame of educational practices, further revealing that peace education is not always a change-driven enterprise. The failure to challenge mythologies that imagine Canada to be peaceful reinforces Canada's false notion of itself as being more involved in and concerned with global issues than other Western countries (Kymlicka, 2003). Such a discursive nationalist positioning has material implications insofar as it perpetuates racialized notions of Canadian innocence (Razack, 2004). More importantly, the lesson fails to question how national identity is constituted through violence (Mackey, 2002). The lesson serves, rather, to reinforce and normalize the existing self-congratulatory conception of Canada as quintessentially peaceful and thereby obscures the violence Canadians not only perpetuate, but also benefit from.

CONCLUSION

Classroom Connections (2002) makes clear that the lessons contained in their resources “will not magically transform our world” (p. 7). Rather the materials are developed with the more realistic goal of encouraging even one student “to think about things in a new way and to question the violence she or he sees around them” (p. 7). In focusing closely on the representations of protest and non-violence in the *Taking Action* lesson and the film, I have argued that although it appears to present students with daring and radical subject matter through open-ended pedagogies, the lesson is in fact rather conservative in its aim to teach students to be good, governable citizens. This is not to suggest that educational institutions should not encompass a personal responsibility dimension that encourages students to act in ways that do not cause harm to others. My objective rather has been to point to the incongruity between the *Cultivating Peace* (Classroom Connections, 2002) program’s stated aims of promoting critical thinking and “moving a step closer to change” (p. 7) and its effects of privileging familiar and widely circulating discourses and knowledge.

As mentioned earlier, this critique is not meant to obscure the strengths of the *Cultivating Peace* program, but rather point to ways it could be made stronger. Instead of merely naming “racism” as a cause of violence⁸ (Classroom Connections, 2002, p. 8), a more challenging and transformative approach would be to explicitly address the pervasive racialized hegemony that is central to nation-building in Canada. Furthermore, to encourage students to think in new ways requires helping them identify knowledge production processes. An educational approach that truly seeks change enables students not only to question the violence they see around them, but also to critically consider the dominant systems of thought that establish the ways violence can be understood. To move in the direction of change, peace education must also help students to understand how national identity is socially constructed and to question what national and global imaginings of Canadians as peaceful serves to obscure.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to Ken Montgomery, Suzanne Lenon, the editors, and the anonymous reviewers for helpful comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this article.

NOTES

¹A second module was developed and made available online and through the Classroom Connections organization in 2004 (see www.cultivatingpeace.ca).

²This is a one-page handout available online from the *Cultivating Peace* website under “additional lessons”: <http://www.cultivatingpeace.ca/cpmaterials/takingaction/addllessions.html>

³Problems of violence are approached at three different levels: peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding (see Harris & Morrison, 2003, p. 11).

⁴Some of this description of the film comes from the National Film Board of Canada website: [http://www.onf.ca/trouverunfilm/fichefilm.php?id=50992&v=h&lg=en&exp=\\${view}%20AND%20\\${summit}](http://www.onf.ca/trouverunfilm/fichefilm.php?id=50992&v=h&lg=en&exp=${view}%20AND%20${summit})

⁵This clause states: “The maintenance and strengthening of the rule of law and strict respect for the democratic system are at the same time a goal and a shared commitment and are an essential condition of our presence at this and future Summits. Consequently, any unconstitutional alteration or interruption of the democratic order in a state of the Hemisphere constitutes a fundamental obstacle to the participation of that state’s governments in the Summit of the Americas process.” (Quebec City Ministerial Declaration, Article 4, in Classroom Connections, 2004, p. 47).

⁶This particular activity can be found in the second module of the *Cultivating Peace* series that was distributed in 2004. This module is largely dedicated to presenting students with how-to tools for numerous actions such as building a website, lobbying for change, or writing letters to the editor.

⁷A violence/ non-violence binary was already constructed through media reports at the time of the summit.

⁸In a section entitled “Causes of War and Violence,” racism is listed as one of nine possible causes, along with human nature, resources, class conflict, learned behaviour, socio-cultural differences, fundamentalism/extremism, and retaliation/escalation (Classroom Connections, 2002, p. 26). The explicit use of the

term racism is noteworthy given the vague references to cultural difference and ethnic conflicts that prevail in many educational materials.

REFERENCES

- Bar-Tal, D. (2002). Elusive nature of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concepts, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 27-36). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berlowitz, M. J. (2002). Eurocentric contradictions in peace studies. *Peace Review*, 14(1), 61-65.
- Bickmore, K. (2002, September). Education for peacebuilding citizenship: A proposal for teaching and learning in the context of fragile peace. *Canadian Issues*, 19-23.
- Boyd, D. (2004, November 12). Character education from the left field. Paper presented at the *Annual Conference of the Association for Moral Education*, Dana Point, California.
- Canadian Commission for UNESCO. (2002). *Education for peace, human rights, democracy, international understanding and tolerance: Report of Canada*. Ottawa: South House Exchange.
- Classroom Connections. (2002). *Cultivating Peace in the 21st century*. Module I. Sponsored by Citizenship & Immigration Canada & Canadian Heritage, Toronto. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from <http://www.cultivatingpeace.ca/cpmaterials/module1/overview.html>
- Classroom Connections. (2004). *Cultivating Peace: Taking Action*. Module 2. Sponsored by Citizenship & Immigration Canada & Canadian Heritage, Toronto. Retrieved May 1, 2006 from <http://www.cultivatingpeace.ca/cpmaterials/takingaction/>
- Evans, M. (2003). Education for citizenship in schools in Canada. *Orbit*, 33(2), 33-37.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language* (S. Smith, trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. Afterword. In H. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 208-226). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1994). Governmentality. In J. Faubion (Ed.), *Power* (Vol. 3, pp. 201-222). (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: The New Press.

- Foucault, M. (2000). Truth and juridical forms. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power: Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984, Volume 3* (pp. 1-89). New York: The New Press.
- Fraser, J. W. (1996). Democracy. In J. J. Chambliss (Ed.), *Philosophy of education: An encyclopedia*. New York & London, UK: Garland Publishing.
- Glaze, A. E., Hogwarth, B., & McLean, B. (2003). Can schools create citizens? *Orbit*, 33(2), 1-3.
- Goldberg, D. T. (2002). *The racial state*. Oxford: Blackwell publishers.
- Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2001). Philosophy of peace education in a postmodern era. *Educational Theory*, 51(3), 315-336.
- Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. London, UK, & Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. Yates, J. (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 72-81). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Harris, I. M., & Morrison, M. L. (2003). *Peace education* (2nd ed). Jefferson, NC, & London, UK: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.
- Heath, J. (2002) Citizenship education and diversity. *Education Canada*, 42(3), 4-7.
- Klein, N. (2004). Moving through the symbols. In D. Solnit (Ed.), *Globalize liberation: How to uproot the system and build a better world* (pp. 249-262). San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- Kymlicka, W. (2003) Being Canadian. *Government and Opposition*, 38(3), 357-385.
- Mackey, E. (2002). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mitchell, K. (2001). Education for democratic citizenship: Transnationalism, multiculturalism, and the limits of liberalism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(1), 51-78.
- Montgomery, K. (2006). Racialized hegemony and nationalist mythologies: Representations of war and peace in high school history textbooks, 1945-2005. *Journal of Peace Education*, 3(1), 19-37.
- National Film Board of Canada. (2001). A view from the summit, 75 min 15 s. Executive Producers Sally Bochner (NFB) Paul Lapointe (Érézi), Order number: C9102 040. <http://www.onf.ca/launchers/?id=33>

- Ontario Ministry of Education & Training. (1999). *Canadian and world studies: The Ontario curriculum Grades 9 & 10*. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Osborne, K. (2005). Political education and citizenship: Teaching for civic engagement. *Education Canada* 45 (1), 13-16.
- Perkins, D. (2002). Paradoxes of peace and the prospects of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 37-53). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Razack, S. (2004). *Dark threats and white knights: The Somalia affair, peacekeeping, and the new imperialism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Roche, D. (2003). *The human right to peace*. Ottawa: Novalis, St. Paul University Press.
- Solomon, G. (2002). The nature of peace education: Not all programs are created equal. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concepts, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 3-13). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sears, A. M., & Hughes, A. (1996). Citizenship education and current educational reform. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 21(2), 123-142.
- Shapiro, S. (2002). Toward a critical pedagogy of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concepts, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 63-71). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Synott, J. (2004) Peace education as an educational paradigm: Review of a changing field using an old measure. *Journal of Peace Education*, 2(1), 3-16.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269.