Schooling for Peaceful Development in Post-Conflict Societies

Education for Transformation?

Clive Harber

Schooling for Peaceful Development in Post-Conflict Societies

Clive Harber

Schooling for Peaceful Development in Post-Conflict Societies

Education for Transformation?

palgrave
macmillan

Clive Harber
School of Education
University of Birmingham
Birmingham, UK

ISBN 978-3-030-17688-4 ISBN 978-3-030-17689-1 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-17689-1

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Preface

The central concern of this book is summarised in the following quotation:

> Children and youth, in whom visions of national development are invested, are central to post-conflict state-building efforts. Statements such as 'children are the future' bring together the fortunes of national development with individual human development. (Pells et al. 2014: 294)

As this book demonstrates in more detail below, the education of young people is increasingly seen as important in peacebuilding in post-conflict societies, that is in helping to create conditions where a violent conflict will not occur again. So much so that in 2011 UNESCO's annual Global Monitoring Report called for an increase in funding to this area of between $500 million and $1 billion a year (UNESCO 2011). Yet a few years ago I was asked to do a review essay of five books on the role of education in conflict and post-conflict states where education is supposed to play a part in peacebuilding by 'building back better', that is to say where schools are re-structured to play an active role in educating for peace and democracy. These were primarily 'developing'

states, as is further discussed below. However, no contributors to the books offered any evidence or working examples of successful systemic restructuring, or transformation, of a wide range schools in a more peaceful and democratic direction. There were a lot of prescriptive 'shoulds', 'cans', 'musts' and 'oughts' but there was overwhelmingly more evidence in the five books of successful attempts to return the 'normality' of providing access to conventional schooling. There was little sign or evidence of them successfully educating for a more peaceful future via their organisation, pedagogy and curricula emphases (Harber 2013).

So I became intrigued and decided to do a detailed content analysis of a wide range of books, articles and other documents on schooling and peacebuilding in post-conflict developing societies. There is now a large and burgeoning literature in the field of education in post-conflict societies and I wanted to see if there was any evidential support for the idea that schools could actually contribute to peace in a meaningful way following violent conflict.

The review of literature in this book is, however, limited to publications in English because of my lack of sufficient proficiency in other languages. I also chose to limit my review of the literature to 'developing' countries (further discussed below) because the majority of violent conflicts in recent decades have been in such countries and it would limit the range and variety of post-conflict contexts. In particular, I wanted to avoid comparing conflict-affected European contexts such as Northern Ireland or Bosnia Herzegovina (or more developed nations such as Israel) with contexts where human and material resources were much thinner on the ground. However, even in more 'developed' contexts like Northern Ireland there seem to be problems in actually implementing critical forms of citizenship education for peace (Reilly and Niens 2014) and the key programme initiative—Education for Mutual Understanding—has not been researched in terms of long-term impact on attitudinal and behavioural outcomes (Tinker 2016: 36).

Although education and learning can take place in many ways and in many contexts, this book is primarily concerned with formal, mass education—primary and secondary schooling. Although everybody learns in and from places other than the school, and many do not go to school, the school is nevertheless globally the main institution for

transmitting the values, skills, knowledge and behaviours that societies deem desirable or acceptable. Thus, if a society is to change in any significant way then schooling must play a role in such a transformation. This role for education has been understood and debated since at least the time of Plato (Harber and Mncube 2012: Chapter 2).

One the reasons that schooling may not, in fact, be playing a part in peacebuilding in post-conflict developing societies (despite the large literature saying it can and ought to) is simply because not all eligible children actually go to school in developing societies (Harber 2014: Chapter 2; 2017: Chapter 3). Another reason is that the necessary physical, human and organisational resources simply aren't there. Providing good quality education in many developing societies can be difficult enough anyway, without the added problems posed by recovering from violent conflict (Harber 2014: Chapter 2; 2017: Chapters 4 and 11). Moreover, after violent conflict it is difficult enough to re-start an education system, let alone re-fashion or transform it so that it takes on very different structures, practices and relationships from before. Buckland (2006: 7), for example, writing in his capacity as a Senior Education Specialist at the World Bank, sets out some of the problems facing education in many post-conflict states as

- An inability of recovering states to fund either capital or recurrent expenditure as few states have access to domestic revenue sufficient to keep systems running
- Chronic shortages of qualified teachers—many have been killed or fled, and many of those who remain or return are snapped up by international agencies and NGOs
- Oversupply of under-qualified or unqualified teachers
- The sheer number of war-affected youth, demobilised soldiers and young people who have not completed basic education
- Poor record keeping, corruption and lack of transparency in education governance: salaries are often paid to 'ghost' teachers
- The 'relief bubble' in international financial support often subsides before a more predictable flow of reconstruction resources can be mobilised: relief agencies often scale back operations before development-focused agencies can be mobilised.

To which Smith (2010: 18–19) adds in relation to the desired role of teachers in 'building back better' via the promotion of peace and reconciliation,

> Ensuring that teachers have the capacity to undertake reconciliation education is an enormous challenge. The conflict reduced the pool of teachers, making it even harder to find those with the skills to teach a sensitive new topic. Teachers themselves are part of the culture and have their own values. The emotional issues surrounding the past conflict make enormous demands on the traditionally technical background of teachers. Addressing conflict and reconciliation, of course, requires knowledge of child rights, expertise in pedagogy and skills in facilitating discussion of controversial issues. Teachers are probably the single most important factor in mediating the curriculum and the values it conveys, and any education strategy needs to take account of their central role.

However, practical problems may not be the only reasons that schools find it difficult to educate for peace in post-conflict, developing societies. This book makes the argument that the existing and dominant model of schooling globally has a built-in dimension of political control, authoritarianism and violence. Moreover, this model is so deep-rooted in historical experience, cultural expectations and popular consciousness that in reality it is relatively impervious to change or transformation. Importantly, such schooling has also often played a part in both reproducing the violence of the surrounding society and in actively promoting it (Bush and Salterelli 2000; Harber 2004; Pinheiro 2006). This will be further discussed below in the next chapter.

Even when it is well known that schooling has played a part in fostering violent conflict in the past, and could easily do so again, it is very difficult to get key actors in schooling (politicians, ministries, heads, teachers, pupils, parents, inspectors, etc.) to change their expectations of what a school ought to look like. Acceptance of the traditional assumptions and practices of the conventional model of schooling is shared by too many people to make it possible for genuine change to occur. Indeed, politicians in a post-conflict society may well want to harness this authoritarian model to transmit the political messages that are convenient to them and their view of what the post-conflict state and

society should look like. Teachers (and students), on the other hand, may well prefer to continue with the old model as a way of avoiding the difficult, highly sensitive and controversial issues of facing up to the conflict and examining its nature and causes.

This book, then, examines the ideas and arguments surrounding schooling for peace in post-conflict developing societies before reviewing the organisational, curricular and pedagogical *evidence* as to whether it actually does make a contribution. It is important to note up front that, despite many optimistic statements to the contrary, evidence of transformed schooling contributing to peace seems extremely thin on the ground. The book also therefore asks both why schools do not really perform this role and why international bodies, NGOs and academic writers continue to perpetuate the myth of building back better.

Birmingham, UK Clive Harber

References

Buckland, P. (2006). Post-Conflict Education: Time for a Reality Check? *Forced Migration Review.* http://www.fmreview.org/FMRpdfs/EducationSupplement/03.pdf.

Bush, K., & Saltarelli, D. (Eds.). (2000). *The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict*. Florence: UNICEF.

Harber, C. (2004). *Schooling as Violence*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Harber, C. (2013). 'Education in and After Violent Conflict: Stability and the Status Quo or Transformation and Peace?' Review Essay. *International Journal of Educational Development, 33*(2), 213–216.

Harber, C. (2014). *Education and International Development: Theory, Practice and Issues*. Oxford: Symposium.

Harber, C. (2017). *Schooling in Sub-Saharan Africa: Policy, Practice and Patterns*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harber, C., & Mncube, V. (2012). *Education, Democracy and Development: Does Education Contribute to Democratisation in Developing Countries?* Oxford: Symposium.

Pells, K., Pontalti, K., & Williams, T. (2014). Promising Developments? Children, Youth and Post-Genocide Reconstruction Under the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF). *Journal of East African Studies, 8*(2), 294–310.

Pinheiro, P. (2006). *World Report on Violence Against Children*. Geneva: United Nations.

Reilly, J., & Niens, U. (2014). Global Citizenship as Education for Peacebuilding in a Divided Society: Structural and Contextual Constraints on the Development of Critical Dialogue Discourse in Schools. *Compare, 44*(1), 53–76.

Smith, A. (2010). *The Influence of Education on Conflict Band Peacebuilding*. Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2011—The Hidden Crisis: Armed Conflict and Education. Paris: UNESCO.

Tinker, V. (2016). Peace Education as a Post-Conflict Peacebuilding Tool. *All Azimuth, 5*(1), 27–42.

UNESCO. (2011). *The Hidden Crisis: Armed conflict and Education*. Paris: UNESCO EFA Global Monitoring Report.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my wife Mary Harber for painstakingly reading through the draft manuscript and correcting my many mistakes. I would also like to thank Robert Skinner for his advice on the chapter of Columbia and Lynn Davies for reading and commenting on the final chapter. Finally, I would like to thank Qing Gu of Nottingham University for inadvertently giving me the idea for the book in the first place when she asked me to do a review of a number books on education in post-conflict societies.

Contents

1

Violence, Violent Conflict and Schooling

Introduction

The United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 16 is Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions':

> Without peace, human rights and effective government, based on the rule of law we cannot hope for sustainable development. We are living in a world that is increasingly divided. Some regions enjoy sustained levels of peace, security and prosperity, while others fall into seemingly endless cycles of conflict and violence. This is by no means inevitable and must be addressed. High levels of armed violence and insecurity have a destructive impact on a country's development, affecting economic growth and often resulting in long standing grievances that can last for generations. Sexual violence, crime, exploitation and torture are also prevalent where there is conflict and no rule of law, and countries must take measure to protect those at risk. (https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/)

The world is plagued by violent conflict. Often those involved in disagreements and conflicts of interest seek to resolve them through the

C. Harber, *Schooling for Peaceful Development in Post-Conflict Societies*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-17689-1_1

use of violence rather than through peaceful forms of conflict resolution via discussion and negotiation. Too often 'war, war' comes before 'jaw, jaw', as Winston Churchill would have put it. UNESCO, in its important study of education and armed conflict (2011: 161–162), notes that armed conflict is more likely to occur and persist where the state is weak and where state institutions are unable, or unwilling, to respond to grievances or mediate in disputes. They note that such state fragility is often associated with low per capita income levels, with poverty, conflict and institutional failure creating self-reinforcing cycles. UNESCO also summarises an extensive body of literature that seeks to identify the underlying causes of violent conflict and suggests that this broadly divides into four approaches

1. Economic where the likelihood of people joining an armed group is inversely related to their employment and income-generating prospects, with low income creating an incentive to join groups engaged in armed conflict.
2. The state's weak administrative capacity and lack of control over territory and resources, including high-value minerals. Because the state is weak, rebels can gain control over these 'lootable' resources, which finance war while providing a powerful economic motivation for engaging in rebellion.
3. Ethnic composition, as some commentators have drawn a link between the extent of ethnic diversity in a country and violent conflict. The rise of intra-state violence based on appeals to ethnic identity, from Bosnia and Herzegovina to Iraq, Rwanda and Sri Lanka would be examples and there is evidence that societies characterised by high levels of social and economic polarisation between ethnic groups (as distinct from ethnic diversity or fragmentation) are more prone to conflict.
4. Grievance and injustice where some commentators have identified grievances associated with political, economic, social and cultural inequality as a primary motivating force for political violence. This is where continuing inequality makes certain groups feel unfairly excluded and marginalised (UNESCO 2011: 161–162).

Such causes often occur in 'developing countries' and indeed UNESCO also notes that 'War has been described as development in reverse' (UNESCO 2011: 131). Thus, in this book the main concern is with such countries. This is a controversial but often used term that has been discussed in detail elsewhere (Harber 2014; McGrath and Gu 2016). However, this book understands the term according to its use by the UNDP in its annual UNDP Human Development Report. The 2016 report, for example, ranks all the countries of the world from 1 to 185 according to a wide range of economic, social and political variables but special emphasis is laid on what they term the 'Human Development Index'. This is a composite index of what they consider to be the three key indicators of human development. These are life expectancy at birth, years of enrolment in schooling and gross national income per capita. In this book, we are primarily concerned with countries in the bottom half of the UNDP's Human Development Index. This corresponds closely with, for example, Smith's classification of about 100 states in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and the Caribbean with a combined population of over 4.8 billion, accounting for 75% of the world's total and nearly 58% of the world's land area (Smith 2009: 1).

What Are Post-conflict Societies?

The main concern in this book is also with conflicted affected and, in particular, post-conflict societies. Thus, it is necessary to consider what is meant by the term 'post-conflict society'.

UNESCO notes the difficulty of defining a conflict and thus a post-conflict society, calling it an 'inexact science' (2011: 138). However, they argue that armed conflict has to entail 'contested incompatibility' over government and/or territory where the use of armed force is involved, and where one of the parties to the conflict is the state. This definition is an attempt to differentiate between organised, politically motivated violence and generalised violence linked to criminal activity. They put forward a list of 35 countries affected by armed conflict between 1999 and 2008 of which 30 were low-income countries.

Of these 35 countries, ten were considered post-conflict in that they had been at peace for less than ten years but could still be considered as being at risk of a relapse back into violence. Quaynor (2011: 34) adds that political scientists working with databases that analyse conflict categorise an ongoing conflict as one which results in more than 25 deaths per year. However, Davies (2016: 182) questions whether any state can be truly seen as post-conflict, given that, while there may be a cessation of violence, the roots of the conflict may not have been addressed. It is also important to note that the presence of ongoing, full-scale armed conflict, such as is the case in Syria and Yemen at the time of writing, would make any educational reconstruction impossible.

The 30 countries low-income countries cited by UNESCO above and of relevance to this study were: Afghanistan, Angola, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Occupied Palestinian Territories, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Uganda and Yemen (2011: 138). It is also the case that in other countries which have experienced violent conflict some time ago the aftermath is still of considerable significance and education still needs to play a role in sustaining peace. A convincing case has, for example, been made for Lebanon as a post-conflict society where civil war took place between 1975 and 1990 (Van Ommering 2015). As Van Ommering says,

> Civil war legacies continue to haunt the present as up to 17,000 persons remain missing, bullet-scarred structures are ubiquitous, mine fields are yet to be cleared and countless people put up with its mental and physical scars. Many of today's politicians are former warlords who retained their positions of power as a result of a general amnesty that pardoned their war crimes. (2015: 201)

Others have argued for the inclusion of other countries as conflict affected or post-conflict such as

- Bangladesh (Uddin 2015)
- Cambodia (Kheang et al. 2018)
- Colombia (Rodriguez-Gomez et al. 2016; Quaynor 2011 and references in Chapter 4)
- Guatemala (Quaynor 2011; Poppema 2009; Bellino 2016; Dougherty and Rubin 2016; Dupuy 2008; Rubin 2016; Oglesby 2007)
- Kenya (Barakat et al. 2013; Mendenhall and Chopra 2016; Lauritzen 2016; Lauritzen and Nodeland 2017)
- Lebanon (Van Ommering 2015; Fontana 2016, 2017; Zakharia 2017)
- the Dominican republic (Bajaj and Acosta 2009)
- El Salvador (Poppema 2015; UNESCO 2011: 247)
- Peru (Paulson 2011; Frisancho and Reategui 2009)
- South Africa (Christie 2009, 2016; Quaynor 2011).

As Quaynor (2011: 35) notes, post-conflict countries differ from countries actively experiencing violent conflict, as the task of reconstruction can be more seriously undertaken once the threat of immediate violence has passed.

Moreover, many developing countries affected by internal conflict or in a post-conflict context are often described as 'fragile states', i.e. where the state and government are not seen as providing the functions and services that would be expected of a 'normal' or more developed state. While as Bengtsson (2011) points out, this can be a rather nebulous term, DFID nevertheless define a fragile state as one where the government cannot, or will not, deliver core functions to the majority of its people, including the poor (Kirk 2011: 160). Barakat et al. (2008: 3) provide a list of factors associated with fragility and these include low state capacity resulting from lack of financial, physical, administrative or human resources; poor governance and/or corruption; failure to deliver basic services; and low levels of social cohesion. Thus Brannelly et al. (2009: 31) contain four different lists of potentially 'fragile and conflict-affected states' containing 28, 38, 35 and 39 countries, respectively.

Given the difficulty of defining and categorising both conflict-affected and post-conflict developing societies, this study takes a broad view and includes evidence from countries that are cited and justified as post-conflict in the published literature on education and conflict. Indeed, there has been an increasing academic, professional and practical interest in education in post-conflict societies over the past two decades. Novelli and Lopes Cardozo (2012: 227–229) argue that this has happened for three main reasons. First, an increasing range of bodies, such as the Global Education Cluster headed by UNICEF, the International Save the Children Alliance and the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies have emerged which have successfully lobbied for an expansion of their own mandates and activities in education.

Second, these organisations and practitioners have successfully placed education and conflict firmly on the international development agenda, aided by a recognition that a large proportion of the world's out-of-school children are located in conflict and post-conflict countries. The third reason has been the merging of security and development agendas, so that aid to education is seen by aid agencies as helping to prevent violent conflict and as a mechanism of providing an alternative route for young people away from violent extremism and terrorism. This has so much been the case that Novelli and Lopes Cardoso note that in 2010 DFID decided to devote 50% of its funding to education to conflict and fragile states. This means, they argue, that countries such as Iraq, Pakistan, Sudan and Afghanistan have received disproportionately large portions of the cake.

As mentioned in the preface, one of the problems or obstacles facing educational reconstruction in post-conflict societies is that schooling itself has been involved and implicated in the violence. Thus, before going on to discuss how schooling might contribute to peace in subsequent chapters of the book, in the remainder of this chapter we examine more closely how schooling has been both affected by, and contributed to, violence in the wider society. We begin by examining the impact of violent conflict on schools.

The Impact of Violence on Schooling

It has been argued that,

> Perhaps more than at any time in history, schoolchildren, teachers and schools are on the front line of violence. Classrooms are destroyed not just because they are caught in the crossfire but because they are targeted by combatants. Young girls living in conflict-affected areas are subject every day to the threat of widespread, systematic rape and other forms of sexual violence. Children are abducted and forced into military service. And resources that could be used to finance productive investment in education are wasted on unproductive military expenditure. The effects are devastating. It is no coincidence that conflict-affected states have some of the worst indicators for education. (UNESCO 2011: 124–125)

For example, in 2014 over 200 school girls were kidnapped by Boko Haram, the extremist Islamic group in northern Nigeria and there were attacks on schools and abductions of children in South Sudan in 2015 (BBC News 24/2/2015). As Moland (2015: 372) puts it in regard to Boko Haram in Nigeria,

> In addition to the tragic loss of life and halted education in schools that have been attacked, this violence leads other families to fear sending their children to school and the government to close more schools. In a vicious cycle, inadequate education becomes both a cause and a consequence of violence. Militant groups such as Boko Haram destroy educational institutions, leading to more uneducated youth. These disaffected youth, in turn, become Boko Haram's target recruits, and are often the perpetrators of violence.

UNESCO estimates that over 2 million children were killed in conflicts and 6 million disabled in the decade to 2008; around 300,000 children are being exploited as soldiers, placed on the front line by warring parties and 20 million children have had to flee their homes as refugees or internally displaced persons. Moreover, they argue that indicators for nutrition, literacy and gender equality in conflict-affected countries are also among the lowest in the world (UNESCO 2011: 131, 142).

UNESCO also notes that, in terms of the impact on formal education, over the decade to 2008 thirty-five countries experienced armed conflict, of which thirty were low- and middle-income countries. 42% of out-of-school children live in conflict-affected, low-income countries. The average duration of violent conflicts in these countries is twelve years, the entire primary and secondary school cycle. Only 79% of young people are literate in conflict-affected poor countries compared to 93% in other poor countries. Over 43 million people have been displaced by armed conflict and refugees and internally displaced people face major barriers to education. In 2008, only 69% of primary school age refugee children in UNHCR camps were attending primary school. As well as this,

- Children in conflict-affected countries are not only less likely to be in primary school, but also more likely to drop out. Survival to the last grade in poorer conflict-affected countries is 65%, whereas it is 86% in other poor countries.
- Gross enrolment ratios in secondary school are nearly 30% lower in conflict-affected countries (48%) than in others (67%) and are far lower for girls.
- The legacy of conflict is evident in literacy levels. Only 79% of young people and 69% of adults are literate in conflict-affected countries, compared with 93% and 85% in other countries.
- Problems start before children reach school age. In conflict-affected countries, the average mortality rate for children under 5 is more than double the rate in other countries: on average twelve children out of a hundred die before their fifth birthday, compared with six out of a hundred in non-conflict-affected countries (UNESCO 2011: 2, 133).

However, this narrative of the negative effect of armed conflict on education has been challenged. Paulson and Shields (2013) note that the 2012 Human Security Report (HSR) argues that education actually appears to improve during periods of warfare. They themselves also state that quantitative evidence raises uncertainty about the impact of

conflict on education, though it does not completely undermine the assumption that generally conflict is not good for education. They reconcile the HSR calculation that in 40% of the cases *national* educational indicators were better at the end of the conflict than at the beginning with other evidence of the negative effect. They do this by arguing that this was often more visible at the sub-regional level rather than the national and on the participation and/or attainment of particular groups such as poor or rural students. The results of Paulson and Shields own research suggest that the effect of violent conflict is negative on primary and secondary school enrolment but depends on the country's overall level of enrolment, i.e. whether existing levels are high or low in the first place:

> For countries with lower levels of enrolment (which tend to have higher rates of growth in enrolment), this negative effect is manifested in a decrease in the rate of growth: enrolment continues to grow during conflict, but at a slower rate than it would have otherwise. For countries with higher levels of enrolment, the effect of conflict is an overall decrease in enrolment levels. (2013: 811)

However, when they included state fragility in their model (the state's incapacity to manage conflict, implement policy and deliver essential services) they found that changes in net enrolment are better explained by fragility than by conflict. So that enrolment rates are lower in fragile than non-fragile states, but there is no difference between a fragile state beset by conflict and one that is not and '…fragility could be the underlying cause'. This is further supported and argued in Shields and Paulson (2015).

Schooling as Contributing to Violence

The central concern of this book is the potential role of formal education in helping to build a sustainable peace and avoid future violent conflict in post-conflict societies. This is the idea that schools can

become involved in conflict transformation, the '…complex process of changing the relationships, attitudes, interests, discourses, and underlying structures that encourage and condition violent political conflict' (Austin 2011: 9–10, cited in Cunningham 2015: 2). However, existing forms of schooling in developing countries (as elsewhere) are contradictory and are a two-edged sword in that they have a dual potential of contributing either to peace or to violence:

> Education has the potential to act as a force for peace – but too often schools are used to reinforce the social divisions, intolerance and prejudices that lead to war. (UNESCO 2011: 3)

Fontana (2017: 39), for example, argues that in deeply divided, conflict-affected countries,

> …through curricula, structures and daily practices, schools produce, convey and reproduce key identity-forming narratives. Thus, they contribute to defining and redefining individual and collective identities, as well as the boundaries between communities.

However, this role can be either positive in building understanding and mutual respect between communities or negative in fostering negative stereotyping and hatred.

As Liberia's Truth and Reconciliation Commission recognised in its assessment of the causes of the country's civil war, limiting educational opportunities through political and social systems based on privilege, patronage and politicisation was a potent source of violence (UNESCO 2011: 160). Further examples of this include Nepal where poverty and exclusion, particularly among marginalised castes and ethnic groups in rural areas, were key factors driving the decade-long insurgency and Peru where the Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path) rebels in Peru exploited high levels of poverty and unemployment among indigenous youth with low levels of education. In Nigeria's oil-rich Niger

Delta region, access to good education and other basic services is limited but young adults with little or no education were most willing to join in violent protest or armed struggle. A person with primary schooling in the region was found to be significantly less likely to be involved in armed struggle than a person with no education (UNESCO 2011: 166). Moreover, even if access to schooling is provided, a mismatch between schooling and the labour market can result in unemployment or under employment making recruitment into militia attractive. UNESCO (2011: 165) provides examples from the Congo, Sri Lanka and Nigeria where educated but unemployed youths are recruits to militias.

Language in school can also be a cause of violence. As UNESCO (2011: 168) points out, in multi-ethnic and multilingual societies,

> …the imposition of a dominant language through the school system has been a frequent source of grievance linked to wider issues of social and cultural inequality…By one estimate, over half the countries affected by armed conflict are highly diverse linguistically, making decisions over the language of instruction a potentially divisive political issue.

UNESCO (2011: 168) uses three examples among others. One is Nepal where the imposition of Nepali as the language of instruction contributed to a broader set of grievances among non-Nepali minorities that feed the civil war. A second is Guatemala's imposition of Spanish in schools which was seen by indigenous people as part of a broader pattern of social discrimination and where armed groups representing indigenous people included the demand for bilingual and intercultural education in their conditions for a political settlement. In Thailand's three predominantly Muslim southernmost provinces, language and education have been at the centre of a wider political conflict involving demands for both secession and more autonomy. Schools and teachers are targets of violence as Malay Muslims perceive them as a threat to

their cultural identity because of their use of Thai as the sole language of instruction.

Thus, schooling is not only affected by violence, as discussed above, but in terms of unequal access or a perceived unfair or unjust language policy can help to cause or further violence. However, and importantly for this book, behaviour and practices ***inside*** schools themselves can also help to reproduce and perpetrate various forms of violence such as fighting, corporal punishment, bullying, negative racial and ethnic stereotyping, sexual harassment and stress, anxiety and illness caused by testing and examinations. This is discussed in detail in Bush and Saltarelli (2000), Harber (2004), Pinheiro (2006), PLAN (2008), Harber (2009), and Harber and Mncube (2017). The following diagram from Harber and Mncube (2017: 14) sets out the ways in which schools are not only affected by various forms of violence coming from society (external) but also help to reproduce violence by omission, i.e. by not doing something (internal indirect) and actively perpetrate violence (internal direct).

Types and Sources of Violence in Schools

Type of violence	External	Internal/indirect by omission	Internal/direct
Violent incursion of schools from armed force in international or civil conflict (e.g. ideological, religious or ethnic)	Army or militia attacks on school buildings and staff and students	Does school teach about peace/actively promote inter-communal respect and democratic values and behaviours?	Does school teach hatred of the 'other' through the curriculum and teacher attitudes and behaviour? Does the school promote militarisation?

Type of violence	External	Internal/indirect by omission	Internal/direct
Physical violence between individuals, e.g. fighting, physical beatings and shootings, including gang violence	Violent conflicts and rivalries that originate outside the school spill over and are continued in the school. The ease of obtaining guns (and knives) in the wider society increases the chance of their use in disputes in school. Violent attitudes and behaviour learnt at home are brought to school by learners and violence is carried out against both teachers and other learners	Does the school actively provide an organisational climate and physical structure that fosters loyalty to the school and a desire to protect it? Does the school have a clear non-violence and conflict-resolution policy and an active conflict-resolution committee? Do teachers consider violence prevention, including why students might want to use violence, a part of their job and a priority? Is violence considered in the curriculum? Is restorative justice practiced? Does teacher absenteeism and lateness to class facilitate fighting?	Is the school left unprotected by fencing and security? Do teachers physically beat students—corporal punishment and slapping, pinching, etc.?
Bullying	Is bullying (physical, verbal and cyber) learnt by students in the family and the community then practised in the schools?	Does the school have an anti-bullying policy and is it actively pursued? Does the school itself exhibit qualities of a bullying culture by forcing students to obey and conform to unnecessary and arbitrary rules?	Do teachers bully students by verbally abusing and humiliating them?

Type of violence	External	Internal/indirect by omission	Internal/direct
Sexual harassment and violence	Do girls suffer sexual harassment in school because male practices and expectations in the wider society intrude into school?	Do schools do anything to prevent sexual harassment of female students by male students by rules and disciplinary procedures and by educating about gender and gender equality?	Do teachers themselves sexually harass female students (and staff)?
Examination stress and illness	Do the competitive nature of educational selection and the labour market demands of the wider society (and its families) create harmful stress (and thus physical and psychological illness) in schools?	Do schools try to do anything to ameliorate such pressures through discussing the nature of examinations and providing support and encouragement for all? Do higher achieving students help less achieving ones? Where possible, do schools encourage cooperative as well as competitive learning?	Do schools make matters worse by an exaggerated emphasis on examinations and over-preparation via testing? Do they further promote competition, winners and losers, via class rankings, prizes, streaming, etc.

Harber and Mncube (2017)—and the references cited above—provide many concrete examples globally of the ways in which schooling helps to reproduce and perpetrate violence by omission and being directly violent, and there is no need to reproduce them here. However, it would be fair to summarise by saying that schools have played a part in contributing to violence in many developing societies that have experienced violent conflict. It is also worth noting that there is now considerable evidence suggesting that violence in the form of terrorism is positively linked to education, i.e. people willing to use violence to pursue political ends are *more* likely to come from the higher educated sections of society. Opinion polls carried out in the West Bank and Gaza

strip, for example, suggest that the more educated sections of the population are *less* likely to support dialogue and peaceful coexistence with Israel and more likely to support armed attacks. Similarly, Hezbollah fighters and Palestinian suicide bombers tend to come from the more educated sections of the Palestinian population. The same piece of research also found that violent Israeli extremists were also disproportionately from well educated, high-paid occupations, including teachers (Krueger and Maleckova 2003). In another paper discussing similar findings, Claude Berrebi of Princeton University comes to the important following conclusion,

> Policy makers, when trying to reduce terrorism via education or income, should focus not on the amount of education but on the content of education; changing the substance when needed in order to create positive stimulations towards democracy, moderation, appeasement and coexistence. Not all education is equal, and as Martin Luther King once said in another context, "education which stops with efficiency may prove the greatest menace to society, The most dangerous criminal may be the man gifted with reason but with no morals". (Berrebi 2003: 38)

Indeed, UNESCO itself notes that in Pakistan, Palestine and Sri Lanka, highly educated youth have been drawn into violence (2011: 163) partly because such young people may have a better understanding of a historical injustice or because the system has taught them hatred of the 'other' (Harber 2004: Chapter 6).

However, the focus of the present book is not on how and where schools have contributed to violence but whether they are capable of positively contributing to peace in post-conflict societies. Nevertheless, before examining the potential contribution of schools to peace, we need first to ask why and how schools are capable of reproducing and perpetrating widespread violence as this is important in considering whether, and in what ways, schools can and need to be changed in a post-conflict context. One key factor in the role of schooling in reproducing and perpetrating violence is its globally predominant authoritarian and pedagogical and organisational model.

Authoritarian Schooling

Schools globally are involved in political learning of different kinds. Elsewhere, for example, political indoctrination has been defined as an attempt to intentionally inculcate values and beliefs as facts or truths. The process may involve deliberately falsifying or ignoring evidence, as well as presenting it in a biased way. Historically, this process has been associated with totalitarian states such as Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia where individuals have little access to alternative viewpoints. Political socialisation is however perhaps more common than overt political indoctrination. This is the learning of preferences and predispositions towards political values and attitudes, though often in contexts where other viewpoints are available. It is just that some ideas and values are taken more seriously than others (Harber and Mncube 2012: 28). Harber and Mncube go on to provide examples of how schools can be involved in political indoctrination and socialisation:

> Schools can, and do, attempt to socialise or indoctrinate a whole series of messages about, for example, nationalism and national identity, attitudes towards other nations, gender, race and ethnicity, religion, economic systems, equality and inequality, war and peace, political participation and leadership. They can do this through the selection of subjects taught on the curriculum, through the content and interpretation of each subject, through the values in textbooks, through the talk and behaviour of teachers, through teaching methods, through the organisational structure and processes of the school, through the symbols displayed in the school (flags, posters, pictures), through the content of assemblies and the nature of extra-curricular activities. (Harber and Mncube 2012: 29–30)

A brief example of relevance here would be the role of schooling in the Kurdish area of Iraq under the Ba'ath Party prior to 2003:

> In accordance with the planned systematic assimilation of the north's non-Arab population, study in non-Arabic languages was prohibited. All civil servants, including teachers, were obliged to join the Ba'ath Party

> and were subjected to ideological testing and surveillance. The regime controlled the teaching of all subjects, using history, geography and civics to reinforce Ba'athist ideology. They forbade reference to Iraq's multicultural make-up, and as such ethnic historical narratives were omitted from the curriculum. (Shanks 2017: 420)

Tawil usefully both describes the role of schooling in political socialisation and links it to issues of violent conflict:

> Schooling functions as an ideological vehicle for political socialization. This socialization can occur as authoritarian structures act as media of repression, apartheid and discrimination, or as dominant groups impose official languages of instruction in multilingual settings. Sometimes the catalysis of increased inequality, discrimination or domination is inadvertent, stemming from unscrutinized textbook content or teacher attitudes. Political socialization is significantly shaped by what is transmitted through official curricula–particularly in courses in civics, history, geography and religion. The content of textbooks in Sri Lanka, for example, has clearly contributed to civil conflict…There has thus been an increasing emphasis in educational research on the ways in which textbooks portray in and out group identity and on the other ways in which they may contribute indirectly to conflict and communal strife. The hidden curriculum–the informal transmission of values, attitudes and beliefs to students through the everyday behaviour of teachers–plays as significant a role in political socialization as the explicit curriculum. Teacher attitudes, easily transmitted to students, may conflict with the content of curricula and official views of the histories of diverse co-existing groups. (Tawil 2001: 295)

Important here is the essentially authoritarian role of schooling in imposing political values on learners which has its roots in the historical origins of mass formal education. Historically, schooling has provided a means of social and political control, in particular to counter the threat to the state of increasingly industrialised, urbanised and potentially organised working populations in North America and Europe where formal, mass schooling originated. This authoritarian model was then spread through missionary work and colonialism to most parts of the globe and persisted in the post-colonial period (Harber 2004: Chapter 4).