

# DOWNLOAD PDF PERSPECTIVES ON NUCLEAR WAR AND PEACE EDUCATION

## Chapter 1 : Peace and Nuclear War. ERIC Digest

*In summary, this book deserves to be widely read by those interested in the task of teaching peace education, especially as it relates to nuclear war.?-International Journal on World Peace In conclusion, the book's diverse articles are individually worthwhile.*

It is in the strange relationship between these two oddly matched allies that the roots and meaning of the Fukushima crisis lay buried. Japan embarked on its nuclear energy program during the US presidency of Dwight Eisenhower, a man now best remembered, ironically, for warning about the rise of the very military-industrial complex he did so much to create. Eisenhower is also the only US president to have criticised the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Fearing the bombings would destroy the prospects for friendly post-war relations with Russia, at one point he advocated international control of atomic energy and turning the existing US stockpile over to the United Nations for destruction. Not wanting to see the United States "choke itself to death piling up military expenditures" and assuming that any war with the Soviet Union would quickly turn nuclear, he shifted emphasis from costly conventional military capabilities to massive nuclear retaliation by a fortified Strategic Air Command. Just like a bullet? On occasion, Eisenhower spoke almost cavalierly about using nuclear weapons. In , he told a reporter: Europeans were terrified that the United States would start a nuclear war, which Eisenhower threatened to do over Korea, over the Suez Canal and twice over the Taiwan Strait islands of Quemoy and Matsu. European allies begged Eisenhower to show restraint. While Secretary Dulles admitted that in the present state of world opinion we could not use an A-bomb, we should make every effort now to dissipate this feeling. He promised that the United States would devote "its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life. But the subsequent March Bravo test almost derailed those plans. A panic ensued when irradiated tuna was sold in Japanese cities and eaten by scores of people. The international community was appalled by the bomb test. Eisenhower told the NSC in May , "Everybody seems to think that we are skunks, saber-rattlers, and warmongers. The movement caught on across the country. The Operations Coordinating Board of the NSC recommended that the United States contain the damage by waging a "vigorous offensive on the non-war uses of atomic energy" and even offer to build Japan an experimental nuclear reactor. AEC commissioner Thomas Murray concurred, proclaiming , "Now, while the memory of Hiroshima and Nagasaki remain so vivid, construction of such a power plant in a country like Japan would be a dramatic and Christian gesture which could lift all of us far above the recollection of the carnage of those cities. How better, indeed, to dispel the impression in Asia that the United States regards Orientals merely as nuclear cannon fodder! Sidney Yates Democrat of Illinois suggested locating the first electricity-producing nuclear power plant in Hiroshima. In early , Yates introduced legislation to build a 60kilowatt generating plant there that would "make the atom an instrument for kilowatts rather than killing". By June, the United States and Japan had signed an agreement to work together on research and development of atomic energy. But selling this idea to the Japanese people would not be so easy. After six weeks in Tokyo, the exhibit travelled to Hiroshima and six other cities. It highlighted the peaceful applications of nuclear energy for generating electricity, treating cancer, preserving food, controlling insects and advancing scientific research. Military applications were scrupulously avoided. The nuclear future looked safe, abundant, exciting and peaceful. The turnout exceeded expectations. The steady spate of films, lectures, and articles proved enormously successful. Officials reported , "The change in opinion on atomic energy from to was spectacular â€ atom hysteria was almost eliminated and by the beginning of , Japanese opinion was brought to popular acceptance of the peaceful uses of atomic energy" p. Such exultation proved premature. Anti-nuclear organising by left-wing political parties and trade unions resonated with the public. An April USIS survey found that 60 per cent of Japanese believed nuclear energy would prove "more of a curse than a boon to mankind" and only 25 per cent thought the United States was "making sincere efforts" at nuclear disarmament.

## DOWNLOAD PDF PERSPECTIVES ON NUCLEAR WAR AND PEACE EDUCATION

The Mainichi newspaper blasted the campaign: But intensified USIS activities over the coming years began to bear fruit. A classified report on the US propaganda campaign showed that in , 70 per cent of Japanese equated "atom" with "harmful", but by , the number had dropped to 30 per cent. Wanting their country to be a modern scientific-industrial power and knowing Japan lacked energy resources, the public allowed itself to be convinced that nuclear power was safe and clean. It had forgotten the lessons of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In , the Japanese government began funding a nuclear research program. Shoriki became minister of state for atomic energy and first chair of the JAEC. Japan purchased its first commercial reactor from Britain but quickly switched to US-designed light water reactors. By mid, the government had contracted to buy 20 additional reactors. Atomic airplanes, nuclear excavation and altering the weather! In the United States, the AEC aggressively marketed nuclear power as a magic elixir that would power vehicles, feed the hungry, light the cities, heal the sick and excavate the planet. Eisenhower unveiled plans for an atomic-powered merchant ship and an atomic airplane. In July , the United States generated its first commercial nuclear power. In October , Eisenhower informed the United Nations that the United States had agreements with 37 countries to build atomic reactors and was negotiating with 14 more. Some wanted to alter weather patterns by exploding a megaton bomb alongside the eye of a hurricane. One Weather Bureau scientist proposed a plan to accelerate melting of the polar icecaps by detonating megaton bombs. Still, Project Plowshare achieved its goals. Lewis Strauss, chair of the AEC, admitted that Plowshare was intended to "highlight the peaceful applications of nuclear explosive devices and thereby create a climate of world opinion that is more favorable to weapons development and tests". Atoms for Peace masks nuclear weapons buildup Under the cover of the peaceful atom, Eisenhower pursued the most rapid and reckless nuclear escalation in history. The US arsenal went from a little more than nuclear weapons when he took office to approximately 22, when he left. But even that figure is misleading. Procurements authorised by Eisenhower continued into the s, making him responsible for the levels reached during the John F. Kennedy administration -- more than 30, nuclear weapons. In terms of pure megatonnage, the United States amassed the equivalent of 1,, Hiroshima bombs in Few know that Eisenhower had delegated to theatre commanders and other specified commanders the authority to launch a nuclear attack if they believed it mandated by circumstances and were out of communication with the president or if the president had been incapacitated. And given the fact that there were then no locks on nuclear weapons, many more people had the actual power, if not the authority, to launch a nuclear attack, including pilots, squadron leaders, base commanders and aircraft carrier commanders. In , Eisenhower approved the first Single Integrated Operational Plan, which stipulated deploying US strategic nuclear forces in a simultaneous strike against the Sino-Soviet bloc within the first 24 hours of a war. The numbers were shocking: The price of denial While Americans were preparing for nuclear annihilation, the Japanese were living in their own form of denial. From its shaky beginnings in the s, the Japanese nuclear power industry flourished in the s and s and continued to grow thereafter. Prior to the tsunami-precipitated Fukushima accident last month, Japan had 54 functioning nuclear power reactors that generated 30 per cent of its electricity; some projected it would not be long before Japan reached 50 per cent. But the terrible nuclear catastrophe in Fukushima has forced the Japanese to deal for a third time with the nightmarish side of the nuclear age and the fact that their nuclear program was born not only in the fantasy of clean, safe power, but also in the willful forgetting of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the buildup of the US nuclear arsenal. Hopefully, the Japanese will move forward from this tragedy to set a path toward both green energy and repudiation of deterrence under the US nuclear umbrella, much as they blazed a path with their Peace Constitution and antinuclearism following the horrors of World War II. He is the author of *Beyond the Laboratory: Japanese and American Perspectives in Japanese*, Currently, he is co-authoring a part documentary film series and book with Oliver Stone titled *The Forgotten History of the United States*, which is scheduled to air on Showtime in November.

*Courses and programs relating to nuclear war have proliferated on the nation's campuses perhaps even faster than the nuclear arsenals have proliferated. Like the arsenals, the proliferation in nuclear war courses has had a vertical dimension, occurring at all levels of education from elementary.*

Cancel Introduction Peace is often defined in the negative, as freedom from war. Peace, development and democracy are mutually reinforcing. Without democracy, fair distribution of economic progress and wealth is unlikely. Without sustainable development the disparities become marked and can be a cause for unrest, and without peace, developmental gains are quickly destroyed. Supporting peace The United Nations recognises four major stages of conflict resolution and supporting peace. Conflict prevention Preventing and resolving conflict before it results in violence is far less costly, both in human and financial terms, than responding to it once it has occurred. Preventing and resolving conflict includes strengthening governance, improving access to human rights, economic and social development, and developing a culture of peace. Peace making Once fighting breaks out, negotiation of a ceasefire and an agreement by all parties accepting that no gains are to be won by continuing the conflict is needed before reconciliation can begin. Peacekeeping Peace agreements are fragile. The presence of groups of neutral soldiers, observers, police and human rights monitors can encourage hostile groups not to return to the use of weapons. Peace building Rebuilding society after conflict requires the establishment of a climate of tolerance and respect for the truth. It is built on political, development and human rights programs to reintegrate soldiers and displaced people, economic rehabilitation and social reconciliation. This is a lengthy process and the legacy of conflict can remain in communities for generations. Building peace Some of the activities and issues to consider in peace building include the following. Humanitarian relief and development Delivering aid food, water, healthcare and reconstruction of infrastructure to communities that have suffered conflict needs to be carefully managed to avoid deepening divisions between groups by apparent favouritism. Disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of combatants Transforming ex-combatants into peaceful and productive members of society is a critical but challenging task. Removing weapons, returning ex-combatants to their homes and supporting a return to civilian life are all vitally necessary. Refugees and displaced people People returning home after the conflict may find their property has been destroyed, littered with unexploded ordnance and landmines, or occupied by others. Mechanisms are needed for resettling people and helping them return to a safe and productive life and preventing future conflict. Economic development Assisting communities to become self-supporting after so much has been destroyed is vital. It can be done through small loans, training, and food for work programs. Rebuilding infrastructure supports these developments through making access to markets and contact with other communities easier. Women Armed conflict affects women and men differently. Women bear the brunt of sexual assault as a tool of war. If they suffer the loss of partners and sons, women may experience a change in their role to the breadwinner and head of the family. Their specific needs may be overlooked, as they are not as obvious as the resettlement needs of ex-combatants. They may have been forced to flee their homes, gone without food, education and healthcare and even witnessed extreme violence or been recruited or conscripted to be active combatants. Rebuilding their lives entails assisting with social rehabilitation, trauma counselling and peace education. Reconciliation All wars are brutal and particularly so when there has been the mass killing of civilians. Developing trust and cooperation within communities of people who have been enemies is a long and difficult process. It involves balancing the competing demands for justice and accountability for perpetrators of violence with the need to reconcile differences and move forward. Timing is crucial as too few compromises may threaten peace in the short run but too many compromises may undermine lasting peace. Reconciliation activities have included public confession, granting amnesty, community involvement to discuss appropriate punishment or acts of reconciliation, community building activities and peace education. Australian Aid also contributes to the clearance of landmines, cluster munitions

## **DOWNLOAD PDF PERSPECTIVES ON NUCLEAR WAR AND PEACE EDUCATION**

and other explosive remnants of war, mine risk education, victim assistance and advocacy activities. There is ongoing development of processes and programs of conflict prevention and peacekeeping. The New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, endorsed by over 40 states and international organisations promotes new ways of partnering to achieve better development outcomes in fragile and conflict-affected states.

## Chapter 3 : Peace building | Global Education

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*

Zola, John - Zola, Jaye Source: Peace and Nuclear War. The increasing concern in the United States about nuclear weapons is paralleled by the interest of educators in providing peace and nuclear war education in the public schools. Numerous school districts, both small and large, are adopting specific resolutions mandating the inclusion of peace and nuclear-war related content in the K program. As with any educational change movement, there is also a measure of controversy, in this case focused upon the appropriateness of teaching these topics in the public schools and whether such topics can be addressed in a non-biased and non-politicized fashion. Nuclear war education focuses on content beginning with the Manhattan Project and the first testing of a successful nuclear weapon. Included in a nuclear war unit would be such topics as the workings of nuclear weapons, historical information on the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan, national security decision making since World War II, current developments in weapons technology, and efforts to achieve arms control. Higher order thinking skills are emphasized in nuclear war education, including interpretation of data rather than simple recall, inquiry, synthesis, and evaluation. The issues related to nuclear war weapons are too weighty to allow students to avoid in-depth investigation and careful thought. Peace education is a broader field than nuclear war education. It also includes content such as the role of violence and aggression in human cultures; the nature of conflict and means of conflict resolution; obstacles to peaceful resolution of conflicts on personal, interpersonal, and international levels; the history of social change; the history and role of warfare; and peace makers throughout history. Not exhaustive, this list illustrates the broad scope of a peace education program. Inherent in the study of peace is the formulation of a definition of the term "peace. This is not for the purpose of countering those viewpoints; rather, it is to help students see the validity of opposing viewpoints and work to find an appropriate middle ground where mutual understanding can lead to new solutions to the issues at hand. Thus, the elimination of polarized thinking is an important goal of peace education. Any content area must work from a basic rationale if it is to have a place in the school curriculum. A rationale serves as a justification to the community for the teaching of a certain content or skill area. Peace and nuclear war education must have a clear rationale if they are to be accepted into the school program. A credible rationale for peace and nuclear war education contains four basic themes. Peace and nuclear war education are appropriate content for developing these abilities in students. Nuclear weapons and national-security-related issues are of paramount interest to our society and to young people. No transient topic, peace and nuclear war form a core content that all citizens must understand. One place to begin that process is in the public schools. It appears that nuclear weapons and the threat of nuclear war hang like shadows over the young people of this nation. Openly addressing and confronting these fears with information and appropriate pedagogy can help young people cope with these most natural concerns. Since the founding of the United States, the importance of an informed electorate has been the cornerstone of participatory democracy. Peace and nuclear war are issues that citizens must be competent to address as they make decisions in the choice of leaders and policy. Overall, peace and nuclear war education seeks to transmit information on key issues of the day, develop skills and values for civic involvement, encourage a sense of global interdependence, and promote the notion that even problems of this magnitude can be successfully addressed by informed and concerned individuals. Perhaps the most difficult aspect of teaching peace and nuclear war education is the controversial nature of the topics. Society seems to agree that nuclear war is to be avoided, but there is no such agreement on the means to achieve this goal. Therein lies the controversy for peace and nuclear war educators. Problems for teachers include reconciling individual political beliefs with the content to be addressed, finding non-biased materials, and anticipating reactions from parents and community

## DOWNLOAD PDF PERSPECTIVES ON NUCLEAR WAR AND PEACE EDUCATION

members. In addition, the political environment now appears to encourage the avoidance of controversial issues in general in school, so extra caution is required to appropriately teach about peace and nuclear war. This being said, educators are nearly unanimous in the sentiment that schools must help students learn how to confront controversial issues in a thoughtful manner. Basic guidelines for teaching about controversial issues are reflective of guidelines for all good education. The topic and material must be age-appropriate and appropriate for inclusion in the particular discipline. In the area of peace and nuclear war education, age appropriateness cannot be over-emphasized. These topics are filled with frightening information, and it is not the place of the school to scare students. Teachers must take care to inform students, not indoctrinate them to one viewpoint or another. There must be balance in presentation of information and opinions, with a variety of perspectives being represented in a credible and honest fashion. Numerous opportunities should be available for dialogue among students and with the teacher. The challenges for peace and nuclear war educators are many, including the following: World Without War Publications, 1 Jacobson, Willard, and others. Arms Control Association, 1 The Stanley Foundation, 1 Educators for Social Responsibility, 1 Teachers College Press, 1 American Security Council Foundation, 1 Zola, John, and Reny Sieck. University of Denver, Center for International Relations, 1

# DOWNLOAD PDF PERSPECTIVES ON NUCLEAR WAR AND PEACE EDUCATION

## Chapter 4 : Publications of Alan Robock on Nuclear Winter

*This work provides an organized collection of views on nuclear war education, a topic of great current concern. It grew out of the "Conference on Nuclear War Education" sponsored by George Mason University.*

Refereed Journal Articles Robock, Alan, Snow and ice feedbacks prolong effects of nuclear winter. PDF file Vogelmann, A. Effects of dirty snow in nuclear winter simulations. A message of hope for a missing colleague. PDF file Robock, Alan, Enhancement of surface cooling due to forest fire smoke. Policy implications of nuclear winter and ideas for solutions. New models confirm nuclear winter. Surface cooling due to forest fire smoke. Use of general circulation model output in the creation of climate change scenarios for impact analysis. *Climatic Change*, 23, Potential effects of global climatic change on the phenology and yield of maize in Venezuela. *Climatic Change*, 29, Atmospheric effects and societal consequences of regional scale nuclear conflicts and acts of individual nuclear terrorism. Toon, Charles Bardeen, and Richard P. Climatic consequences of regional nuclear conflicts. Consequences of regional-scale nuclear conflicts. Turco, Luke Oman, Georgiy L. Stenchikov, and Charles Bardeen, The continuing environmental threat of nuclear weapons: Integrated policy responses needed. *EOS*, 88, , , doi: Nuclear winter revisited with a modern climate model and current nuclear arsenals: Environmental consequences of nuclear war. *Physics Today*, 61, No. Local nuclear war, global suffering. *Scientific American*, , *Climate Change*, 1, *Eos*, 91 47 , , doi: Nuclear winter is a real and present danger. The climate impacts of nuclear war, *Bull. Atomic Scientists*, 68 5 , , doi: Impacts of a nuclear war in South Asia on rice production in mainland China. *Climatic Change*, , , doi: Multi-decadal global cooling and unprecedented ozone loss following a regional nuclear conflict. Decadal reduction of Chinese agriculture after a regional nuclear war. Pearce, Alan Robock, and Richelle Winkler, Resilience to global food supply catastrophes. *Environment, Systems, and Decisions*, 35, , doi: Climatologist Alan Robock on the effects of geoengineering and nuclear war. Asia treads the nuclear path, unaware that self-assured destruction would result from nuclear war. *Asian Studies*, 76, , doi: Surface temperature effects of forest fire smoke plumes. Invited paper Robock, Alan, Surface cooling due to smoke from biomass burning. Press, New York , Climate effects of nuclear war. Mansbach and Edward Rhodes, Eds. Climatic consequences and agricultural impacts of nuclear conflicts. Chapter 24 in *Global Change and Future Earth: Invited paper Magazine Articles* Robock, Alan, Climate effects of a regional nuclear conflict. *IPRC Climate* , 7, no. Climatic catastrophe would follow regional nuclear conflict. Book Reviews Robock, Alan, Nuclear Winter and the End of the Arms Race. Invited paper Conference Proceedings Robock, Alan, Weinberger, Secretary of Defense. House of Representatives, March 14, , U. Government Printing Office, Washington , Robock, Alan, Andrew M. Vogelmann and Robert G. Dirty snow effects are of small climatic consequence in nuclear winter scenarios. Cooling from forest fires. Invited paper Prepared by Alan Robock robock envsci.

# DOWNLOAD PDF PERSPECTIVES ON NUCLEAR WAR AND PEACE EDUCATION

## Chapter 5 : Download [PDF] the war and peace of the nuclear age

*Perspectives on Nuclear War and Peace Education* By Robert Ehrlich Greenwood Press, *Read preview Overview Peace Theory: Preconditions of Disarmament* By John W. Burton Knopf,

The three major sociological perspectives offer some very different understandings of war and terrorism. You might agree with some of their assumptions and disagree with other assumptions, but together they capture the major dimensions of these two forms of armed conflict. For example, they increase social solidarity as a society unites to defeat a perceived enemy. Some wars have also helped preserve freedom and democracy. Conflict theory War and militarism primarily advance the interests of the military-industrial complex and take billions of dollars from unmet social needs. Symbolic interactionism Symbols such as the flag play an important role in marshaling support for war. Definitions of several concepts also play an important role in public opinion regarding war and terrorism. Functionalism Recall that functionalism emphasizes the usefulness of certain behaviors and social institutions for many aspects of society. To use an example from Chapter 1 "Understanding Social Problems" , crime certainly causes many problems, but it also creates hundreds of thousands of jobs in law enforcement, courts and corrections, home security, and other sectors of the economy that deal with crime. In this spirit, functionalism similarly emphasizes the ways in which war and terrorism are useful for society, however horrible they are in so many other ways. Perhaps the first sociologist to make this point for war was Robert E. Park, the president of the American Sociological Association which was then called the American Sociological Society—a name that was later changed because of its acronym! The social function of war: *American Journal of Sociology*, 46, 88 First, war helps resolve international disputes over matters such as territorial boundaries and religious and other ideologies. No matter what one might think of war, historically it has resolved disputes between nations, with the winner of the war winning the dispute. Even though very few people would say that war is a preferred method for resolving a dispute, it still has performed this function. Second, war generates a stronger sense of social bonding and solidarity within the societies that are at war. A reevaluation of an old theory. *American Sociological Review*, 47, 88 Although Park did not discuss terrorism, this form of armed conflict can also create social solidarity. As these tribes came under the rule of nation-states, their separate tribal identities weakened as they gradually identified themselves as one people belonging to their nation-state; Park p. War, then, indirectly contributed to these advances. Although nation-states still might have eventually developed even without war, their development was accelerated by war. Other functions of war can also be cited. In the past and also today, war and military service have also provided important opportunities for jobs and career advancement for people of color and women. Related to this, the US military provides millions of jobs annually and is a ready form of employment for people who only have a high school education. More generally, the military and the defense industry are certainly important components of the US economy, and military spending in some eras has helped stimulate the US economy. In perhaps the most notable example of this effect, spending for World War II is commonly credited with helping to lift the United States out of the Great Depression Shiller, *New York Times*, BU3. In a final function, weapons research and other types of military research have contributed to scientific and technological development in general. For example, military research played a key role in the early development of the Internet. There are actually many different views within conflict theory about war and the military, but three related views stand out. According to conflict theory, the United States spends so much on the military and even goes to war because military officials, defense contractors, and political leaders work hand-in-hand in a rather cozy relationship. Although they may profess that their actions are meant to keep the nation safe, their ultimate goal is to enhance their political power and financial well-being. The most famous critique of the military-industrial complex from a conflict theorist is undoubtedly that of sociologist C. Wright Mills in his book *The Power Elite* According to Mills, the power elite C. Members of the power elite, Mills said, see each other socially and serve together on the boards of directors of corporations, charitable

organizations, and other bodies. When cabinet members, senators, and top generals and other military officials retire, they often become corporate executives; military officials in particular join defense contractors. Conversely, corporate executives often become cabinet members and other key political appointees, and defense industry executives often end up in the Pentagon. This circulation of the elites creates a rather cozy relationship that helps ensure their dominance over American life and in particular ensures that the military-industrial complex has an untold influence over economic and foreign policy. A more recent critique of the military-industrial complex and foreign policy by sociologist Mark C. Why nations go to war: A sociology of military conflict. The triumph of corporate and military power. This view, held by the more radical proponents of conflict theory, argues that war and other military ventures by the United States are done for the sake of imperialism rather than for noble goals such as the preservation and extension of democracy. In this view, the United States wages war and engages in other military actions to gain access to oil and other resources of other societies, with the ultimate aim of enriching multinational corporations and other parties. The characterization does not hold true for World War II, conflict theorists concede, but they argue it holds true for many and perhaps most other US wars and military actions, historically and today. A third view of conflict theory criticizes the size of the military budget and emphasizes the billions of dollars it takes from social needs such as poverty and climate change. As sociologist Carl Boggs , p. Decaying American cities have become a supreme legacy of the warfare system. Symbolic Interactionism Symbolic interactionist writing on war features several emphases. One theme concerns the perceptions and experiences of people involved in war: A second emphasis concerns the use of symbols to marshal support for war or protest against war. Symbols such as the flag evoke feelings of patriotism, perhaps especially when a nation is at war. The president and other politicians typically display a flag when they give major speeches, and it would be unthinkable for a flag not to be showing when the speech is about war or the threat of war. During the Vietnam War, protesters sometimes flew the US flag upside-down the international symbol of distress to show their hatred of the war, and some protesters also burned the flag—an act that is almost guaranteed to provoke outrage and hostility from onlookers. Other symbols can also be important. When the United States invaded Iraq in March , millions of Americans put magnetic yellow ribbons on their cars, SUVs, and pickup trucks to show their support for the troops. The largest manufacturer of the ribbons sold more than one million monthly a year after the war began. However, sales slipped as support for the war declined, and four years after the war numbered only 4, monthly Ward, Yellow ribbons dwindle with war support. Another ubiquitous symbol during the Vietnam War was the so-called international peace symbol see Figure Vietnam War protesters wore this symbol on their clothing, and many put peace symbol decals on their motor vehicles, book bags, and other possessions. A third emphasis of symbolic interactionism concerns how concepts related to war and terrorism come to be defined in ways that advance the goals of various parties. For example, a key goal of the military in basic training is to convince trainees that people they may face on the battlefield are the enemy and, as such, an appropriate target for killing. Related to this goal is the need to convince trainees that when they kill an enemy soldier, the killing is a justified killing and not murder. Similarly, the military often refers to civilian deaths or wounding as collateral damage in a conscious or unconscious attempt to minimize public horror at civilian casualties. Another definitional issue concerns terrorism. As we shall discuss later, the definition of terrorism is very subjective, as actions that some people might regard as terrorism might be regarded by other people as freedom fighting or some other much more positive term than terrorism. With this theoretical background in mind, we now turn to several issues and problems of war and terrorism. Key Takeaways War and terrorism serve several functions, including the creation of social solidarity. According to conflict theory, war advances the interests of the military-industrial complex, while militarism takes money away from unmet social needs. Symbolic interactionism emphasizes the importance of symbols in support for war and terrorism and the experience of civilians and veterans as victims of war. For Your Review Which one of the three perspectives on war and terrorism do you most favor? Why do you think the flag has so much symbolic importance in American society?