GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR THE PREVENTION OF ARMED CONFLICT

Nansen Dialogue Centre
SERBIA

EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR conflict prevention

Conflict Resolution and Peace Education Policy Examples

Resource Pack

developed for

The Balkan Regional Conference on Peace Education and Conflict Resolution in Schools

12-13 April 2007
Belgrade
Serbia

Auswärtiges Amt

ifa Institut für Auslands-beziehungen e.V.

List of Policy Documents Relevant for Peace Education

Please note that this list is by no means comprehensive.

Organization: United Nations – High Level Group -Alliance of Civilizations **Date:** 13 November 2006

Document title: *Alliance of Civilizations: Report of the High Level Group*
Contributors: Secretary-General Annan established this High Level Group of Eminent persons for a full list of members please see: http://www.unaoc.org/aoc.php?page=4
Reference: http://www.unaoc.org/aoc.php?page=7

Policy Points/ Recommendations:

- Civic and peace education: Citizens should be expose to the principles enshrined in the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, if they are to function effectively in a pluralistic world.
- Growing efforts to teach interdisciplinary world history in colleges and schools contribute to developing knowledge and appreciation of the diversity and interdependence of global cultures, and to building a sense of shared human experience.

Organization: United Nations **Date:** 20 September 2005

Document title: *Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations Conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields: Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit*
Signatories: All members of the United Nation General Assembly
Reference: http://www.unis.unvienna.org/pdf/A60L.pdf

Policy points (para 144):

- Reaffirm the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace as well as the Global Agenda for Dialogue among Civilizations and its Programme of Action adopted
- Reaffirm the value of different initiatives on dialogue among cultures and civilizations
- Commit ourselves to taking action to promote a culture of peace and dialogue at the local, national, regional and international levels and request the Secretary- General to explore enhancing implementation mechanisms and to follow up on those initiatives

Organization: United Nations **Date:** 14 July 2005

Document title: *The Plan of Action for 2005-2007*
Signatories: All members of the United Nation General Assembly July 2005
Reference:
http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2004/ga10317.doc.htm
Policy points:

- Promoting respect for human dignity and equality and participation in democratic decision-making, human rights education contributes to the long-term prevention of abuses and violent conflicts.
- Proclaiming a World Programme for Human Rights Education which would focus on primary and secondary education by integrating human rights issued into curricula.
- Adopting a resolution which stressed the belief that human rights education was essential to the realization of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and contributed significantly to promoting equality and preventing conflict and encouraging democracy.

Organization: UNESCO **Date:** October 1994

Document title: *Declaration of the 44th session of the international conference on Education*
Signatories: Ministers of Education meeting at the conference.
European National representatives included e.g.:
- Minister of education, Belgium
- Minister of Education and Culture, Cyprus
- Minister of Education, Spain
- Minister of Education, Former Republic of Macedonia
- Minister of Education, France
- Ministry of Education, Greece
- Ministry of Education, Hungary
- Vice-minister of Education, Poland
- Minister of Education, Czech Republic
- Minster of l'enseignement, Romania
- Ministry of Education, Slovakia

Reference:
http://www.unesco.org/education/nfsunesco/pdf/REV_74_E.PDF\
Policy points:

- To take suitable steps to establish in educational institutions an atmosphere contributing to the success of education for international understanding.
- To pay special attention to improving curricula, the content of textbooks, and other educational materials including new technologies.
- To encourage the development of innovative strategies adapted to the new challenges of educating responsible citizens committed to peace, human rights, democracy and sustainable development.

Organization: UNESCO **Date:** 6 October 2000

Document title: *Declaration and Program of action on a culture of Peace*
Signatories: General Assembly, 6 October 2000
Reference: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-vv1121703274255/1439264-1126807073059/unesco_WB_meeting_Mar03.pdf
Policy points:

- Encourage revision of educational curricula, including textbooks beating in mind the 1995 Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy for which technical cooperation should be provided by UNESCO upon request.
- Encourage and strengthen efforts by actors as identified in the Declaration, in particular UNESCO aimed at developing values and skills conducive to a culture of peace, including education and training in promoting dialogue and consensus-building.

Organization: UNICEF **Date:** June 1999

Document title: *Peace education in UNICEF* (by Susan Fountain)
Signatories: members of UNICEF
Reference:
http://www.unicef.org/girlseducation/files/PeaceEducation.pdf
Policy points:

- Creating a definition: Peace education is an essential component of quality basic education that aims to build the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values tat will enable young people to prevent violence, resolve conflict peacefully, and promote social conditions conducive to peace and justice.
- There is a clear need for more systematic research and evaluation of peace education programmes in UNICEF, in order to provide more information on factors that contribute to effectiveness in the wide range of social and cultural contexts in which UNICEF operates.

Organization: European Commission **Date:** 1 June 2006

Document title: *Supporting Peacebuilding. An overview of European Community Action*
Signatories: Members of the European Union
Reference: http://www.eplo.org/documents/ECsupportPBjune06.pdf
Policy points:

- Dissemination information on human rights to the population at large is an essential aspect in creating peaceful societies, and human rights education and media involvement are also a key focus for the EC.

Organization: Hague Appeal for Peace **Date:** 20-23 October 2004

Document title: *The Tirana Call for peace education*
Signatories: National, UN and Civil Society Representatives
Ministry Representatives:
- Special Advisor to the Minister of Higher Education, Palestine

- Ministry of Education, Peru
- Deputy minister of Education, Science and Technology, Sierra Leone
- Teacher Training Department, Ministry of Education, Cambodia

Reference: www.haquepeace.org

Policy points:

- Call on all ministers of education, regional, and local authorities to replicate these achievements, exchange experiences, and integrate peace education into all pre-school, primary and secondary school systems, tertiary institutions, and teacher training programs.
- Call on our colleagues to commit to the dissemination of examples of these successful programs throughout the world, and to give a special emphasis to non-formal, informal, youth and community-based education.

Organization: INEE Inter-Agency Education in Emergencies **Date:** 2002

Document title: INEE peace education programme
Signatories: INEE members
Reference: http://www.ineesite.org/about/PeaceEdReport.pdf
Policy points:

- The INEE materials are well-developed and comprehensive, with excellent attention to pedagogical principles.
- Funding agencies should be encouraged to support translation of the materials and their incorporation into specific programmes.
- There should be a review of relevant peace education-related materials/networks available on the internet.

Country: Albania **Date:** 1999-2000

Document title: *Global Education Project*
Contribution: Ministry of Education and Science, Albania
Reference: http://www.mash.gov.al/projekte/HRTPROJEKT/UNICEF/2001.htm
Policy points:

- Creation and development of capacity building, at district and school level in order to identify the major problems and optimal alternatives for their solution
- Active involvement of district educational specialists, school principals and teachers in the education reform
- Sensitization of the Educational Local Authorities in the process of knowing and resolving major educational problems
- Preparedness for the harmonization of the local schools and national strategy with the regional.

Country: Germany **Date:** May 2006

Document title: *Working together to strengthen security and stability through crisis prevention.* 1st Federal Government Report on the Implementation of the Action Plan.
Reporting period May 2004-April 2006

Reference: http://www.auswaertiges amt.de/diplo/de/Aussenpolitik/FriedenSicherheit/Krisenpraevention/Aktionsplan1Bericht0506-EN.pdf
Type of document: Government report

Policy points:
- Education is one of the crucial fundamental prerequisites for the emergence of democratic societies and for peaceful coexistence
- In conflict-affected and post-conflict countries the Federal Government supports peace education projects which are designed to improve primary school education but which also over the prevention of violence in schools and extracurricular education, trauma counseling and reconciliation work, as well as political and social education.
- The further operationalisation of the guiding principle "culture of peace" is taking place above all in the framework of information and education work in development policy and education for peace (action 109)
- GPPAC mentioned

Country: Germany (GTZ commissioned by: Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development **Date:** Dec 2004

Document title: *Education and Conflict: The role of education in the creation, prevention and resolution of societal crises- Consequences for development cooperation*
Reference: http://www2.gtz.de/dokumente/bib/05-0160.pdf
Type of Document: Government Commissioned Study (see larger extract at the end of this resource pack)
Policy Points:
- Neither peace education nor global education, development pedagogy or education for sustainable development has succeeded in establishing itself as a partial discipline in educational sciences or becoming anchored on an academic footing to a sufficient degree.
- The academic basis for peace education is lagging behind practice. The whole field of peace education suffers from considerable conceptional confusion
- The evaluation practice in peace education is not at all satisfactory
- Peace Education is often positioned between children and adults (parents) if the conflict conduct pattern which children see in the adults in their immediate environment do not correspond with those they are suppose to

learn through peace education. Parents must therefore be included in peace education programmes

Country: Germany **Date:** May 2004

Document title: *Action Plan. Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-building*
Reference: http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/30/45/34242665.pdf
Type of document: Policy document

Policy points:
- Document translates "Comprehensive Concept on Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building" of German Federal Government into concrete action plan.
- Considers a general operationalisation of the overall concept of the culture of peace to be a long overdue task
- Support educational systems that promote non-violent approaches to dealing with conflicts and allow different point of view, especially with regards to contemporary history curricula.
- Supports programmes of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in the fields of education, science, culture and communication to further the development of a culture of peace. The recognition, preservation and promotion of cultural diversity and the interaction of many different and dynamic cultural identities of individuals and groups take on particular importance in this context.

Country: Norway **Date:** 2005-2008

Document title: *A strategic Plan for the learning environment in primary and secondary education in Norway*

Signatories: Ministry of Education and Research of Norway
Reference: http://udir.no/upload/Brosjyrer/learning_environment.pdf
Policy points:
- A strategic plan to help school owners and the individual school making plans and implementing efforts for developing good leaning environments.
- Creating an environment with few problems such as bullying, noise and disorder, vandalism, violence, substance abuse, crime, racism and discrimination.
- Stimulate the pupils and apprentices in their personal development and identity.
- To contribute to the development of ethical, social and cultural competence and to the ability to understand and take part in democratic processes.

Country: Norway **Date:** April 2003

Document title: *Education Act*
Reference:
http://www.utdanningsdirektoratet.no/upload/Brosjyrer/Pupils_school_enviro

nment_9a.pdf
Signatories: Ministry of Education and Research of Norway
Policy points:

- Section 9a-3 focuses on the school psycho-social environment, and deals with such issues as bullying, discrimination, violence and racism.
- Requires that staff members investigate the situation, notify the school's management and possibly directly intervene.

Country: Norway **Date:** 2005

Document title: *Manifesto against bullying; Plan of Measures 2006-2008*
The first Manifesto was signed 2002 but the latest was signed June 2005
Reference:
Signatories: Government of Norway
Policy Points:

- Follows up on the Education Act, Section 9

Region: South Eastern Europe **Date:** 27-28 Jun 2003

Document title: *Memorandum of Understanding*
Signatories : Ministry of Education and Higher Education from:
- Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- FYROM
- Moldova
- Montenegro
- PISG Kosovo
- Romania
- Serbia

Reference: http://www.see-educoop.net/graz_2003/downloads/MoU_FINAL_Oslo_allSignat.pdf
Policy points:

- Agree on concrete actions to strengthen co-operation with regard do ongoing reform processes of the education systems.
- Commitment to the reform agenda: the Enhanced Graz Process that focuses on democratic and peaceful development of the South Eastern European region by supporting and coordinating education-related projects. And promotes stabilization of the region and to establish a lasting peace by instilling democracy and above all respect for diversity. (See successful cases)

Key Literature

From Seitz, Klaus *Education and Conflict : The role of education in the creation, prevention and resolution of societal crises – Consequences for development cooperation* (Pages 59-72)
Published by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) (December 2004)

EDUCATION FOR PEACE: CONCEPTS FOR PEACE EDUCATION AND THEIR RELEVANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

"Its programmes are usually targeted at people who are already peaceful" (Sommers 2001b).

5.1 Peace as an education programme: New dimensions in peace education

Education and teaching are fundamentally committed to the goals of improving human relationships (Comenius: "emendatio rerum humanorum"), enhancing communication between people, and bringing about peace between nations. This pedagogical self-image was laid down at the very outset of the development of modern pedagogy. The early peace education tradition, in which educating for peace is not seen as a partial area but as an over-riding task in all pedagogical endeavours, may be traced from Comenius through European humanism to the cosmopolitan education programmes of the European enlightenment. In the era of the nation states, however, the cosmopolitan peace tradition of education very often clashed with the nationalist education concept. The genesis of the European nation state, the expansion of the education system, and the differentiation of academic educational sciences went hand in hand: in this respect education was assigned the task of fostering a national identity, which was also based on linguistic and cultural
homogenisation internally and on exclusion and delineation externally (cf. Seitz 2002). The theory and practice of nationalist education towards the end of the 19th century displayed a growing affinity to fostering militant feelings of superiority, and made a not inconsiderable contribution to paving the way for the catastrophe that was the First World War. The colonial education concept disseminated the concept of nationalist education in many parts of the southern hemisphere – and in the wake of its universalisation the model of the "national school" still exists worldwide (cf. Adick 1992).

The burgeoning international peace movement at the beginning of the 20th century was characterized above all by resistance to the militancy of the imperialistic national states, and linked up, although its pedagogical approaches were somewhat sporadic, with the cosmopolitan tradition. The foundation in 1921 of the New Education Fellowship saw the establishment of the first international peace and reform-pedagogical network, which also included a number of peace education-oriented educationalists from the southern hemisphere (e.g. Rabindranath Tagore). Social openmindedness and international understanding formed the central features of this alliance, which Hermann Röhrs dubbed the first "pedagogical global society", however, it placed its focus on the reform-pedagogical endeavours for a holistic view of man, and therefore to a certain extent on the spiritual renewal of the social, emotional and intellectual powers of mankind. It was less forthcoming on macro-political issues and questions of

political education. The burgeoning peace education approaches after the Second World War, in contrast, were more interested in the emerging structures for international cooperation. Peter Manniche, who founded the first international adult education centre in Helsingör in 1921, aptly summed up the motives behind this dominant peace education approach in the first 25 years after the First World War: "The League of Nations and other international organizations provided the machinery for peace, and the war-weary populations had the earnest wish for peace, which might be transformed by education into intelligent international cooperation". Hermann Röhrs played a major role in the further development of this approach in post-war Germany: he saw international cooperation ambitions as "the true breeding ground for international understanding, which is all the more effective, however, if it is borne along by a humane attitude and foresightedness, and practiced in even the simplest forms of interpersonal communication" (Röhrs 1963, 132*). The UNESCO programme "Education for international understanding" at that time was aimed at mobilising the necessary societal legitimation and acceptance for the international cooperation endeavours of the states, and to a certain extent creating the
personal bedrock for the inter-governmental peace endeavours. This corresponded to a simple model of a peace continuum from the interpersonal to the interstate level, which assumes "that those elements which can create harmony in the family are fundamentally the same as those which can create peaceful existence in the wider community" (Gillett 1957, 234).

The beginning of the 1970s saw the rise of a "critical peace education" movement, which articulated itself against this harmonistic tendency on the part of peace education to bow to the state; this peace education was aimed at societal change, and in doing so attached key importance to the ideology-critical and politico-economic analysis. In this respect a conflictbased debate was, in contrast to the traditional stance, regarded in a positive light and the suppression of conflicts seen in a critical light: "Peace education which sees itself as political planning and which wishes to bring about a change in society's framework conditions with a view to reducing structural violence is also conflict education. It has to assume that the societal conditions for peacelessness cannot be changed without a conflict of interests or without debate and conflict" (Wulf 1973*).

The stimulus provided by this school of critical peace education and the emphatic appeal for a "conflict didactic" has still not been taken up by the most important international peace education reference document, the UNESCO recommendation "concerning education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedom" from 1974. The UNESCO recommendation cites, above all, the following basic principles for education policy (quoted from European University Centre 1997, 51 et seq.):

- introduction of the international dimension and global perspectives on all education levels and in all forms of education;
- understanding and respect for all peoples, their cultures, civilisations, values and ways of life; i.e. both the cultures of peoples in their own countries as well as in other nations of the world;
- consciousness for the growing mutual dependence between the peoples and nations of the world;
- ability to communicate with others;
- mediation of a consciousness not only for the rights but also the obligations of individuals, societal groups and nations towards one another;
- furtherance of the understanding for the necessity for international solidarity and cooperation;

 promotion of the readiness of the individual to help overcome societal problems in his more immediate environment, within his country and in a global framework.

The coordinates which define the tasks of international education and peace education have shifted considerably since the adoption of the UNESCO recommendation on education for international understanding. In view of the global political changes it was
often suggested within UNESCO that the recommendation from 1974 be revised. Instead of a new draft of the recommendation, at the 44th International Education Conference in Geneva in 1994 a Declaration and an Integrated Framework Action Plan for Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy were presented (cf. European University Centre 1997). These documents now address additional aspects not taken into account or left largely unaddressed in the 1974 recommendation: among these are primarily
 the emphasis on democracy,
 greater emphasis on intercultural learning and environmental education,
 the consideration of the gender dimension and the postulate of equality between the sexes,
 the revaluation of extra-curricular education and the advocation of improved collaboration between formal education and extra-curricular education,
 the debate on the positive definition of peace, which, when regarded as a "culture of peace", goes beyond the mere negative understanding of peace as the "absence of war",
 the recognition that societal change and living together in a pluralistic and multicultural society will always be accompanied by conflict, a culture of peace cannot be founded on the elimination of conflict, but rather has to be anchored in the ability to peacefully resolve conflict.

Also of significance is the implicit revision of the conventional view of international understanding, which at the same time lends the expression "international education" a totally new meaning. Since the foundation of UNESCO, the concept of international understanding has been bound to the principle of national sovereignty. International relationships were primarily interpreted as relationships between states and their representatives – and education for international understanding was, as already shown, primarily given the task of ensuring the acceptance of the population for the international obligations to which the respective government had committed itself. The 1974 recommendation by UNESCO is shaped by the prerequisite that the actors in international relationships are exclusively governments or the representatives of nation states. Yet countless non-governmental actors have long since entered the international stage – the documents of the International Education Conference from 1994 take this development into account insofar as they expressly acknowledge the equality of the various levels on which societal actors move, from individuals, through ethnic, cultural, social and religious groupings through to non-governmental organisations, governments and international organisations. With the recognition of interpersonal, intra-national, inter-cultural and trans-national action levels, the nation-state paradigm is relativised and the tasks in international education liberated from the yoke of the quality of inter-governmental cooperation. Seen thus, the point of reference for international education is no longer the world of states but world society
(cf. Seitz 2002).

The Delors Report of the UNESCO Commission on Education for the 21st Century (German UNESCO Commission 1997) expands the idea of a global learning society into further dimensions. As the four pillars for future-viable learning the Commission lists:

- learning to live together,
- learning to know,
- learning to do,
- learning to be.

In this respect the social competences relevant to peace education are primarily to be assigned to the pillar "learning to live together"; accordingly the International Bureau of Education at UNESCO regards "learning to live together" as a framework concept which encompasses various topic areas such as conflict management, human rights, civic education, international and intercultural understanding to the same degrees. Relevant, diverse practical models which may be assigned to this "pillar" are, in the meantime, documented in the RelatED database of IBE (at www.ibe.unesco.org).

With the "new and extended dimensions" (Koehler 1994, 10) accorded to peace education and international education through the Integrated Framework Plan of Action from 1994 and the Delors Report from 1997, the profile of the peace education concept of UNESCO threatens to become blurred, however. Of an undoubtedly groundbreaking nature is the reformulation of peace education in the context of a constructive understanding of conflict, as well as the new and comprehensive concept of a "culture of peace". In the meantime the extensive framework thus covered by UNESCO, and the diversity of topics and issues which are subsumed under the expressions peace education and culture of peace have also led to justifiable criticism – such a wide span seems highly eclectic (cf. Smith/Vaux 2003, 34). The necessary perspective of a positive peace definition, which also considers the causes and cultural roots of direct and structural violence, is expressed through the concept of the culture of peace. Nevertheless, it has to date been omitted, concedes UNESCO's Christine Merkel, to clarify the architecture and dynamics of a "multi-track approach" (Merkel 2004). And the plan of action of the German government for civil conflict prevention considers a general "operationalisation of the overall concept of the culture of peace" to be a long overdue task, and in particular with a view to the German "intermediary organisations" (Bundesregierung 2004, 49).

With the expansion of the subject matter of peace education as described here, the borders to related pedagogical working fields such as intercultural pedagogy, development education, global education, environmental education and human rights education then become blurred. There is some considerable debate as to whether the generic term to be taken for the whole field of a pedagogy intended to react to society's development problems should be global education or peace education; and of late – against the backdrop of the commencing UN Decade – also whether "Education for Sustainable Development" could be used (cf. also Wintersteiner 1999, 26 et seq.). In this respect, however, it has to be taken into account that to date neither peace education, nor global education, development pedagogy or education for sustainable development has succeeded in establishing itself as a partial discipline in educational science or becoming anchored on an academic footing to a sufficient degree. Seen thus, the immeasurable scope of the task does not correspond to the degree of attention which such issues have so far found in the mainstream of academic educational sciences.

5.2 Comments on the literature and research status

Despite the extensive publications of the long-standing peace education traditions, there has been talk for some time now in the German-speaking literature of a "theoretical backwardness in peace education" (cf. Wintersteiner 1999, 15 et seq.). A sobering verdict on the current state of the art of international peace education is also arrived at by the renowned Israeli peace

educationalist Gavriel Salomon: the academic basis for peace education is lagging behind practice, he states. While, in agreement with Johan Galtung, it has to be said of the field of peace policy that there is much more peace research than practical peace activity, in the field of peace education it is precisely the reverse which is the case (Salomon/Nevo 2002, XI). This may on no account be misunderstood as praise for a progressive practice – the whole field of peace education suffers from considerable conceptional confusion, which Salomon sees above all in three factors:
 firstly, there is general disagreement as to what "peace education" actually is;
 secondly, there is no agreement and no clarity on the (attainable) goals of peace education;
 and thirdly, in peace education there are not sufficient empirical findings as to which approaches function and which do not.

Looking further afield, Salomon considers the context- overarching generalisation of peace education to be unsuitable, and he expressly advocates a differentiated approach taking into consideration the sociopolitical contexts in which peace education is provided (see below).

That evaluation practice in peace education is not at all satisfactory is confirmed by a survey conducted by Nevo and Brem (2002, 271 et seq.). The authors from the University of Haifa identified a total of over 1000 articles, book chapters and conference documents in English published on questions of peace education in the period 1981-2000. According to Nevo/Brem, some 300 publications describe a concrete peace education programme. Only about a third of these refer in any form to methods for the evaluation of the programme. Nevo/Brem were at least able to show that of 79 publications which report on evaluations and which were included in the detailed analysis, only 10 regarded the respective measures as being ineffective or as having failed; in 51 cases, however, the intervention measures were evaluated as being successful (ibid., 275). Nevo/Brem see their finding as clear testimony "to the relative scarcity of evaluation studies in Peace Education (PE). It is quite clear that hundreds of PE programs are initiated and operated around the globe, at any particular period, without being subjected to any act of empirical validation" (ibid.). They state four main reasons for the lack of evaluations: a general underestimation of the significance and usefulness of an evaluation phase, a lack of experience in dealing with evaluation methods, budget considerations, and specific avoidance strategies.

The extensive literature analysis by Nevo/Brem attest to a whole series of shortcomings on the part of the peace education programmes which have been documented in the past 20 years, in addition to the inadequate evaluation practice:
 very few programmes are aimed at a change in behaviour;
 scant attention is paid to possible contradictions between differing target dimensions and intended abilities;
 very few peace education programmes are devoted to work with adults;
 the majority of peace education programmes appeal to reason, very few are aimed at feelings;
 most programmes are short-term programmes, very few programmes are designed such that they work with the same participants for a period of more than one year;
 where evaluations are at least conducted, it is very rare that the important later follow up tests are implemented (cf. Salomon/Nevo 2003, 274 et seq.).

The lack of evaluation practice in peace education and education in emergencies, as well as the inadequate empirical findings on the efficacy of their methods is also attested to by Retamal/Aguilar (1998, 41), Michael Sommers (2001, 2002),

and, in particular for the context of the UNICEF programmes, Susan Fountain: "There is a clear need for more systematic research and evaluation of peace education programmes in UNICEF, in order to provide more information on factors that contribute to effectiveness in the wide range of social and cultural contexts in which UNICEF operates. Relatively few systematic attempts to evaluate peace education programmes have been carried out by UNICEF offices so far" (Fountain 1999, 32).

In addition to criticism of the meagre evaluation knowledge, Sommers (2001) lists two further major criticisms of the current status of peace education theory and practice, and above all in the context of development cooperation:
 peace education predominantly focuses on target groups who do not require peace education or do not require it to such a large degree; its clientele is above all the (potential) victims and sufferers of violence, while the perpetrators and actors are generally neglected;
 peace education concepts are based on a "western bias"; given the fact that it is rooted in a western and Christian concept of man, any transfer to nonwestern contexts is extremely problematical.

With regard to the above-mentioned target group problem, the noticeable focus on children, and specifically on schoolchildren, is extremely precarious for Sommers. Peace education is often positioned between children and adults (parents) if the conflict conduct patterns which children see in the adults in their immediate environment do not correspond with those they are supposed to learn through peace education. Such elementary dissonance between the values taught in school and at home can trigger angst and stress in children – seen in this light peace education in school would be counter-productive. The necessity for the inclusion of the parents in peace education programmes is obvious, above all, with education measures in refugee camps. Refugee education also demonstrates a further target group paradox in peace education: peaceability is primarily conveyed to those who have suffered violence and strife, while the actors and aggressors are often not reached by peace education measures. This criticism, which is above all based on Sommers' observations in refugee camps, should not be applied prematurely as a generalisation to the entire field of peace education; in the meantime there have been numerous findings and concepts in Germany, e.g. within the framework of the campaign programme of the German government "Together against violence and right-wing extremism" for the anti-aggression work with young violent offenders and young people with right-wing tendencies. Furthermore, there are also practical learning models for civil courage-oriented intervention in acute violent conflicts (cf. Meyer et al. 2004; Weidner et al. 2000).

The western bias, which Sommers addresses as a handicap in peace education, becomes clear above all in the strong emphasis on the individual and on individual self-esteem. The majority of peace education programmes are aimed at reinforcing self-esteem: yet "self" is a European concept, a concept which is associated with individualistic societies. The resulting fixation on the regulation of inter-personal relationships is often mistaken in many contexts as the dynamics of armed conflicts are often determined by collective action and group identity.

Sommers summarises his striking criticism of the current concepts in peace education thus: Peace education "is popular but hard to define. Its values are widely embraced but its implementation inspires scepticism. It espouses universal ideals that are often interpreted according to Western cultural notions of universality. It preaches acceptance, communication and inclusion, while programmes relating to it may actively resist collaboration and coordination with each other. Its programmes are usually targeted at people who are already

peaceful. And peace educators strongly endorse its expansion while claiming that its results cannot be easily assessed" (Sommers 2001b).

The literature on peace education theory and practice is frequently regarded as inadequate, especially in the area of development cooperation relevant here. Alongside the high-profile peace education programmes backed up by numerous project evaluations, such as those conducted by UNHCR, UNESCO, UNICEF and INEE in emergencies, and above all in refugee camps, there are few mature concepts which have been documented and in which peace education research has been utilised for development cooperation practice. There is, at the very least, a lack of systematic analysis of the available findings, as Schell- Faucon also states in a GT study: "The approaches tested in conflict regions for the education of peaceability and conflictability have to date not been subject to a systematic observation or evaluation in either the formal or non formal education sector" (Schell- Faucon 2001, 8*).

A lamentable "lack of consensus with the label ofpeace education" is also confirmed by a concept paper commissioned by the Canadian CIDA (Isaac 1999, 2). Annette Isaac refers in this study to a survey conducted in 1998 among Canadian aid organizations and NGOs, which revealed that very few facilities have had any experience with peace education in a development cooperation context.

In their joint working paper "Essentials der Friedenspädagogik im Kontext von Entwicklungszusammenarbeit" [Essentials of peace education in the context of development cooperation] InWEnt and the Institute for Peace Education Tübingen undertake the remarkable attempt, starting from their finding that there is no uniform definition of peace education, to at least sharpen the profile of this working field through the identification of existing common ground and "essentials" (Gugel/Jäger 2004, see below). This paper also warns that the necessity for cultural and regional differentiation of peace education topics and approaches is a "major challenge for the endeavours to initiate peace education and learning processes within the framework of development cooperation" (ibid., 4). The paper regards the evaluation, application and further development of existing standards for the minimum conditions for successful peace work, the qualification and professionalisation of peace education activities, and the clarification of the relationship between peace education and "basic education" as the key
tasks in further work at the interface between development cooperation and peace education.

In all events the further qualification of this working field requires an expansion of the international perspective of peace education research and practice. In the German-speaking literature there has been very little critical review of peace education experiences in other countries. Thus Teutsch/Wintersteiner also see a "lack of comparative approach" in the standard works on peace education (Wintersteiner 2003, 123). With the compendia from Wintersteiner et al. (2003), Salomon/Nevo (2002), Burns/Aspeslagh (1996) (and also, albeit specifically for education in emergencies, Retamal/Aedo-Richmond 1998, Crisp et al. 2001) there are now a number of handbooks which indicate the usefulness of the international and comparative view. They also make it clear that any decisive progress in the qualification of peace education theory and practice in the context of global crises is only to be expected if pedagogical research and concept development are themselves allowed to develop internationally, through cross-border discourse. In this respect clear problems are the inadequate inclusion of peace educationalists from the southern hemisphere, as well as the fact that in Germany the peace-building and educational reform traditions in Africa, Asia and Latin America have

rarely been analysed and documented (cf. also Datta/Lang-Wojtasik 2002; Reagan 1996).

Given the excessive and generally unrealisable expectations placed in the contribution which peace education can make to the genesis of a more peaceful world, Lennart Vriens recommends a "modest concept of peace education" (Vriens 2003, 79). It is important in this respect, he states, to be aware of the difference between pedagogical and political action: peace education cannot create or guarantee peace, neither in the world, nor in organisations or in people. Yet peace education can reinforce the competence of people to contribute to the peace process. Ian Harris also advises that there be some reservation vis-à-vis the political efficacy of peace education and the significance of its pedagogical logic: "Peace education can help people understand the causes of conflict and generate potential solutions, but conflicts must be transformed through a complicated process of agreement, reconciliation, compromise, and forgiveness if they are to be resolved and overcome" (Harris 2002, 23) – and these are tasks which cannot be regarded as part of guided education processes (certainly, however, as part of collective learning processes).

5.3 Conceptional differentiations

Peace education is influenced by differing pedagogical traditions in different regions of the world, and depending on the context has a different focus, which is also often reflected in the terminology: thus, for instance, peace education in Japan is primarily understood to be "anti-nuclear bomb education", in Ireland as "education for mutual understanding", in Korea it is seen as "re-unification education", whereas in countries in the southern hemisphere the preferred talk is of "development education", and in North America and in Europe the discourse in peace education is currently guided by "conflict resolution education". Ian Harris interprets this specific regional diversity in peace education profiles as an indication that peace education reacts to the respective prevailing, diverse forms of violence (Harris 2002, 16, cf. also Bar-Tal 2002, 28 et seq.).

Several more or less practical suggestions on how the complex and multi-facetted field of available peace education concepts may be logically structured are to be found in literature. Gavriel Salomon (2002) puts forward four approaches for discussion:

1. The differentiation of the peace education concepts in accordance with the underlying "peace" and/or "violence" concept. Here possibilities for definitions are differentiation according to direct/personal, structural and cultural violence as put forward by Galtung, or the use of a negative or positive definition of peace (cf. also Sommers 2001).
2. Differentiation using the levels on which changes are desired: these may, ideally, be at the macro-level of changes in conduct on the part of collectives towards one another or changes in structures which generate strife; on the micro-level, in contrast, changes in the dealings between individuals.
3. A further possibility for differentiation is offered by distinguishing between peace education concepts on the basis of the social, economic or political status of those addressed or also that of the actors in peace education: minorities or majorities, the conquerors or the conquered, oppressors or victims. Peace education for the weak and oppressed cannot mean the same as peace education for the strong and dominant.
4. Ultimately peace education concepts may be differentiated by the socio-political contexts in which they take place. To this end Salomon puts forwards three basic categories:

- peace education in regions with intractable, protracted and violent conflicts,
- peace education in regions of interethnic tension,
- peace education in regions of experienced tranquility.

For Salomon the latter is the key differentiation as the conditions set by the respective contexts also dictate the other differentiations with regard to the requisite tasks, targets, methods and target groups. In this respect peace education designed for and practiced in regions with intractable conflicts has a paradigmatic character for Salomon for the entire
peace education field, as it covers the superordinate principles and practices which are also of significance under other context conditions. He characterises the central challenges facing peace education under the conditions of intractable and protracted conflicts as follows: "(a) it faces a conflict that is between collectives, not between individuals; (b) it faces a conflict which is deeply rooted in collective narratives that entail a long and painful shared memory of the past; and (c) it faces a conflict that entails grave inequalities" (Salomon 2002, 7).

Based on a context-relative understanding of peace education, Salomon advocates that the respective differing agendas of peace education endeavours not be ignored: "In this light, conflict resolution and skills for school-yard mediation are not of primary relevance for peace education in regions of conflict or tension; the former programs deal with the micro, individual level, whereas the latter needs to focus on the collective" (ibid., 7). Above all in German-speaking peace education the paradigm of personal peacefulness plays an outstanding role, something which is currently receiving fresh impetus from the warm reception being given to mediation techniques, conflict management etc. The relationship between individual conflict management competence and the level of collective strife remains unexplained to a large degree, however.

From the analysis of the conflict situation Salomon arrives at the following extensive definition of "peace education": "We can see peace education, in its best form, as an attempt to change individuals' perception of the 'other's' collective narrative, as seen from the latter's point of view, and consequently about one's own social self, as well as come to practically relate less hatefully and more trustingly towards that collective 'other'. More specifically, peace education would be expected to yield four kinds of highly interrelated dispositional outcomes:
 accepting as legitimate the 'other's' narrative and its specific implications;
 a willingness to critically examine one's own group's actions toward the other group;
 a willingness to experience and show empathy and display trust toward the 'other';
 and a disposition to engage in non-violent activities" (ibid., 9).

This definition has a different focus against the background of overt ethno-political conflicts to the description given at the beginning (Chapter 1), which Susan Fountain coined within the peace education concept of UNICEF: Peace education was described there as a process to change behavioural attitudes which allow the learner to avoid personal and structural violence, to resolve conflicts peacefully, and to create conditions conducive to peace at a personal and political level (Fountain 1999, 1). Fountain attaches significance to this basic understanding of peace education being seen as an educational mandate which has to be observed and can be realised in all societies. At the same time she points out that he respective practical approaches can indeed be amended in line with the specific context: "An overview of approaches to peace education in UNICEF illustrates the fact that programmes are highly responsive to local circumstances, and that no one approach is universally used" (Fountain 1999, 16).

Conceptionally Fountain differentiates between three methodical approaches to peace education: one approach which is primarily aimed at knowledge and specialist competence in all issues of peace, conflict resolution and violence; an approach aimed at personal skills, attitudes and values; and her preferred "mixed" approach, which aims to promote knowledge, skill and attitudes to an equal degree (Fountain 1999, 39).

For the German peace education discussion Brigitte Reich (1985) has identified four main categories:

- education for international understanding – the idealistic-appellative approach;
- education to deal with conflict – the individualistictraining approach;
- critical peace education – the society-oriented educational approach;
- education for disarmament – the political-collective approach.

Above all Werner Wintersteiner has contributed greatly to the development of a new paradigm of peace education, the "culturological" paradigm, which is not in line with these conventional discourse levels (Wintersteiner 1999). He advocates a shift in emphasis from the political to the cultural aspects, and for a debate on the generally subconscious cultural structures in which individual and structural violence often have their roots. In this respect he also advocates a dedicated pedagogical concept of peace education, which removes peace education from its traditional subordination to peace research and peace policy. Peace education, he states, has instead to be the didactics of socio-scientific peace research (ibid., 36).

Insofar as Wintersteiner places the conflict with the symbolic forms in which dealing with the "other" is expressed at the focus of peace education, his concept of a "pedagogy of the other" is very close to the approach taken by Salomon. His specifications, which in this context can mean "culture of peace", can be very helpful for the pedagogical operationalisation of this generic expression: "Culture of peace (...) should (...) in particular (…) look at the question of which symbolisations and symbolic practices of peaceful conduct are to be seen in history and are of relevance today" (Wintersteiner 1999, 99*).

The peace idea of dealing with the other and having respect for the countenance of the other, based to some extent on the anthropology of Emanuel Lévinas, is also meeting with greater resonance as a central feature of the international peace education discourse. Thus in the compendium from Salomon/Nevo several authors outline the contours of a new peace education concept which focuses on inclusion, the acceptance of differences, the acknowledgement of the other (thus e.g. Svi Shapiro 2002, 63 et seq.). Sherry B. Shapiro (2002, 145) goes even further from a postmodern and feminist stance, warning of the need to turn away from the dehumanising rationality of the modern spirit: "If we are to find the seeds of a culture of peace, we surely cannot seek them among the ruins of enlightenment thinking and practices." Rather she advocates an "embodied pedagogy", which should primarily be aimed at tracking down our deep-set cultural feelings and passions, which are also manifested physically to a certain extent. Whether such an anti-educational concept can be helpful in promoting discourse abilities on constructive conflict management has to be doubted, however.

The approach of a "culturologically-oriented" peace education, anchored in the recognition of difference, heterogeneity and foreignness, however, opens up a number of promising perspectives for peace education, and especially in the context of ethno-political conflicts. Attempts to take up this concept within the framework of development cooperation have not yet been documented, however.

The wide range of areas of activity and forms of education assistance with a peace-building orientation within the framework of technical cooperation is set forth by Stephanie Schell-Faucon (2000, 2001):
 breaking down a segregative and developing an integrative education system,
 promotion of mother tongues and foreign languages and the establishment of bilingual schools,
 development of new teaching materials and revision of examination contents,
 anchoring of peace-building and conflict-preventive work in the curriculum,
 participative structure and opening of schools through peer group education,
 recreational and integration offerings for children and young people (incl. work camps, mediation training, encounter work, sporting activities),
 conflict and reconciliation work in community work,
 training of teaching staff (among other things on the fundamentals of constructive conflict management and dealing with collective traumata),
 international exchange measures (among other things between countries with similar conflict situations and within the framework of the North-South dialogue).

Lynn Davies (2004) differentiates between two elementary forms of offering for peace education, the explicit peace education curricula on the one hand, and the diverse forms of permeated curricula and extra-curricula offerings on the other hand, whereby with the latter she highlights the comparatively sophisticated dialogue and encounter programmes in conflict situations (e.g. in Israel/Palestine and in Northern Ireland, cf. also in details Salomon/Nevo 2002). For Davies the "3 Es" are the most important pillars for successful peace education: "exposure, encounter and experience" (Davies 2004, 139).

5.4 The peace education programmes of UNHCR and UNICEF: Lessons learned

The UNHCR Peace Education Programme, in the meantime adapted by INEE, is regarded as the peace education concept with the highest profile to have been used to date in humanitarian aid and development cooperation. Accordingly, it receives considerable attention and is widely documented in the literature. In contrast to the above-mentioned UNICEF peace education concept, which is aimed at integrating peace education as a cross-cutting task in all areas of education, UNHCR expressly advocates that peace be an independent "topic", and in the case of schools an independent subject. This is based on the plausible assumption that when attempting to establish peacebuilding as a cross-cutting topic and principle, the concrete peace education components then generally disappear or are neglected, given the abundance of teaching subjects. For Baxter it is a major error in peace education to believe that it can be integrated at all times in a suitable manner into other topics and teaching curricula (Baxter 2004).

A comparatively stringent concept and curriculum was developed for the UNHCR Peace Education Programme, therefore, based on the experiences in Kenya in 1997. To the amazement of its creators, according to Pamela Baxter, it was possible to introduce this programme in other African regions without any culture-specific modifications and it apparently met with unreserved acceptance (Baxter 2004, 2001). The programme, originally based on a collection of material, which was then redeveloped as a set of individual activities, includes not just a school programme but also a "community programme", as well as the corresponding training and advanced training offerings for teachers, community-leaders and facilitators.

"The Peace Education Programme of UNHCR (PEP) is derived from the belief that peace can be fostered in the world through the adoption of peace promoting

behaviour and by the practice of specific peace related skills, which can be taught. The objectives of PEP can be summarised as follows:
 PEP educators strive to promote what they call positive peace, enhancing the quality of life for all individuals, and for the community and nation; and they aim to prevent violent conflict.
 They teach peace-building skills to pre-empt conflict, including an initiation into mediation techniques for conflict resolution and dispute containment.
 At the same time, in order to strengthen skill acquisition, PEP provides opportunities for individuals to acquire new understandings, values and attitudes related to peace" (Obura 2002, 1).

A comprehensive evaluation of the Peace Education Programme, which was conducted in the refugee camps in Dadaab and Kakuma in 2001 for the term of the programme from 1998-2001, attests to the efficacy of the programme. The programme has contributed to promoting peace in the refugee camps above all with regard to the following seven points
(Obura 2002):
 conflict prevention,
 resolution of small problems, disputes and fights,
 small dispute containment,
 prevention of conflict escalation,
 improved security situation and reduced criminality in the camp,
 enhanced interaction between the various population groups,
 spontaneous, unplanned positive effects such as independent initiatives on the part of the refugees for the multiplication of the peace education programme in the camps and in their home countries (ibid., 34).

In contrast, Sommers points out a number of considerable weaknesses of the programme, which in his opinion, however, are not only typical of the UNHCR programme (Sommers 2001):
1. The training and further training of leaders is an inappropriate means of dealing with the problems of experience of serious violence. Leaders in refugee camps often do not represent those refugee groups which have been subject to direct violence.
2. Further training is a form of empowerment. Giving preference to an elite group among the refugees, generally anyway well-trained males, over the most vulnerable and possibly also violent groups reinforces the existing power structures and contributes to further frustration on the part of the marginalised.
3. Peace education has, just like peace itself, a quintessentially symbolic dimension. This is also seen in the language used. The fact that the UNHCR programme uses English, the language predominantly mastered by the refugee elite in Uganda and Kenya, as the teaching language, has a counterproductive connotation therefore.
4. "Fourth, the real and perceived threat of violence in the refugee camps blurs the distinction between conceptions of conflict prevention and conflict resolution in peace education work. A more important distinction is prioritizing those who could make the best use of peace education training. Clearly, the limited participation of marginalized 'drop-out' youth in the programme limits the programme's potential to transfer needed problem-solving skills to refugees who could benefit from the experience. The 'drop-outs' are marked by frustration and a tendency towards involvement in violent activities, and peace education alone cannot solve these significant problems. These youth need jobs and the sort of productive activities that very few seem to be receiving".
5. The proportion of young females among the participants in the programme is very low.

6. Peace education programmes have to take grater account of the fact that peace education can be counter-productive if it is only aimed at children and not also at parents.

For the peace education programmes of UNICEF Susan Fountain lists the following elementary conditions which make the success of the corresponding measures more probable, as lessons learned so to speak (Fountain 1999, 31):
 conducting a precise situation analysis prior to designing the programme, and planning for monitoring and evaluation prior to beginning any intervention;
 the specific training of project staff/teachers;
 the use of cooperative and interactive methods;
 teaching problem-solving skills and key qualifications through the use of real-life situations;
 transfer and use of the acquired skills in nonschool contexts;
 ensuring gender and cultural sensitivity in the education process;
 incorporating analysis of conflicts in the community;
 the necessity to enlist broad-based community support for the peace education programme before it is integrated into the education system.

5.5 International structures in peace education

An education programme aimed at international understanding and global peace is fundamentally dependent on a cross-border pedagogical discourse. "Internationality" not only has to be expressed in the subject matter but also in the context that gives rise to such a pedagogical concept. UNESCO makes available a framework– albeit a very sweeping one – for the global "scientific community" working on peace education issues. To date, however, it has not been possible to institutionalise a relevant peace education network in the UN context, as has been the case for the field of "education in emergencies" with the INEE network. An information platform for good-practice examples within the framework of the wide-ranging concept of "learning to live together" is offered by the RelatED database of UNESCO-IBE.

In the meantime a number of international discourse and work platforms for the exchange of results from peace education research and practice have been established, which should also be consulted on the further development of peace education approaches in development cooperation (see also Spajic-Vrkas 2003): among these are, for example, the International Peace Research Association IPRA, which is based in Copenhagen and which maintains its own Peace Education Commission; Association mondiale pour l'école instrument de paix (EIP) in Geneva; the International Association of Educators for World Peace (IAEWP), which is based in Huntsville/Alabama; as well as the International Teachers for Peace. A Global Campaign for Peace Education was ultimately founded in 1999 on the basis of the Hague Appeal for Peace and Justice in the 21st Century by renowned peace education pioneers, including Betty A. Reardon (cf. Reardon 2003). The Global Campaign feels obligated to the UNESCO recommendation from 1974 and the plan of action from 1994 (see above). The Hague Appeal calls for greater public and political support for peace education to be anchored in all areas of education, including non-formal learning, as well as the training of all teaching staff in issues of peace education (cf. www.ipb.org). In the case of Europe mention has to be made of the network "Education for Europe as Peace Education" EURED, which was founded in 2000 (cf. Wintersteiner et al. 2003), and which is focusing on the development of a further training programme for teachers. An important element in the further development of international peace education could be the new master's degree course in peace education, which begins in 2005 at the Peace University of the United Nations in San José/Costa

Rica. The peace education core curriculum foresees the following elements (cf. www.upeace.org):
 introduction to peace studies,
 cultures on learning – from violence to peace: to handle difference as a central assumption in peace education,
 human rights,
 research methods,
 sustainable development education,
 psychology of violence and peace,
 education for inter-cultural solidarity, environmental care and personal peace,
 education systems and educational change,
 education for conflict transformation and peace-building,
 language and media.

It will have to be examined to what extent education assistance and the specific issues of peace education work in conflict regions in the southern hemisphere can also be taken into sufficient account in this forward- looking curriculum of peace education research
and teaching. There is at least hope that the internationally acclaimed establishment of a postgraduate peace education course will be able to promote the long-overdue recognition of this working field as an independent academic discipline.

5.6 Citizenship education

The condensed review of the current literature on education in complex emergencies and peace education presented to this point should have made it clear that peace education within the framework of development cooperation can neither be restricted to simply insisting on promoting competences for the management of interpersonal and inter-human conflicts, nor would it be well advised to primarily see itself as a broker of socio critical messages and appeals to improve the world. Rather peace education has to be included in the individual and collective learning process for the development of a democratic culture of conflict and debate, and in reinforcing societal competences for the sustained civilisation of conflict management: "Education for peace can only mean education for politics. And education for politics is in turn a matter for the entire community – to be implemented for the whole persons and over the course of a whole life" (von Hentig, 1987, 9*).

Seen thus, peace education is closely linked to citizenship education, under the prerequisite, however, that education for democracy is re-formulated in the post-national situation as education for cosmopolity and is not tied to the exclusive concept of national citizenship. It would be beyond the scope of this literature overview to also sum up the international peace education discussion – the following concise comments are intended, however, to at least forge a bridge to a discussion context still requiring a critical analysis in the context of conflict-sensitive education assistance. As an example, however, reference can be made to the community-based peace-building concept of the Life and Peace Institute Uppsala, which was tested in Somalia and Sudan as a civic-education programme (cf. also Mehler/Ribaux 2000, 105 et seq.).

There have already been several references to the significance of inclusive concepts of democratic citizenship for peace education. The question of the extent to which it is possible to establish structural stability in post-conflict societies essentially depends on national democratic institutions regaining legitimacy and on the trust placed in them on the basis of an inclusive understanding of citizenship. "Conceptualizations of citizenship" are, therefore, quite rightly a key

element in the IBE project "Curriculum Change and Social Cohesion in Conflict-Affected Societies" (cf. Tawil/Harley 2004).

"Inclusive democracy" refers above all in this respect to the acknowledgement of the de facto ethno-cultural plurality of a society and the equal participation of all population groups (cf. also UNDP 2004; Davies 2004). The plurality of the cultural roots of all members of a national society also has to be reflected in the education process in the multi-perspectivity of the curriculum and the learning process. The peaceability of a society is determined by how it deals with heterogeneity, by how much plurality and foreignness it can accommodate without losing its social cohesion. The current debate on "citizenship education", "civic education" and "education for global citizenship" (Audrey Osler among others), presently taking place in Great Britain above all, and inspired to a significant degree by the "cultural studies" (Stewart Hall among others), offers considerable potential for stimulus.

Based on the "alarming signs of an increase in violence, right-wing extremism and xenophobia, disenchantment with politics and scepticism towards democracy, and in particular among young people" these ideas have been taken up in part in the BLK
model project "Demokratie leben und lernen" [Living and learning democracy] (Edelstein/Fauser 2001) – regrettably without taking into account a cosmopolitan expansion of horizons. The tolerant acceptance of difference, on the one hand, the development of democracy as a life form which also has to be expressed in the republican constitution of our educational facilities, on the other hand, are also underscored here as central elements of a peace education concept. The destructive implications of mistaken education conditions, which we examined with a view to the South in Chapter 3, are also being scrutinised here in Germany: the orientation framework for the BLK project expressly raises the question "which structural and socio-psychological conditions in schools have led to reinforcing socio-ethical deprivation and anomie with the consequence of a right-wing orientation and affinity to violence on the part of young people" (Edelstein/Fauser 2001, 78*).

It would also be wise to examine to what extent the concepts and tried-and-tested practice models developed to overcome democracy deficits in our schools can be utilised for education assistance within the framework of technical cooperation – and, in return, to what extent findings and the relevant pilot programmes from the field of developmentoriented emergency relief and education assistance with the South could offer input for school development in Germany.

What Conflict Resolution Education Offers

A document from NIDR

Conflict resolution contributes to a healthy school climate by:

- Reducing violence, vandalism, chronic school absence, and suspension
- Helping students develop relationship and communication skills to participate more responsibly in the school community
- Shifting responsibility for resolving nonviolent conflicts to the students themselves, freeing adults to concentrate more on teaching and less on discipline.
- Supporting discipline systems more effective then detention, suspensions or expulsion
- Providing educators with skills and processes for effective team management

Conflict resolution enhances social an emotional skill development by:

- Helping students develop fundamental competencies (self-control, self respect, problem solving, empathy, teamwork) needed to make a successful transition into adulthood.
- Helping educators create an environment of respect and understanding that supports the teaching and modeling of these fundamental competencies.

Conflict Resolution programs promote improved intergroup relations by:

- Teaching the principles and skills for students and adults to respect others as individuals and as group members.
- Teaching responsible and productive intergroup relations in a pluralistic society.

Conflict resolution training helps improve academic performance by:

- Building students' cognitive skills and confidence in their own personal capacities.
- Giving students and teachers the skills and processes to solve problems that interfere with teaching and learning.

Conflict Resolution education helps build responsible citizenship by:

- Helping students understand the relationship between law, rights, personal and community responsibilities.
- Teaching skills that are basic to the expression of concerns and interests in a peaceful and productive way, and providing students with the ability and avenues to solve problems for the mutual benefit of community members.