INTRODUCTION: EDUCATION FOR RECONCILIATION AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

BIRGIT BROCK-UTNE

This special issue of the International Review of Education (IRE) deals with *Education for Reconciliation and Conflict Resolution* not only in states in which peace (defined as the absence of war) exists, but also in states that are or have recently been experiencing violent conflicts on a macro level. While the first four articles deal with more general, fundamental and conceptual issues, the next two deal more specifically with education for reconciliation in situations of conflict. The seventh article analyses the role of the media in relation to violent and non-violent solutions to conflict. The fourth and final set of contributions deals with the teaching of peace and conflict resolution. One article describes the teaching of graduate peace studies in the US, followed by a note on the coordination of peace research and education in Australia.

General and conceptual articles on education for reconciliation

In her novel: *Three Guineas* (1938) Virginia Woolf has her main character say "As a woman I have no country. As a woman I want no country. As a woman my country is the whole world" (p. 125). These words could also have been uttered by the researcher, peace activist and world citizen, *Evelin Lindner*, whose article opens this issue. She is the founder of a remarkable network focusing on humiliation studies which, like herself, spans the whole world. She starts her article by asking: what kind of education are we talking about, for which forms of reconciliation and conflict resolution? She distinguishes between two fundamental types of reconciliation and conflict resolution, one built on the subjugation of non-equals, and the second based on dialogue between equals. She illustrates this dichotomy by pointing on the one hand to tyrants who teach their underlings that conflict resolution and reconciliation are achieved through subservience. This way of thinking she sees as the traditional paradigm of ranked honour. A Nelson Mandela, on the other hand, will argue that conflict resolution and reconciliation are achieved when equal rights and dignity for everybody are respected. She refers to this as a human rights framework. This kind of framework actually has much in common with the *ubuntu* ideology described by Tim Murithi in his article on the African way of dealing with conflict.

Lindner poses the rhetorical questions: Who is right and what is the "correct" approach to education for reconciliation and conflict resolution? The obedient subservience of underlings ("ranked honour"), or mutual respect

for equal rights and dignity ("equal dignity")? She sees the two approaches as diametrically opposed. She finds that, at the core normative level, the issue is whether or not to rank people as "higher" or "lesser" beings. In her own words: "It is either Apartheid or no Apartheid. There is no compromise. It is like right-hand driving or left-hand driving: a country has to decide – mixing leads to head-on collisions".

She holds that in a traditional world of ranked honour, humiliation is often condoned as legitimate and a useful tool. In contrast, a human rights framework of equal dignity views humiliation as an obscene violation of humanity. She notes that norms of equal dignity are worth supporting and are preferable in today's world for two main reasons. First, the human rights framework promotes human quality of life more than the traditional paradigm of ranked honour, and second, it is better suited to tackling ever-increasing global interdependence. Lindner shows the catastrophic consequences of cycles of humiliation and revenge, dubbing humiliation the "nuclear bomb of the emotions" (a term she herself has coined). She holds that the human rights movement can only fulfil its promise if and when these feelings are reconciled into Mandela-like social transformation. Decency reigns when reconciliation is no longer sought through the subjugation of underlings, and inclusion is applied to all people to grant them equal dignity.

The IRE is a peer-reviewed journal; in other words, even when an article is solicited and read by the guest editor as well as the IRE editorial staff, it is also sent for anonymous assessment to two highly competent reviewers. In the case of Evelin Lindner's contribution, one reviewer, *Finn Tschudi* (himself a psychologist and peace researcher), did not wish to remain anonymous and initiated an open debate with Evelin on some of her thinking, which he saw as lacking in nuance. The debate between the two peace researchers and psychologists (Evelin is also a medical doctor) developed into a fascinating, 30-page exchange which is posted on the humiliation studies web-page and can be accessed in full at http://www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php#brockutne. In this issue, we have concentrated on the main points in Tschudi's criticism as well as Lindner's response.

While agreeing on the basic tenets of her analysis, Tschudi in his rejoinder points to what he sees as an incompleteness in Lindner's analysis of "ranked honour" and "equal dignity". He explains that the "Relational Theory Model" may offer a more benign picture of forms of mild humiliation, which are not discussed by Lindner, and thus offer a more nuanced picture of ranked honour. He considers the issue of social inequality, which is largely equal to "structural violence", a concept also used by Brock-Utne in her article. While the emphasis on power is the same, the Relational Theory Model points to a situation whereby the "higher" beings provide protection and guidance, and the "lower" beings look up to the "superior ones". Tschudi hopes that this is a prominent feature in relations between parents and children!

In her response to Tschudi's rejoinder, Lindner sees the debate between them partly as a matter of choice of words, partly a matter of operating at

different levels of analysis. She suggests that peace educators should start to make clear linguistic choices. In the same way as human rights defenders use the term "humankind" and not "mankind for humanity", she recommends implementing human rights linguistically by reserving the words "humbling", "humbleness", and "humility" to signify important, positive, prosocial characteristics that must be nurtured in all possible ways, thus clearly differentiating them from humiliation (including "mild humiliation"), a concept which should be reserved for the "violation of equal dignity".

As to levels of analysis, she advocates seeking complexity and flexibility within the system as a whole rather than forcing the same degree of complexity and flexibility into each layer. She illustrates this point by alluding to so-called honour killings. It could easily compound feelings of humiliation to ask a girl who is in fear of being killed to think in terms of complexity. She needs very clear support and protection, as much as traffic needs clear support and protection. The verdict of "the girl must be killed" needs an unambiguous response, namely "the girl must NOT be killed". According to Lindner, therefore, complexity and flexibility can be nurtured at other levels rather than at the core normative level.

There are similarities between the articles of Evelin Lindner and *Lynn Davies*. They both adhere to a human rights framework. While Lindner cannot accept any type of humiliation, Lynn Davies is just as uncompromising when it comes to extremism and the harm it does to efforts to create a peaceful world. Extremism, as she sees it, is often related to a call for some form of imagined purity. In her book, *Educating Against Extremism*, Davies (2008) explores the potential role of schools in averting the more negative and violent forms of extremism in a country. She examines the nature of extremism through religious beliefs, faith schools, the myth of equal value, justice, revenge and honour, free speech, humour and satire. In her article in this issue, she argues that religious fundamentalism and state terrorism need to be addressed in schools. She argues for a greater politicisation of young people, through the promotion of critical respect and disrespect using a secular basis of human rights. Specific forms of citizenship education are needed, which provide the skills needed to analyse the media and political or religious messages while simultaneously fostering critical idealism.

Davies argues that formal education currently does little to prevent people from joining extremist groups or enable young people to analyse fundamentalism in a critical manner. Many suicide bombers, for example, have had extensive schooling in state systems, some of them even becoming doctors trained to save lives, not take them. Although global communication technologies mean that the way in which young people organize either for peace or for terrorism lies mostly outside the school, Davies nonetheless argues that this does not mean that schools are without power.

Her article proposes an educational strategy that is very different to the conventional one of tolerant multiculturalism. The task as she sees it is to politicise young people without cementing an uncritical acceptance of single

truths. She finds that there is a reluctance to tackle issues of religious belief and other fundamentalisms beyond a plea for "respect" and "tolerance". According to her, a critical analysis of beliefs and the reasons why certain interpretations lead to extremist acts is central to understanding actions which are otherwise labelled as "irrational". Schools are equally reluctant to address state terrorism, or to give young people skills to hold governments to account in their actions towards other countries. She argues that specific forms of human rights-based citizenship education are needed, which provide students with the skills needed to analyse the media and political or religious messages. Davies wants youngsters to learn how justice can be pursued without recourse to violence and revenge. She wants schools to foster a critical idealism within a rights framework. I agree with her but know from my own experience of organizing disarmament education in Norwegian compulsory schools at the beginning of the 1980s (Brock-Utne 1989) that the type of citizen education promoted by Davies may lead teachers into trouble if their lessons fail to draw both on international texts ratified by their home countries and on classroom discussions with the youngsters' parents regarding what is being taught.

Davies prefers the concept of "hybridity" to those of multiculturalism and cultural diversity, which essentially stress the recognition of difference. Like Homi Babha (1994), to whom she refers, she prefers to focus on long histories of cultural and ethnic intermingling and the hidden history of hybridity in culture. She challenges the notion of single or pure cultures and views hybridity as a combination of new identities rather than a mere collection of multiple identities, while Babha considers it a mode both of appropriation and of resistance to the mother culture. In educational terms, educators should thus aim to emphasise originality and not to push children into "camps" by encouraging them to learn about Asian food or visit to a Sikh temple. According to Davies, "the trick is to enhance the resistance to such simple labels and categorisations, and give children status by showing how original and special each of us is".

In my article in this issue, I offer a gender perspective on peace education and the work for peace. I ask the question: To what extent are girls and boys in our society getting the same socialisation when it comes to learning to empathise and to engage in or endure violent behaviour? I furthermore ask whether we are in effect socialising boys for war and girls for peace, and look at the different toys, reading materials and computer games offered to the two sexes. I make the point that across the world, there are more men than women in the military and conclude that this is likely to have a presocialising effect on boys. In countries with compulsory military service, this service is normally obligatory for boys and optional for girls. Boys know that it is "normal" for them to go through boot camp and are thus socialised into military thinking. By extension, this implies that they learn to view at least some of their fellow human beings as enemies and also learn how to

kill. This socialisation may explain why women are more likely than men to support conscientious objectors and oppose war toys and war itself.

I furthermore refer to groups of women peace activists who challenge the basic epistemic premises of public discourse on war and armaments. In an article on 11 September, 2001, Ann Tickner (2002) offers a feminist analysis of the event and its aftermath. Both here and in other conflict situations, gendered discourses have been used to reinforce mutual hostilities, and gender has proven a powerful legitimator of war and national security. Our acceptance of a remasculinised society rises considerably in times of war and uncertainty. Indeed, Goldstein (2001) finds it remarkable that the association between masculinity and war has received so little attention from scholars who write about war. However, the masculine activity of war and the process of socialisation that takes place in the military have long been central to feminist investigations.

Tim Murithi's article describes the African cultural world-view known as *ubuntu*, which highlights the essential unity of humanity and emphasises the importance of constantly referring to the principles of empathy, sharing and cooperation in our efforts to resolve our common problems. *Ubuntu* is a difficult concept to translate into a Western language. It refers to the very essence of being human. To praise someone highly, one might say, *''Yu, u nobuntu''* (you have *ubuntu*), meaning that the person in question demonstrates empathy, acts in a generous, hospitable, friendly, caring and compassionate way, and shares what he or she possesses. Furthermore, *ubuntu* means that ''a person is a person through other people'' (in Xhosa *Ubuntu ungamntu ngabanye abantu* and in Zulu *Umuntu ngumuntu ngabanye*), i.e. one is human because one belongs, participates and shares with other human beings. A person with *ubuntu* is open and available to others, affirming of others and does not feel threatened that others are able and good, knowing that he or she is part of a greater whole. Those with *ubuntu* feel and are diminished when others are humiliated, oppressed, or treated as if they are lesser beings. The thinking central to *ubuntu* has much in common with that described by Evelin Lindner. Humiliation of one person is a threat to all.

As a human being through other human beings, it follows that what we do to others eventually impact upon us as well. Murithi describes how Desmond Tutu utilised the principles of *ubuntu* during his leadership of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. He outlines the five stages of the peacemaking process found among *ubuntu* societies including:

- acknowledging guilt;
- showing remorse and repenting;
- asking for and giving forgiveness; and
- paying compensation or reparations as a prelude to
- reconciliation.

Ubuntu approaches to conflict resolution and reconciliation have some important lessons to contribute towards peace education, four of which Murithi summarises as follows:

- the importance of allowing people to participate in peacemaking processes in situations that affect them;
- the utility of encouraging and supporting victims and perpetrators as they go through the difficult process of making peace;
- the value of acknowledging guilt and remorse and the granting of forgiveness as a means of achieving reconciliation; and
- the importance of referring constantly to the essential unity and interdependence of humanity.

Education for reconciliation in situations of conflict

The two next articles deal with education for peace in countries characterised by conflict: the Middle East and Ireland.

The article by *Zvi Bekerman* addresses the complexities encountered by teachers and students when dealing with conflictual historical narratives in integrated Palestinian-Jewish schools in Israel. Some students are Arab, other Hebrew-speaking. They celebrate different events and have different histories. The narratives presented are based on long-standing research efforts in these schools and offer insights into how those involved draw selectively from formal and informal sources in order to support their identification and sense of belonging within their particular political, national and religious communities. Teaching history is not a simple task at integrated bilingual schools in Israel.

Since their inception nearly a decade ago, these schools have challenged some of the basic educational premises of Israeli society, claiming, for example, that Palestinian and Jewish children do not necessarily need to learn in segregated, monolingual educational settings. The integrated bilingual schools are non-religious and are recognised and partially funded by the Israeli Ministry of Education. For the most part, they use the standard State curriculum for the non-religious school system. The main difference is that both Hebrew and Arabic are used as languages of instruction. The schools have adopted what has been characterised as a strong additive bilingual approach, which emphasises the symmetry between both languages in all aspects of instruction. Two homeroom teachers – a Palestinian and a Jew – jointly lead classes and each school is co-directed by a Palestinian and a Jewish principal. Children from both groups are equally represented in the student body. The article presents a complex picture that is not necessarily encouraging in terms of the potential of education to help overcome situations of intractable conflict.

Within a post-conflict society's education system, activities of peace, reconciliation and inclusive citizenship must involve not only challenges to the existing structures of education, but also the development of a more inclusive curriculum. In her article in this issue, *Mella Cusack* describes an Education for Reconciliation Project in Ireland, funded by the EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation and managed by the Dublin-based Curriculum Development Unit (CDU). The CDU is a non-denominational, independent centre for teacher education, curriculum development and research, jointly managed by the City of Dublin Vocational Education Committee (CDVEC), Trinity College Dublin and the Department of Education and Science (Republic of Ireland). The Education for Reconciliation Project works with teachers and members of the two police services on both sides of the border on the island of Ireland to produce teaching/learning modules on law and policing for use in Citizenship Education classrooms.

The project's objective is to develop teachers' ability to deal with local, conflict-related issues as a means of promoting reconciliation. Half of the 32 (urban and rural) secondary-level schools involved in the project were from Northern Ireland and half from the Republic. Over a three-year period, teachers received in-service training, in-school support and workshops for Citizenship Education teams. They also developed Citizenship Education teaching/learning materials for use on both sides of the border.

The project launched a Working Group that included members of the Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) and the Republic's national police service (*An Garda Síochána*), with the aim of developing curriculum materials on policing and the law. Although the resource, entitled "Policing Matters", is aimed at all schools, it is of particular relevance to schools located close to the border. The initiative enabled the two police services to develop a joint response to the Citizenship Education curricula both of Northern Ireland (predominantly Protestant) and of the Republic of Ireland (predominantly Catholic). The first teacher residential training session highlighted a number of issues that teachers found difficult to address in the classroom, including the often strained relationship between students and law enforcers. The "Policing Matters" teaching/learning resource seeks to familiarise students with law and policing at a local level, before introducing a cross-border dimension through a research/action project in relation to policing in another jurisdiction. The plan developed by the Working Group recognised that action must be rooted in pedagogically sound classroom practice and open debate that lead to positive learning outcomes, particularly when dealing with controversial issues, which themselves must be embedded into the curriculum.

Members of both the PSNI and An Garda Síochána acknowledged the difficulties they faced due to the legacy of conflict in Ireland and the difficulties of engaging in good community relations practices. Some of those interviewed felt that Citizenship Education teachers had a particular duty to deal with the issue of policing in their classrooms, partly because the issue

fitted well with the curriculum, but also because Education for Reconcilia-
tion training had equipped them to tackle controversy with their students.

Following visits to police stations, students' comments revealed that a
number of powerful learning outcomes had been achieved, including the fac-
ing of fears and misconceptions, an increased knowledge about the role of
law and policing, a better understanding of the conflict in Northern Ireland,
a more critical approach to current political realities, and a greater insight
into the way in which history shapes attitudes. One Southern teacher found
that the fact that students had engaged with a police force from another
jurisdiction – one which they might formerly have regarded with mistrust –
was in itself a huge step towards reconciliation.

Hence, Cusack summarises the main strength of the Education for Recon-
ciliation Project as its ability to bring together Citizenship Education teach-
ers from both sides of the border to engage in joint capacity-building which
better equips them to address controversial, conflict-related issues. The
"Policing Matters" initiative, meanwhile, has improved the relationships
between schools and police forces and across the policing organisations at all
levels. She sees positive relationships as the key to dealing with controversial
issues – those between the teachers, students and, in the case of policing,
with members of the security forces – as a crucial element in the reconcilia-
tion process as a whole. However, she notes that schools' capacity to sustain
equitable educational processes depends on wider, societal changes and the
support that education systems receive in order to tackle destructive prac-
tices and structures. She concludes that reconciliation will only be possible
once all levels of society have engaged with experiences that facilitate posi-
tive relationship-building.

Critical media literacy

It is not only through history books that our youngsters are exposed to
accounts of war and violence. Most young people spend more time watching
television or playing computer games than reading history text-books. In an
article analysing Ridley Scott's *Black Hawk Down*, the German peace
researcher Holger Pötzsch shows how the American soldiers in the movie are
depicted as individuals and helpers while the Somalis are de-humanised and
depicted as an invisible threat. The film and subsequent DVD have proven
immensely popular both in the USA and in Europe and it has been claimed
that the film is an accurate portrait of the battle between the US army and
Somali forces in Mogadishu in 1993. In spite of its explicit claim to realism,
however, Pötzsch shows that the film employs the same representational
strategy as do fully-fledged, fictitious action and horror movies when depict-
ing self, other, and the conflict between them. He demonstrates that in order
for the audience to distinguish between dichotomies such as self/other, good/
evil, order/chaos, the film places the US soldiers and their enemies in very

specific surroundings. The enemy stronghold is characterised by filth and decay where chaos, invisible dangers and deadly threats lurk behind every corner. The American soldiers, however, are located in surroundings where order, sanity, technological confidence and control are paramount. The type of analysis that Pötzsch adopts in his article is one in which our teachers should be trained. Although we cannot prevent youngsters from watching films and playing games that centre on violence, we could nonetheless make what Kellner (1995) refers to as critical media literacy part of the school curriculum.

In a study on children's stereotypes of other nations that I carried out in 1975 together with two other Norwegian researchers (Brock-Utne et al. l975), we found that children had derived their stereotypes in part from their immediate surroundings, including their families, and in part from the media to which they had been exposed. The school environment was not responsible for nurturing these stereotypes, but had at the same time done nothing to dismantle them. In several instances, the stereotypes revealed misinformation and a lack of knowledge. Many of the children, for instance, claimed that the German Democratic Republic (GDR) was responsible for Hitler and the Second World War, whereas they did not hold the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) responsible to the same extent. They appeared to be unaware that Germany was not divided at the onset of World War II. Maybe it is high time for teachers to accept that their pupils derive a good proportion of their knowledge outside of school, and look into the stereotypes that they hold and the attitudes they have towards other people. In this instance, the school could serve as a place to discuss and analyse the prevalent attitudes found in the classroom.

Graduate peace and conflict studies education

According to *John Windmueller, Ellen Kabcenell Wayne, and Johannes (Jannie) Botes*, the increase in the number of established graduate Peace and Conflict Studies (PCS) programmes from just four in 1985 to 80 in the United States and 130 globally by 2000 means that PCS educators are now facing a number of critical and as yet unanswered questions about the education they provide. What core competencies should graduate-level peace education convey? What curriculum elements promote these competencies most effectively? To what degree are these competencies and pedagogical approaches culturally bound? How is this education assessed and how does it relate to professional practice? The article centres on the University of Baltimore's Negotiations and Conflict Management degree programme, addressing these and other questions regarding the lack of clear core competencies and curriculum-related expectations at the graduate level of PCS programmes, and discussing how educators in this field can or should assess their own work and train students for practice.

Furthermore, Windmueller et al. draw on a comparative case study of a programme in Tajikistan to assess the degree to which competencies and pedagogical approaches in this field are culturally-bound. The picture that emerges suggests that significant omissions have been made in terms of the way that the various educational programmes and the wider field of PCS have developed thus far. In this context, the authors discuss the implementation of the programme in Tajikistan that sought to disseminate general PCS knowledge and intervention skills in order to highlight five key criteria that are needed in order for general knowledge and skills to be adapted successfully to suit specific conflict and cultural contexts:

1. Inclusive partnerships. Organizations and individuals in both countries collaborated to design and implement the project from the outset.
2. Decentralised implementation. The final curriculum was tailored by individual faculty members in Tajikistan to fit their own academic programmes, students, and interests.
3. Sensitivity to language. Course material was translated into Russian. The authors admit that this decision may have been less than ideal in view of the current move towards promoting the Tajik language; nevertheless, it demonstrated that the critical importance of the language of instruction had been recognised.
4. Critical consideration of power disparities and structural violence. The project organizers worked to identify the systems of structural violence within which the programme would operate.
5. Value transparency and engagement. The project's attempts to accommodate existing Tajik cultural values conflicted at times with Western human rights and social justice values. Such situations were addressed by openly discussing differences, tensions, and underlying values and beliefs.

The note by *James Page* on co-ordinating Peace Research and Education in Australia offers us a further example of how peace education can be taught. He reports on a meeting of Australian university teachers involved in peace and conflict studies that was held in Canberra on 2 May 2008. They met to discuss how to better organize and co-ordinate university-level peace education in Australia.

The meeting raised a number of issues, which I believe to be of interest to a wider public. One suggested innovation was the establishment of a Wiki peace studies website that would deal with peace research and education issues, and be moderated by academics from the field – a resource of particular relevance as Page notes widespread concern that peace researchers in Australia are not doing enough to connect with colleagues in other countries within the region. A further concern raised during the forum is the lack of funding generally allocated to peace research and education, particularly compared to the financial support received by the more traditional departments of politics and international relations. His note

furthermore highlights the more general concern than peace is also being marginalised within debates and discourse on national security. This phenomenon is by no means unique to Australia. The language of public discourse, driven largely by the news media, concentrates on the language of threat and how those threats may be countered, particularly in the face of a general assumption that the best response is necessarily a military one. The possibility that Australia itself may be part of the global problem, both in its foreign policy and its lack of action on other issues, is rarely canvassed in public discourse.

The Canberra forum also touched on the question of how to define peace itself – one that has been raised repeatedly by academics and practitioners over the years and can be seen as integral to the field of peace studies (Brock-Utne 1989). There is no doubt that Australia and, indeed, the rest of the world, will continue to debate the direction that peace education and research should take. As guest editor of this special issue, it is my hope that the articles here will help to stimulate these debates, raise and address new issues, and take the field of education for reconciliation and conflict resolution one step further on the path towards peace.

References

Babha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Brock-Utne, Birgit. 1989. *Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Peace Education*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Brock-Utne, Birgit, Torbjørn Ottestad, and Karl Johan Skårebrevik. l975. Har bosted i Norge betydning for barns oppfatninger av andre nasjoner? [Do Children's Stereotypes of Other Nations Depend on Where in Norway the Children Live?] A Research Project Sponsored by the Council for Peace and Conflict Research, Oslo.

Davies, Lynn. 2008. *Educating Against Extremism*. Trentham: Stoke on Trent.

Goldstein, Joshua S. 2001. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*. California: University of California Press.

Kellner, Douglas. 1995. *Media Culture. Cultural Studies, Identity and Politics Between the Modern and the Postmodern*. London: Routledge.

Tickner, Ann J. 2002. Feminist Perspectives on 9/11. *International Studies Perspectives* 3: 333–350.

Woolf, Virginia. 1938. *Three Guineas*. London: The Hogarth Press. Reprinted in New York by Penguin Books in 1977.

The author

Birgit Brock-Utne is a Professor of Education and Development at the University of Oslo. Her doctorate was in peace studies. She has been a Researcher at the Peace

Research Institute of Oslo and teaches at the European University of Peace in Stadtschlaining, Austria. She was a Professor of Education at the University of Dar-es-Salaam (1987–1992) and has since written numerous articles, books and chapters in books on education in Africa. She has been a Visiting Professor in the USA and in Japan teaching peace studies and African studies.

Contact address: Institute for Educational Research, University of Oslo, P. B. 1092, Blindern, Oslo 0317, Norway. E-mail: birgit.brock-utne@ped.uio.no. Home page: http://folk.uio.no/bbrock/.