

The Role of Peace-Education as a Coexistence, Reconciliation and Peace-Building Device in Ethiopia

by

Megersa Tolera Abdi

PhD fellow (Peace and Development Studies), Arsi University, Ethiopia

Email: magarsatolera@gmail.com

Abstract

Since the end of the 1990s, the number of major inter-state conflicts is decreasing while intra-state conflicts are increasing. This has tripled, and fighting in a growing number of lower intensity conflicts has escalated. These increasing intra-state conflicts are mainly caused by ethnic divisions. Much of this conflict remains entrenched in low-income countries, including Ethiopia, yet some of today's deadliest conflicts are occurring in countries at higher income levels with stronger institutions. Thus peace education is optional to deal with increasing conflicts in ethnically divided societies like that of Ethiopia. Peace-education necessarily involves formal and non-formal education and training programs aimed at changing negative attitudes and perceptions of the other side, as well as fostering peaceful coexistence, reconciliation, and peace-building between former belligerent parties. Among the goals of peace, education is the gradual legitimization of the other side's collective narrative, critical assessment of one's group role in the conflict, developing empathy and trust toward another group in an effort to narrow the psychological distance between different groups, and in this way creating grounds for inter-group dialogue and understanding. The study was conducted using a constructivist theoretical paradigm. As a qualitative study, this inquiry followed an exploratory nature. It aims at describing and exploring the role of peace education as coexistence, reconciliation, and peace-building tool. The study found that peace education deal with deep-rooted beliefs and attitudes makes the implementation of such programs challenging, because of the underlying contextual and situational factors that stimulate inter-group conflict. It also concentrates among other things on fostering discussion and reconsideration at the intra-societal and inter-societal levels of underlying factors that reinforce negative perceptions and attitudes. The study concludes that peace education at the societal level is dependent on the experience of heightened levels of an individual (and hence communal) such that peace grows ever-deeper, from the surface level of negotiation to deeper forms of co-existence and mutuality between the different structures of society. The study recommends peace education programs at the society level should precede or be implemented simultaneously with the work on coexistence, peacebuilding, and reconciliation.

Keywords: peace education, peace building, reconciliation, coexistence.

Introduction:

Development of peace education as a field was a result of the peace advocacy movements which gained popularity since the second half of the 20th century and pioneered studies of

nonmilitary approaches to the resolutions of conflicts (Apsel et al., 2002). Existence of different names for peace education, such as but not limited to conflict resolution, coexistence education, human rights education, civic education, and multicultural education indicates that the field of peace education embraces in itself various meanings and concepts. If so, we need to be clear and specific about the concept and meaning of peace education that would guide its practice.

Over the course of the last two decades, the concept of peace has evolved considerably. One of the concepts of peace deals with the social-structural dimensions of peace and focuses on the elimination of both physical and structural violence at the macro and micro levels. This approach, in addition to negative peace, introduced the concept of "Positive peace", which initially meant the absence of structural violence (inequalities in societies, which could potentially lead to violence). Later the concept of the structural violence expanded to include personal-micro and macro-level structures that "harm or discriminate against particular individuals, ethnic communities, or groups" (Kowalewski et al, 2001).

More recent peace concepts view peace as a holistic complex system and are based on the premise that diversity is a strength. This "intercultural" approach to peace concept envisages establishing peaceful coexistence between different ethnic, racial, cultural, and religious groups. Thus, recent "multi-factored" theories focus not only on causes of violence and conflicts but also on the view of peace in more holistic positive terms, i.e. defining the conditions and factors, which are necessary in order to create a peaceful world (Kowalewski et al, 2001).

The existence of different meanings of peace does not mean that peace programs should deal only with negative or positive peace. Johan Galtung argues that peace programs should define as the achievement of their ultimate goal of both negative and positive peace since they are interconnected in the sense that inequality and structural violence may lead to the eruption of violence (Galtung, 2001).

The difference between the concepts of peace ultimately determines different levels of analysis for various peace education programs. It is therefore essential to make distinctions between goals that various peace education programs pursue.

Salomon considers the socio-political context as the most important distinguishing factor between various peace education programs (Dwyer, 2003). Thus, in some countries peace education is called to address the consequences of intractable conflicts. In other regions, the focus is on the issues of inequalities and injustices, which can potentially lead to violence (structural violence). For others, peace education is a means of promoting human rights. In other countries, peace education deals primarily with interethnic or racial tensions (Dwyer, 2003).

Similarly, UNESCO in its action plan envisaged the promotion of a culture of peace around the world through the "International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World" initiative launched in 2002. This included the promotion of international peace and security along with advancing understanding, tolerance and solidarity, promotion of sustainable economic and social development, respect for all human rights, and democratic participation.

Indeed, as we see from the evolution of the concept of peace, the absence of war still remains a necessary precondition for all peace definitions. However, there is ample evidence in the recent history suggesting that formal treaty between belligerent parties or even signing of peace accords creates conditions for the negative peace, i.e. absence of direct physical violence. Yet, few would argue that the absence of war is enough for building lasting peace.

Reconciliation, empathy and mutual trust, which are regarded as essential goals of peace education require intensive efforts to create an environment of positive peace in its broader

conceptualization, i.e. condition which would maintain peaceful coexistence of different ethnic, religious groups as well as prevent the occurrence of structural inequalities and injustices (Kowalewski et al, 2001).

Statement of the problem:

Fostering coexistence between the different groups is seen as a crucial step and even a precondition for the continuation of the process of improving inter-group relations leading to reconciliation and between the opposing groups. In a similar manner, Shapiro argues that the peaceful coexistence requires a change in "psychological dispositions" of people, because it influences their cultural attitudes towards others, beliefs and behavior (David Smock and John Prendergast).

In other ways peacebuilding as the Secretary-General of the UN (1992) originally defined it was primarily a post-conflict concept, although he has acknowledged that peacebuilding activities are appropriate during all phases of a conflict (Boutros B. Ggali, 1992).

Boutros Boutros-Ghali's definition of peacebuilding in 'An Agenda for Peace is an 'action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict'. Peacebuilding is clearly preventive in its nature, as is reconciliation. Both of these concepts have great overlap indeed. This indicated that peacebuilding involves a continuum of responses, including economic development, security, and conflict resolution.

Having reviewed the key goals of peace education programs, it is becoming clear why peace education in the most recent literature is also referred to as "education for coexistence". Accordingly, peace education is regarded as fulfilling a central role in establishing and sustaining nonviolent societies where divided societies are able to live in recognizing each other, and conflicts are resolved through peaceful means. It is concerned with supporting humans in developing their individual potentials for achievement through peaceful means and in the transformation to peaceful societies and institutions. The potential contribution of this study is twofold: a focused and critical examination of the Peacebuilding and peace-destroying role of education; and the placement of education on the mainstream peacebuilding and reconstruction agenda. To this end, the study explores the need for peace education as a coexistence, peacebuilding, and reconciliation tool

General objective of the study:

The general objective of the study is to explore the need for peace education as coexistence, peace-building and reconciliation tool.

Specific objectives of the study:

The specific objectives of the study were:

- i. To assess the role of peace education in the coexistence of divided society
- ii. To review the role of peace education in peace-building in society and
- iii. To appraise the function of peace education in reconciliation processes

Study design and Methodology:

This paper has employed qualitative research approach. The rationale for the selection of the qualitative research approach is due to the fact the conceptual issues to be investigated require a holistic qualitative data and discussion. It draws heavily on secondary sources, including books, journals, researches and reports of various institutions. The facts collected is analyzed thematically, trans-active approach as alternative explanation to the need for peace education as a coexistence, reconciliation and peace-building is discussed as part of the analysis in various sections.

Reviews of related literature:

Education and Nation-Building:

Traditionally, education systems have played a key role in maintaining this fictive image of cultural homogeneity. John Paul Lederach, 1995, highlights some of the ways in which education has been used in the service of cultural homogenization, including the invention and use of a canon of “national literature” and the promulgation of a common national language – two essential components in what has been called the “naturalization” of citizens. Hizkias Assefa, 1993, goes further to suggest that the traditional notion of the state embodied a set of assumptions that simultaneously claim and construct linguistic, cultural and political homogeneity. Schooling may contribute to this process by constructing and imposing a common culture, founded on a common language, a shared sense of history and destiny, and more broadly, a common set of expectations and behaviors rooted in a sense of civic loyalty. Whether the end result is assimilation or integration depends on both the way schooling is structured and the content of the curriculum (both hidden and explicit).

In other words, the “naturalization” of citizens is a process that may be either integrative or disintegrative. In a liberal view of the world, the end result is a society based on tolerance and respect for differences. However, this same process may also generate the opposite outcome: intolerance, xenophobia, and fear, and rejection of difference.

Through the liberal lens, the principal task of public schooling, properly organized and delivered, has traditionally been to create “harmony” within a nation of divergent peoples. Public schooling is viewed as an investment in a social contract the benefits of which are believed to accrue not only to the individual who experiences schooling but also, and perhaps more importantly, to the wider society.

But the current challenge of education in many countries is intent on forging a national identity, is to maintain peace within their own borders, while fostering tolerance of their often very divergent neighbors.

It is possible to identify historical examples of these processes. The development of mass education systems towards the end of the 19th century played a role in unifying nations at a time when the democratic charter was being extended. This was as true of “old” societies, such as Britain, where the schools could promulgate tradition and history, and “new” societies such as the United States where schools were expected to act as part of the “melting-pot” to fuse a multitude of migrant communities into American citizens. Towards a somewhat different purpose, but following essentially similar processes, the promising USSR education served as a mechanism for constructing “Soviet man” (Pankhurst, Donna, 1999). In contrast to the melting pot model of the United States, schooling in Canada used the metaphor of a multicultural

“mosaic” in which differences were recognized and highlighted, rather than overlooked and blended. The results of these models were mixed, but sufficient to reduce widespread violence – though this generalization should not obscure or minimize the violence inflicted on the aboriginal peoples of Canadians in the residential school system.

A further case is illustrated in the conflicts between Albanians and Serbs in Kosovo. To counteract Albanian attempts to affirm their minority national identity, the Serbian government adopted a policy of assimilation, eliminating teaching programmes in the Albanian language and introducing a unified curriculum and standardized textbooks across the country, measures that many blame for the ensuing conflict. In its report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child in 1994, the Yugoslav government admitted that it was encountering major problems in the education of Albanian children in the provinces of Kosovo and Metohijo. Parents refused to send their children to schools working according to the “legitimate programme of the Republic of Serbia”. Instead, Albanian children attended non-accredited parallel schools, treated by the Government as illegal. In an alternative report submitted to the Committee, a nongovernmental organization points out that a number of important institutions in the educational system were shut down in 1994, including the Institute for Albanology and the Academy of Sciences and Arts of Kosovo. Educational and professional activities in the Albanian language were no longer allocated government funds, teaching aids in Albanian were not published and the major Albanian publishing house, Rilindja, was closed down. The curriculum and the approach of teachers in the official schools were highly politicized.

There can be no doubt that the split in education in Kosovo was a major contributor to the upsurge of violence that reached its horrifying peak in 1999. The point to be emphasized here is that the systematic ethnic cleansing undertaken by the Serbian military forces in late 1999 was in no way a spontaneous event. The pioneer to abuse on such a massive scale is the systematic dismantling of the social, political and economic institutions that provide order and stability for a community. This was certainly the case in Nazi Germany, and in Cambodia under Pol Pot.

Education for Peace Programmes:

Graça Machel has suggested ‘Education for Peace Programmes’ as one kind of educational initiative that might have constructive peacebuilding impacts (UN, 1996a). Education for peace programmes are being promoted by UNICEF and are reaching many thousands of children in war-scarred countries, in Burundi, the Republic of Congo, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Lebanon, Liberia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and former Yugoslavia. However, while such programmes are *reaching* thousands of school children, the nature or depth of their impact is less clear.

Similarly, public media are sometimes involved in these processes, especially to reach out-of-school children and other sectors of the community. It is hoped that an educational approach will contribute to the development of local peacebuilding capacities, since, as already noted, any solution will be unsustainable unless it is developed and supported by state and non-state actors within the societies themselves. Such positive measures could be implemented throughout an ethnic conflict-affected society, including the schools, the media, judicial system, the security sector, and the unions, and so on.

Although peace education and human rights courses are essential for cultivating broader understandings of rights and possible options, experience from some countries suggests that introducing them in a context of systematic discrimination is one ingredient in the method for change. More broadly, school systems themselves must become more equitable and democratic, starting from the experience children have in the classroom. Lessons characterized by rote learning and the absence of open debate, where rules must be obeyed without question, undercut children's confidence, and inhibit their participation as active members of their societies.

Similarly, children cannot be expected to learn the real meaning of democratic principles when their families and communities have no way of making their views and feelings known to the school and staff and no assurances that, if they do, these will be taken seriously. The process of education, teaching, and learning, as well as the way schools, function as institutions, carry their own powerful messages. Democratic, participative, and inclusive schools are an important part of children's experiences (Roland Paris, 2003). Unfortunately, however, this is an ideal that is rarely present in the North, let alone the South. The fundamental question is how a critical education system can be nurtured within non-democratic, pseudo-democratic, or transitionally democratic political systems?

To the extent that the schooling system is able to do so, it assumes a very important role in the peacebuilding process – not necessarily in the oppositional function it plays, but in its ability to maintain and articulate credible alternative visions of the future; visions that are inclusive, tolerant, liberal, democratic and just. This is precisely why authoritarian states tend to target the school system as soon as they acquire sufficient means.

Distinguishing Peacebuilding Education from Peace Education:

In any discussion of peacebuilding education, there is a clear need to go beyond approaches based predominantly on academic study and training. First, academic study is too often too removed from the real world, application, and the practical consideration of implications or impact. Second, the idea of training strikes of an approach premised on externally generated and imposed solutions, that fails to recognize the possibility that culturally and place-specific peacebuilding capacities may well exist, and be more appropriate and sustainable. It is significant to note that within the international community, the language of training (external intervention with quick exit strategies) set dominates over the language of education (implying longer-term commitment)(Pankhurst, Donna, 1999).

As a starting point, it is useful to note a number of substantive differences between peace education and peacebuilding education. Peacebuilding education would be driven by those affected by militarized violence, not by the largely Northern, white, academic elite that drove efforts to get peace issues onto the academic agenda in the 1960s, '70s, and '80s. Peacebuilding education – like peacebuilding itself – would be a bottom-up rather than top-down process is driven by communities themselves, founded on their experiences and capacities.

Like peace education, peacebuilding education might include facts and figures related to contemporary militarized violence. And it would include the teaching of conflict management techniques and critical reading skills and the cultivation of the values of cultural tolerance and non-violence. However, peacebuilding education would be firmly rooted in immediate realities, not in abstract ideas or theories. It would be applied, immediate and relevant. This means that it cannot be restricted to the classroom. It might include community projects involving children and adolescents from across ethnic borderlines or inter-ethnic development projects. For example, in Mozambique, this might include assistance in rebuilding schools where damage to

the educational infrastructure left two-thirds of the primary school-age children without access to education (UNICEF, 1996). The joint UNICEF/Government of Sri Lanka programme, Education for Conflict Resolution, provides another example of how the process and content of new curriculum packages might draw on and resonate with the cultural environment within which they are set – even when the environment is bifurcated into Hindu and Buddhist (UNICEF, 1996).

If education is to have a sustainable peacebuilding impact, then it will have to be driven by those individuals and groups within the societies themselves. This means that external actors must assume supporting and facilitating roles. This does not suggest that external factors should reduce their development assistance, rather that they should devolve decision-making authority and, where necessary, support the development of the managerial capacity needed for populations to regain administrative control of both public and private educational initiatives.

The identification, cultivation and support of national and local peacebuilding capacities require a sustained commitment, as well as a willingness to take risks, experiment, and learn from mistakes.

Findings of the Study:

The Role of Peace Education in Coexistence of Divided Society:

Many factors contribute to peaceful coexistence between different groups within a society, but it is clear to many observers that education plays a definite role. A central question for the current study is the degree to which, and the conditions under which, education can play a constructive role – not necessarily in altering the content of group identities but in altering the rules of interaction. Thus in this study, education was broadly defined as an important medium for imparting not only pedagogic instruction but attitudes, values and behaviors. It transmits language, culture, moral values and social organization, leading to a particular identity and often has a strong political role. It is understood to rest on two distinct foundations:

- i. the *formal structures* of schooling (a teacher who teaches and a student who learns)
- ii. the *informal and non-formal structures* of learning – involving the acquisition of ideas, values, beliefs and opinions outside educational institutions, whether in streets, fields, religious settings or the home.

Formal education is often viewed as a neutral or technical process of information dissemination set within a given societal context. It found that this starting point inhibited consideration of the role of education in the creation of a “constructed” – rather than a “given” – societal context. The broadening of the analytical focus reveals that implicitly and explicitly, intentionally and unintentionally, education *inevitably* has a societal impact – for good or for ill. As the author and critic Neil Postman has said,

“... public education does not serve a public. It creates a public. The question is, what kind of public does it create? A conglomerate of self-indulgent consumers? Angry, soulless, directionless masses? Indifferent, confused citizens? Or a public imbued with confidence, a sense of purpose, a respect for learning and tolerance?”

Informal education is learning that occurs without being specifically planned and structured. Examples might be socialization, learning how to behave in a family or learning a trade from a parent. This is usually more flexible and open than the formal education typified by schooling.

In this way, formal schooling and training, as well as non-formal education, can play an essential role in conflict transformation, whether to sensitize society to inequities in a system; to foster tolerance and inter-group understanding; to promote healing and reconciliation, or to nurture the idea and capacities for peace.

The Role of Peace Education in Peace-building in Society:

Many peace educators have expressed their understandings of the roles of peace education in society and the continuous process of deepening and clarification of these goals is essential to the development of the field. Burns and Aspeslagh, from whose work I have developed much of the discussion in this essay, commented succinctly: ‘Our central thesis is that education and the generation and transmission of knowledge which challenges dominant thinking and puts forward alternatives, can contribute to the realization of a peaceful, just and sustainable future. From another view peace education in society has the following features:

- i. an emphasis on *values* like justice, cooperation, solidarity, development of personal autonomy and decision-making;
- ii. rejection of values that goes against a culture of peace like discrimination, intolerance, ethnocentrism, blind obedience, indifference and conformism;
- iii. a focus on peaceful *action*
- iv. behavior and awareness understood within micro and macro *contexts*;
- v. Peace education aims at recovering the idea of a positive peace for all citizens and in all the areas of human interaction.

These principles applied in areas like conflict resolution, conservation and restoration of the environment, application of human rights, gender equality, socio-economic justice, disarmament, cultural diversity, and other related areas serve to place education as a dynamic and central agency in society, leading societies towards sustainable, peaceful futures.

The Function of Peace Education in Reconciliation Processes:

Reconciliation involves (re)building relationships among people and groups in society and between the state and its citizens. Healing trauma, building trust, enabling forgiveness, and sharing narratives are some of the many elements of reconciliation. Depending on the conflict, reconciliation may be needed between political groups, between different communities or ethnic groups, between citizens and the state, or a combination of these.

While both peacemaking (in which the parties involved negotiate a cease-fire, an initial agreement or a framework for resolving the conflict in the future) and Peacebuilding (in which the economic, political and educational institutions are used to create long-term peace) are forms of consensual peace, long-term consensual peace depends on Peacebuilding. Peacebuilding deals with structural issues and is aimed at creating long-term harmonious relationships based on positive interdependence, mutual respect and social justice. Peace education is one means of institutionalizing reconciliation. Peace education may focus on building mutuality among all

citizens and teaching them the competencies, attitudes and values needed to build and maintain cooperative systems, resolve conflicts constructively and adopt values promotive of peace.

Institutionalizing Reconciliation through Peace Education:

The steps of institutionalizing reconciliation through education include:

- i. establishing public education that is compulsory and integrates the diverse members of society,
- ii. establishing the mutuality and positive interdependence underlying a peaceful society and teaching students the competencies and attitudes they need to engage in cooperative efforts,
- iii. teaching students how to engage in peaceful political discourse to make difficult decisions,
- iv. teaching students how to engage in integrative negotiations and mediation, and
- v. inculcating civic values.

Step 1 - Establishing Public Education:

In order for peace education to influence children and youth, they must attend school. A necessary condition for accomplishing the goals of peace education is, therefore, the existence of mandatory public education. Requiring all children and youth within a society to attend public school is a critical step in bringing peace to the society.

There are many other reasons why national education systems are needed. One is that schools can provide a setting in which peace may be lived and experienced, not just talked about. The day-to-day fabric of school life needs to reflect the mutuality, cooperation, political discourse and decision making, and constructive conflict resolution inherent in a peaceful society. Peace is woven into the fabric of school life primarily through instructional methods.

Another reason is that schools may provide the setting in which students may be educated in the competencies and attitudes they need to build and maintain long-term peace. The social resources (i.e., individuals skilled in being part of a cooperative effort, making difficult decisions and resolving conflicts constructively) needed for peace to flourish are developed through experiencing the processes of building and maintaining peace in the day-to-day life in the school.

In addition, mandatory public education may create a literate workforce, help children and youth find positive roles in society, increase students' commitment to improving society, give students' hope for a rewarding and meaningful livelihood and life and integrate diverse groups into society.

For reconciliation to be developed and maintained, positive relations must be established. This is difficult to establish if schools are segregated. Segregated schools may have both cultural and social consequences. In segregated schools, students may be introduced into opposing cultural worlds through the curriculum tailored for their cultural group. Socially, the very separation of different groups into segregated schools emphasizes the group differences and hostilities, reinforces the intergroup conflict, and communicates that the conflict is intractable (that is, a conflict that is difficult to resolve, intense and ongoing in which each side tends to view their own group as righteous and the opposing group as evil). Students may then be culturally and socially socialized into the values, attitudes, norms, and information underlying the continuation of the conflict. The more different the groups in terms of culture, religion,

ethnicity, history, and so forth, the more destructive the effects of segregation may tend to be. Peace tends to be very fragile in segregated societies. As long as groups are separated, long-term peace is at risk.

Step 2 - Establishing Mutuality, Positive Interdependence:

Building and maintaining reconciliation requires mutuality to be established on three levels: mutual goals, mutual benefits from achieving goals (i.e., common fate), and mutual identity. These three types of positive interdependence need to be institutionalized in the economic, political and educational institutions of the society. Long-term reconciliation depends on having common goals that unite all members of a society in a joint effort.

The mutual goals have to be salient and compelling enough to overcome competing agendas, the past history of conflict among the parties, and the dynamics of intergroup conflict. The benefits received from achieving the mutual goals must be justly distributed among all relevant parties.

Usually, benefits need to be equally distributed, although in some cases those with the most need may be given more than others. Equal benefits tend to highlight the common fate of all members of society. Mutuality is also established through a superordinate identity that makes all citizens members of the same group. This mutual identity is created by::

- i. respecting one's own cultural identity,
- ii. respecting others' cultural identities,
- iii. developing a superordinate identity that subsumes all the diverse identities, and
- iv. basing the superordinate identity on a pluralistic set of values.

Step 3 - Teaching Students How To Make Difficult Decisions:

Maintaining peace requires deliberating on the difficult issues facing a diverse society and making decisions in ways that ensure all relevant individuals are committed to implementing the decision. When left unresolved, the difficult issues may result in a renewal of war or violence. In order to have constructive discussions of difficult issues, the parties involved need an effective decision-making procedure. In order to teach students how to make these decisions effectively, peace education includes training students on how to use constructive controversial procedures skillfully. Controversy exists when one person's ideas, opinions, information, theories or conclusions are incompatible with those of another and the two seek to reach an agreement

Controversies are resolved by engaging in what Aristotle called *deliberate discourse* (i.e., the discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of proposed actions) and are aimed at synthesizing novel solutions (i.e., *creative problem solving*). Deliberate discourse is related to *political discourse*, which is the formal exchange of reasoned views as to which of several alternative courses of action should be taken to solve a societal problem.

Political discourse is intended to involve all citizens in the making of a decision, participants attempt to persuade each other (through valid information and logic) and clarify what course of action would be most effective in solving the societal problem. Political discourse is in turn closely related to *deliberation*, a public discussion aimed at reaching a justifiable decision to solve a societal problem or, if a decision cannot be made, live respectfully with the reasonable disagreements that remain unresolvable.

Step 4 - Teaching Students how to Resolve Conflicts Constructively:

If reconciliation is to last, individuals must learn how to resolve conflicts of interest constructively. A *conflict of interests* exists when the actions of one person (attempting to maximize his or her wants and benefits) prevent, block, or interfere with another person maximizing his or her wants and benefits. Conflicts of interests are resolved through negotiation and mediation. Teaching students how to resolve conflicts of interests constructively help make schools safe places where diverse students experience peace and socialize diverse students into the competencies they need to resolve conflicts constructively for the rest of their lives in career, family, neighborhood and societal settings. All students in a society should be taught the procedures and skills required to manage conflicts constructively. This requires a *total student body approach* that trains every student in the school to manage conflicts constructively and help schoolmates to do likewise as opposed to a *cadre approach* that emphasizes training a small number of students to serve as peer mediators.

In order to manage conflicts constructively, students need to learn how to engage in integrative or problem-solving negotiations and peer mediation. While peacemaking may involve *distributive* or ‘win-lose’ negotiations where one person benefits only if the opponent agrees to make a concession, peacebuilding requires the use of *integrative* or problem-solving negotiations where disputants work together to create an agreement that benefits everyone involved, that is, maximizes joint benefit. Working together cooperatively, and resolving conflicts constructively, sets the stage for reconciliation and forgiveness.

Step 5 - Inculcating Civic Values:

Reconciliation is maintained through the application of civic values. Reconciliation survives on the virtue of the people and virtue is reflected in the way individuals and groups balance their own needs with the needs of the society as a whole. Motivation to be good is created by a sense of belonging to an inclusive society, a concern for society as a whole, and a moral bond with society. When parties work together to achieve mutual goals and when conflicts are managed constructively, the adoption of the civic values underlying civic virtue is promoted.

Mutuality cannot exist in settings dominated by competitive or individualistic efforts. Rather, students need to internalize the values reflective of cooperation, controversy and integrative negotiations, which include a commitment to the common good and to the well-being of others, a sense of responsibility to contribute one’s fair share of the work, respect for the efforts and viewpoints of others and for them as people, behaving with integrity, empathy with and caring for the other parties, compassion when other members are in need, equality, justice, and appreciation of diversity. In addition to promoting reconciliation, individuals who hold these values strongly tend to lead happier and healthier lives.

In general, this study seeks to develop a brief understanding of one particular dimension of education: the *constructive* and *destructive* impacts of education (the two faces of education). The negative face shows itself in the uneven distribution of education to create or preserve privilege, the use of education as a weapon of cultural repression, and the production or doctoring of textbooks to promote intolerance. The positive face goes beyond the provision of education for peace programs, reflecting the cumulative benefits of the provision of good quality education. These include the conflict-dampening impact of educational opportunity, the promotion of linguistic tolerance, the nurturing of ethnic tolerance, and the ‘disarming’ of

history, this is the role of education in serving as peacebuilding, reconciliation and coexistence tool.

Conclusions:

Peace may be imposed (either by the most powerful party in the conflict or by powerful third parties who provide peacekeepers) or may be based on a consensual agreement about goals, benefits, and the sharing of resources. Once established, peace is institutionalized through the economic system, political structures, education, religion, housing patterns, and mass media. There are five essential elements of institutionalizing peace through education.

First, in order for education to influence children and youth they must attend school. Compulsory public education must, therefore, be established. In order to build the long-term positive relationships needed to institutionalize peace, the schools must be integrated so that the children and youth from the disputing groups interact with each other, get to know each other, and build positive relationships. This contact must occur under optimal conditions (i.e., work together cooperatively; build personal relationships in which candid conversations may take place, equal status, support from authorities, and societal norms).

Second, mutuality and an awareness of a common fate must be established so that individuals perceive that the goals of any group can be accomplished if and only if the goals of all other groups are accomplished. The benefits of achieving mutual goals must be distributed in a 'just' and fair manner. A superordinate identity unifying the diverse groups must be built. There are a variety of ways to teach mutuality, but the most effective may be to use cooperative learning to ensure that mutuality is built into the day-to-day fabric of school life. The school becomes a microcosm of society by having students work together cooperatively to achieve mutual learning goals. The pedagogical procedures weave mutuality into the fabric of school life and can be extended to cooperative classrooms and an overall cooperative school structure.

Third, the children and youth in many societies have never lived in a democracy and are unfamiliar with the role of citizens in a democracy. Dissent may have been punished. They need to learn, therefore, how to engage in democratic decision making involving political discourse or deliberation. This may be taught through the constructive controversy procedure.

Fourth, many of the children and youth attending school may have participated in the conflict as warriors, support personnel, or victims. They are used to seeing violence as the primary strategy for dealing with conflicts. They need, therefore, to learn how to manage conflicts constructively. In order to teach students how to resolve conflicts of interests constructively, the peacemaker program (consisting of integrative negotiation and peer mediation procedures) may be implemented at all grade levels.

Finally, the civic values necessary for consensual peace need to be inculcated. By engaging in cooperative efforts, the constructive controversy procedure, students will tend to internalize the necessary civic values.

These five steps need to be implemented at all levels of schooling so that students experience positive interaction for years and the cooperative, controversy, and conflict resolution procedures become automatic habit patterns and their underlying values become firmly embedded. The personal experiences resulting from cooperation and constructive conflict resolution among diverse students result in an understanding of the meaning and relevance of peace and justice and define a way of life. It also institutionalizes peace in educational settings.

Recommendations:

The contents and process of education should promote peace, social justice, respect for human rights, and the acceptance of responsibility. Children need to learn the skills of negotiation, problem-solving, critical thinking, and communications that will enable them to resolve conflicts without resorting to violence.

In addition, education systems should be encouraged to include instruction about the fallacies and risks of prejudice and the duty of individuals to be alert to their own tendencies to engage in reconciliation, peacebuilding and coexistence in a divided society like Ethiopia.

References

- Apse, J. & Fine, H. (Eds.) (2002). *Teaching about Genocide: a Guidebook for College and University Teachers*. Washington DC: American Sociological Association Teaching Resource Center.
- Dwyer, S. (2003). Reconciliation for Realists, in: Carol AL Prager and Trudy Govier (eds.): *Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts*. Waterloo, Ontario, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, pp. 91-110.
- Galtung, J. (2001). After Violence, Reconstruction, Reconciliation and Resolution, in: Mohammed Abu-Nimer, ed., *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence: Theory and Practice*. Lanham, MD, Lexington Books, pp. 3-23.
- Hizkias, A. (1993). Peace and Reconciliation as a Paradigm, Nairobi Peace Initiatives Monograph One, 1993, p. 9.
- Kowalewski, Brenda M., Ender, Morten G., DeFiore, J. (Eds.) (2001). *Service-Learning and Undergraduate Sociology: Syllabi and Instructional Materials*. Washington DC: American Sociological Association Teaching Resource Center.
- Lederach, J. P. (1995). *Building Peace: Sustainable Development in Divided Societies*. Tokyo: United Nations University. p. 51.
- Pankhurst, D. (1999). Issues of justice and reconciliation in complex political emergencies: conceptualizing reconciliation, justice and peace. *Third World Quarterly*, Volume 20, No. 1, pp. 239-256.
- Roland P. (2003). *At War's End; Frances Fukuyama, International Order and State-building*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003
- Smock, D., Prendergast, J. (1996). *NGOs and the Peace Process in Angola*. U.S. Institute of Peace Special Report, April 1996, p. 2.
- Turmini, Kristiawan, M., Sari, A. P. (2020). The Influence of Education, Training, and Experience towards Teacher's Professionalism. *Electronic Research Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*. Volume 2, Issue II, pp. 102-110

UN. (2000). Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations," October 2000. Retrieved April 19, 2000 from http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations/.