

Peacebuilding Methods for the Post-Conflict Education System

By

Kerstin Tebbe

Submitted to the  
School of International Service  
of American University  
in Partial Fulfillment of  
the Requirements for the Degree  
of

Masters of Arts

in

International Peace and Conflict Resolution

Course Number: SIS-794-003

Evaluation and Certification:

Course Title: Education and Peacebuilding

Grade: \_\_\_\_\_

Credit Hours: 3

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

Semester of Registration: Fall 2006

\_\_\_\_\_

Comprehensive Examination:

\_\_\_\_\_

Unsatisfactory: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Faculty Member:

Satisfactory: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Distinction: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Graduate Office Certification:

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## I. Introduction

Interstate conflict increasingly challenges peace, stability, and development around the globe. Numerous statistics combine to reveal that the incidence of civil war is a monumental problem in the contemporary world. According to the Uppsala Conflict Data Project, there were 116 active conflicts during the period of 1989-2002.<sup>1</sup> Of these, only 7 were interstate armed conflicts, proving a trend of increasing intrastate war well known by practitioners and scholars in the conflict resolution field. At the same time, the costs of human suffering and economic devastation resulting from internal conflicts have mounted, with high civilian death tolls, tens of millions of refugees worldwide, governance and political systems in tatters, development set back by decades, and societies shattered. The high risk of return to civil war – 40 percent risk in the decade following the cessation of violence<sup>2</sup> – gives priority to any actions or strategies in the post-conflict period that can be taken to mitigate tensions and contribute to long-term, sustainable peace.

Conflict, and thereby reconstruction following conflict, affects every sector within a country. As of 2003, over 42 countries had had their education systems severely affected by conflict according to the World Bank.<sup>3</sup> Where the toll is so intense, the devastated education system requires massive, comprehensive inputs to rebuild capacity, access, and quality. However, given the risk of continuing tensions and possible relapse into conflict if the causes are not addressed, the question at hand is how to most effectively achieve in combination two critical tasks – rebuilding the education system and building peace.

Post-conflict education systems can be viewed from two perspectives. On one hand, there are the effects of the conflict on the education system, such as destruction of physical infrastructure including schools; decreased capacity as a result of administrators and teachers that have fled or been targeted by violence; and scores of traumatized students in need of support. This perspective is the most common. On the other hand is the ability of education to contribute to mitigating conflict. This is the capacity of education – the content, the structures, the processes of delivery, and the capacity of stakeholders – to contribute to addressing the proximate and root causes of conflict within the broader society and realizing a peaceful future for the country.

### *Purpose of the Study*

The purpose of this paper is to contribute to an understanding of how to approach rebuilding the post-conflict education system to enhance its contribution to building peace. As the literature on peacebuilding theory and practice demonstrates, post-conflict strategies and responses of all sorts must incorporate certain types of methods in order to create desired peace outcomes. This paper will explore how peacebuilding methods can be integrated into the very process of rebuilding the education system as a means of building peace. It is not concerned specifically with education outcomes, but with how the process towards achieving education outcomes can be designed to contribute to peace. Education outcomes such as a quality education system accessible for all, a national curriculum that emphasizes tolerance and reconciliation, or an efficient national administration with effective decentralization to the local, community level are all worthy goals. However, the choice of means to pursue these ends is of utmost importance to the peacebuilding process. The means of rebuilding the education system – for example, instilling dynamics of open

---

<sup>1</sup> “Armed Conflict, 1989-2002.” *Journal of Peace Research*. Vol. 40, No. 5 (2003) pages 593-607.

<sup>2</sup> Collier, Paul, Anke Hoeffler, and Måns Söderbom. “Post-Conflict Risks (CSAE WPS/2006-12). Center for the Study of African Economics, Department of Economics, University of Oxford. August 17, 2006. <http://www.csaef.ox.ac.uk/workingpapers/pdfs/2006-12text.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> “Post-Conflict Reconstruction in the Education Sector – Summer School Report.” International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)—World Bank Summer School. Paris, France. July 7-15, 2003.

communication and participation or establishing mechanisms for consensus-building – are those that can contribute to peace.

This paper seeks to define specific methods of peacebuilding on which the process of rebuilding the education system after conflict can be premised. Those methods can be implemented as a practical means of combining the two tasks at hand, rebuilding the system while building peace. Past experiences of rebuilding post-conflict education systems in conflict-affected countries will be used to exemplify how best to utilize those methods.

#### *Definition of Terms*

For the purposes of this paper, we must first define two critical terms – peacebuilding and education system. The term *peacebuilding* will be used here based on a definition of John Paul Lederach as a transformational process that addresses structural issues, social dynamics of relationship building, and the development of a supportive infrastructure for peace.<sup>4</sup> The term *education system* is here used to describe the configuration of education delivery embedded in the state governance structure, headed by a national administration or ministry with additional levels of administration including perhaps regional, provincial, and district levels, down to the school level. An education system may be characterized by centralized power within the national ministry or a relatively decentralized structure providing more inputs and control from the school or community level. It may guide and/or manage a number of tasks including planning and financial management; curriculum development; teacher training; maintenance of schools and infrastructure; and data collection and monitoring.

#### *Limitations and Significance of the Study*

An inherent limitation of the study will be the need to generalize. In this paper, I will outline general peacebuilding methods for designing and implementing strategies to rebuild a post-conflict education system. Though examples from a variety of countries are used to illustrate potential implementation, these methods can in fact be adapted in numerous ways based on the needs and constraints of a specific context. In practice, every conflict, every education system, and every context will be unique in innumerable and immeasurable ways. The methods outlined in this paper are meant to serve as a general roadmap for rebuilding a post-conflict education system in a way that builds peace. In any given country, the next – and critical – step would be to creatively adapt and apply these methods to the realities of that context.

Though the field of education during conflict and post-conflict is growing, there is much yet to be learned. Generally the field to date, comprised primarily of development practitioners, has focused on creating responses that achieve a range of education outcomes post-conflict; there has been little attention to how the process of reaching education outcomes can be designed to simultaneously achieve peace outcomes. This paper attempts to move towards a discussion of rebuilding education after conflict that is rooted in conflict resolution and peacebuilding theories and practices so as to integrate responses towards these two sets of outcomes.

## II. Design of the Study

This study is designed to link two fields of study and practice – peacebuilding and education within international development – in a way that derives a useful roadmap for how to serve the goals of both in a post-conflict situation. It will first review both current trends in post-conflict education responses and peacebuilding theory and practice with a focus on rebuilding state institutions. It will

---

<sup>4</sup> Lederach, John Paul. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997

then use peacebuilding theory and practice to outline methods for how a post-conflict education system should be rebuilt. These methods are meant to facilitate the practical linkage of the process of peacebuilding with the process of rebuilding an education system.

#### *Assumptions and Rationale*

This paper works from a deeply held belief that every action or response after conflict must serve a primary purpose of instituting a long-term sustainable peace. If the primary goal is peace, then reconstruction and rebuilding must consciously be designed and implemented in a manner that contributes to mitigating tensions and addressing root and proximate causes of conflict. This can be accomplished by integrating the theory and practice of peacebuilding broadly and deeply into typical post-conflict reconstruction and development activities.

#### *Data Collection Methods and Procedures*

Data collection for this study attempted to address both theory and practice. Therefore, data utilized includes academic studies as well as practitioner papers. Documents from think tanks, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), international development donors, and international organizations were reviewed as part of the research for this paper. The literature review was complemented by informal interviews which were undertaken with practitioners in the field to gather practical insight. Acknowledgement and appreciation go to the following individuals for their participation: Frederick Barton (Co-Director, Post-Conflict Reconstruction Project, Center for Strategic and International Studies); Elisabeth Kvitashvili (Director, Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation, US Agency for International Development); Joseph Lombardo (Independent International Development Consultant); Yolande Miller-Grandvaux (Senior Educational Advisor, Regional Coordinator for Africa, US Agency for International Development); Talaat Moreau (Senior Research Analyst, American Institutes for Research); Zachary Rothschild (Eurasian Regional Affairs Officer, Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, US Department of State); and Mark Schneider (Senior Vice President, International Crisis Group). Any omissions or inaccuracies are my own.

### III. Current Trends in Education and Conflict

The field of education and conflict has exploded over the last decade as a reaction to a combination of two major trends. The first is the general global trend of intrastate war in the post-Cold War period that devastated numerous countries on almost all of the continents of the world. As the trends in civil war have become clear, the resultant massive devastation has also become evident. Development practitioners, including education specialists, took notice of the set-backs made to development via the destruction of war.<sup>5</sup> The recognition of the destruction of civil wars, more and more common in the world today, combined with broader international development agendas – in this case, the international education agenda – that began to set agendas and indicators for human development goals for the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries such as the Education for All framework and the Millennium Development Goals. These trends have colluded to increase the attention to education responses after conflict.

---

<sup>5</sup> Seitz, Klaus. "Education and Conflict: The Role of Education in the Creation, Prevention and Resolution of Societal Crises – Consequences for Development Cooperation." Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ). December 2004.

*Responding to Crisis and the Devastation of Civil War*

As any practitioner in the field will describe, education systems are often ravaged by conflict, as are any state sectors. The physical infrastructure may be virtually destroyed.<sup>6</sup> School buildings are often targets of violence and attacks. Destruction of schools may be widespread or focused in specific areas where educators and children must now teach and learn in tents. Human resources may similarly be depleted. Teachers may have become targets of the violence; if not victims of direct violence, they will most likely be among the huge numbers of displaced peoples, as will the students they used to teach. Teacher training may have been disrupted for any number of years, leaving teachers unequipped to handle even a normal situation, let alone a chaotic post-conflict environment and the particular post-conflict needs of traumatized students. Psycho-social trauma may affect the vast numbers of both students and teachers. The content of education may also be in tatters following conflict. Curricula, which may have even previously served to rile intergroup tensions through their content, are often in need of reform. The questions of how to address the conflict and the history behind it within the curriculum may become controversial issues. School enrolments will drop during conflict, as schools became dangerous places of increasing violence for both teachers and students, if not even recruitment centers for child soldiers.<sup>7</sup> As the needs mount, the public funding available for education may decrease as other priorities take over.

Given the major issues of service delivery outlined briefly above, equitable access to quality education is clearly a near-impossible achievement in most post-conflict environments. Education systems are often devastated in terms of physical, intellectual, and human capacity. The damage to education as a result of conflict is often extensive and requires intensive efforts to provide interim educational opportunities, restart schools, and build longer-term educational capacity in teachers, administrators, and ministries of education. Post-conflict education responses must have a range of targets – students (e.g. psycho-social and safety issues; educational access and quality); teachers (e.g. training; payment of salaries; safety issues); refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) (e.g. education for reintegration; recognition of certifications or education received abroad or in refugee camps); curriculum (e.g. curriculum reforms to integrate child-centered, participatory pedagogies; incorporating peace education); and education governance (e.g. decentralization; community participation; capacity building), among others.<sup>8</sup>

The literature on education and conflict emphasizes the effects of conflict on the provision of education in conflict-affected areas during and after the conflict. The literature details the intense educational needs of a conflict or post-conflict setting both in the short-term, by including education in the realm of humanitarian relief, and in the longer term, through education as a development activity. The destruction of education as a result of conflict has been well-documented over recent years and has been complemented by research addressing strategies and tactics for reconstructing education in the post-conflict period. Scholars and practitioners both advocate for and provide insights and best practices to reinstitute education after a conflict's end in a broadening field of literature. A major World Bank study published in 2005 – *Reshaping the Future: Education and Postconflict Reconstruction* – detailed lessons in education reconstruction (such as system-wide approaches and community involvement) and inventoried both promising directions and neglected issues for system

---

<sup>6</sup> “Rewrite the Future: Education for Children in Conflict-Affected Countries.” International Save the Children Alliance. 2006.

<sup>7</sup> Seitz, Klaus. “Education and Conflict: The Role of Education in the Creation, Prevention and Resolution of Societal Crises – Consequences for Development Cooperation.” Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ). December 2004.

<sup>8</sup> Smith, Alan and Tony Vaux. “Education, Conflict, and International Development.” Department for International Development (DFID). 2005.

reconstruction.<sup>9</sup> The report emphasized the damage to education systems as one of the most devastating impacts of conflict on a country.<sup>10</sup> In late 2006, the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) of UNESCO released the 700-plus page *Guidebook for Planning Education in Emergencies and Reconstruction*.<sup>11</sup> The *Guidebook* outlines objectives, strategies, and guidance notes for reconstructing education in over 35 topical areas from early childhood development to life skills curricula to teacher training to data collection and management.

As the field has grown, this focus on addressing conflict-induced educational challenges has been encompassed by an even broader body of literature and practice within the concept of “education in emergencies.” The education in emergencies framework has been taken up as a mantle by a broad group of practitioners and scholars with the goal of placing education more prominently on the humanitarian relief and post-conflict development agenda. On the premise of the right to education as per the Convention on Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, advocates for education in emergencies argue that education must be part of responses to any crisis situation.<sup>12</sup> The education in emergencies framework derives primarily from a humanitarian relief-type of focus that considers the specific and pressing ramifications of a manmade or natural disaster immediately after it has taken place and how to provide education relief in that situation. The cornerstone of this literature is the *Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies, Chronic Crises and Early Reconstruction* developed by the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) that guides humanitarian relief practitioners and education specialists in planning and implementing education strategies in emergencies.<sup>13</sup> The *Minimum Standards* is now widely regarded as the gold standard for undertaking humanitarian responses for education.

#### *The International Education Agenda in Post-Conflict Education*

Both implicit and explicit in the body of literature on education and conflict is the international education agenda, on which the parameters for educational reconstruction have been determined. Current trends in research and practice regarding education and conflict/post-conflict have derived directly from an international education agenda premised on Education for All (EFA) and meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in education. The Dakar Framework for Action, “Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments” adopted in April 2000 reaffirmed EFA as the primary goal of the international education community and laid out timetables for ensuring specific dimensions of equitable and comprehensive access to basic education throughout the world.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, Goal 2 of the Millennium Development Goals launched in September 2000 laid out the goal of establishing universal primary education by the year 2015. Well-founded fears abound with education specialists in the development community that the presence of conflict and civil strife will constrain the potential for reaching the MGDs for education.<sup>15</sup> The push towards

---

<sup>9</sup> Buckland, Peter. *Reshaping the Future: Education and Postconflict Reconstruction*. Washington, DC: The World Bank. 2005.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. Page xi.

<sup>11</sup> *Guidebook for Planning Education in Emergencies and Reconstruction*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO, 2006.

<sup>12</sup> Sommers, Marc. “Emergency Education for Children.” Working Paper. Cambridge, MA: Center for International Studies, MIT, 1999.

<sup>13</sup> *Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies, Chronic Crises, and Early Reconstruction*. Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). 2004.

<sup>14</sup> The EFA agenda had been originally adopted ten years earlier in 1990 via the World Declaration of Education for All. The concept of education as a human right as defined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the original adoption of EFA were the basis of the international education agenda in the 1990s.

<sup>15</sup> Seitz, Klaus. “Education and Conflict: The Role of Education in the Creation, Prevention and Resolution of Societal Crises – Consequences for Development Cooperation.” Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ). December 2004.

developing effective emergency and longer-term responses for education after conflict is a response to such fears.

Running concurrently with the goals to ensure universal access to education was the simultaneous understanding of “the critical role of peace, security, and disarmament as fundamental for human well being.”<sup>16</sup> In other words, it was recognized that the prevalence of conflict across the globe is a major hindrance to human development, including education. It was noted by the UN Millennium Project in 2005 that “of the 34 poor countries farthest from reaching the Goals, 22 are in or emerging from conflict.”<sup>17</sup> The Dakar Framework also specifically pledged to “meet the needs of education systems affected by conflict, natural calamities and instability and conduct educational programmes in ways that promote mutual understanding, peace and tolerance, and that help to prevent violence and conflict.”<sup>18</sup> There was clear recognition that countries in or recovering from conflict will require broader and more intensive support if they are to meet EFA.

Perhaps most importantly, the claim has been made within the international agenda that education has a key role to play in preventing conflict in the future and building lasting peace and stability.<sup>19</sup> It is this belief – of education’s positive contribution to preventing conflict and building stability – that is continuously reaffirmed by the international education agenda and has been explored from a number of perspectives. The concept that education can contribute to mitigating conflict – not just respond to conflict via reconstruction – is a fundamental one that has led to research and developments regarding a number of potential contributions by education to reducing conflict.

#### *Trends in Education Strategies: Education Mitigating Conflict*

As mentioned above, education has become both an immediate, humanitarian activity and a longer-term development activity in conflict settings. Education strategies for post-conflict situations often outline staged responses: incorporating education into humanitarian relief (via, for example, schools in a box, organized recreational and learning spaces and times, etc.), reopening schools and restarting the system, and planning for long-term development and reform of the education system to improve educational outcomes over time. General consensus in the field has solidified around the need for a development perspective for post-conflict education which incorporates long-term planning and builds intrinsic capacity for management and coordination.<sup>20</sup> Within the system itself, issues of access; activities and curriculum; resources; and coordination and capacity building must all be addressed.<sup>21</sup> Common practice assumes that schools must reopen as quickly as possible, for as many as possible. Inclusion is a necessity. Access must be accompanied by a complementary drive for improved quality. Communities must be involved and decision-making processes participatory. Specific responses for recovery – psychosocial support, peace education – must be incorporated into the structures and content of education. Moreover, external actors must be coordinated and, most importantly, indigenous capacity for education must be built.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> “Chapter 12: Strategies for Countries Affected by Conflict.” *Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals*. UN Millennium Project. New York: UN Development Program, 2005. Page 183.

<sup>17</sup> I bid.

<sup>18</sup> *The Dakar Framework for Action, Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments*. World Education Forum, April 26-28, 2000. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2000. Page 9.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. Page 15.

<sup>20</sup> Pigozzi, Mary Joy. “Education in Emergencies and for Reconstruction: A Developmental Approach.” UNICEF. 1999.

<sup>21</sup> Sinclair, Margaret. “Planning Education in and After Emergencies.” International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO. 2002.

<sup>22</sup> *Guidebook for Planning Education in Emergencies and Reconstruction*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO. 2006.

As the literature and practice on post-conflict education has expanded, an almost self-conscious analysis of education's role in conflict has developed. From an initial focus of responding to the effects of conflict, the field of education and conflict has begun to delve into the intersections of conflict and education, both constructive and destructive. The ability of education to fuel conflict is a continuous topic of study. Research indicates that the content, structures, and delivery of education can all serve as catalysts for violence and conflict.<sup>23</sup> Education systems that are exclusionary and limit access based on ethnicity can fuel tensions.<sup>24</sup> Entry and achievement in the Rwandan education system, for example, was based on ethnic quotas and discrimination, feeding interethnic resentment and anger between Hutus and Tutsis. Ethnic inequalities in education in Kosovo led Albanians to pull out from the formal system, dominated by Serbs, and create a parallel education system divided along ethnic lines. Education can also be manipulated for political and ideological purposes via the curricula and learning materials.<sup>25</sup> Different history texts are used in ethnically segregated classrooms in Macedonia, for example, with Albanians and Slavs each learning a history of victimization by the other.<sup>26</sup> Curricula that teach intolerance, discrimination, and scapegoating create divisions, as does the manipulation or exclusion of history and culture of certain ethnic groups from textbooks. In these and a myriad of other ways is it possible for education to contribute to destructive tensions and social divisions, fueling violent conflict.

Belief in education's potential to mitigate conflict is a next step in this exploration of the relationship between education and conflict. Various strategies have been claimed to contribute to mitigating conflict. Schools can provide psychosocial support to students to heal from the traumas of war; education strategies can be utilized as part of the reintegration process for former combatants, particularly child soldiers; and peace education and conflict resolution training can be integrated into curricula. The provision of universal access to education can reduce intergroup tensions, as can equity at both the system level and the classroom level. An example of this is the expansion of equal access to and resources for previously segregated education in the United States as a response to ethnic tensions in the 1960s.<sup>27</sup> For any strategies to mitigate conflict, they need to focus on healing social divisions, building social cohesion, and rebuilding lives and communities. Incorporating "Education for Mutual Understanding" into the curriculum in Northern Ireland or integration of linguistic diversity into schools in Senegal are examples of how this can be done.<sup>28</sup>

The most valuable strategies determined thus far for mitigating conflict are those that relate back to principles of what Bush and Saltarelli call peacebuilding education.<sup>29</sup> Peacebuilding education is defined by its objective of building social cohesion, with an emphasis on a grassroots, participatory approach to rebuilding education that is driven by and responds to the realities and needs of a society's situation in the aftermath of conflict. It is a long-term process that relies on local

---

<sup>23</sup> "Curriculum Change and Social Cohesion in Conflict Affected Societies." Report on colloquium held April 3-4, 2003 in Geneva, Switzerland. International Bureau of Education, UNESCO.

<sup>24</sup> Obura, Anna P. "Building Africa, Building Peace: What Education Can Do." Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA) Newsletter. Vol. 16, No. 4 (October-December 2004).

<sup>25</sup> Pasalic-Kreso, Adila. "Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Minority Inclusion and Minority Rules, The System of Education in BiH as a Paradigm of Political Violence on Education." *Current Issues in Comparative Education*. Teachers College, Columbia University. November 15, 1999.

<sup>26</sup> Cole, Elizabeth A. and Judy Barsalou. "Unite or Divide? The Challenges of Teaching History in Societies Emerging from Violent Conflict." Special Report 163. United States Institute of Peace (USIP). June 2006.

<sup>27</sup> Bush, Kenneth D. and Diana Saltarelli (eds.) "The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict: Towards a Peacebuilding Education for Children." Innocenti Research Centre, UNICEF. August 2000. Page 16.

<sup>28</sup> Bush, Kenneth D. and Diana Saltarelli (eds.) "The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict: Towards a Peacebuilding Education for Children." Innocenti Research Centre, UNICEF. August 2000. Pages 17-8.

<sup>29</sup> Bush, Kenneth D. and Diana Saltarelli (eds.) "The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict: Towards a Peacebuilding Education for Children." Innocenti Research Centre, UNICEF. August 2000.

inputs and seeks to create opportunities rather than impose solutions. For Bush and Saltarelli, this process will demilitarize the mind; problematize the status quo; articulate alternatives; change the rules of the game by focusing on tolerance and trust; and delegitimize violence as a means of addressing problems.<sup>30</sup> In these ways, peacebuilding education seeks to transform interactions and relationships by opening minds, creating tolerance and building bridges across communities and groups.

Literature and practice on education and conflict has therefore moved from reactionary to proactive; it no longer simply responds to the affects of conflict but attempts to mitigate those impacts. A new but growing body of literature on education and fragility – which posits education’s ability to mitigate all types of social, political, and economic fragility – similarly assumes the constructive capacity of education in societies. What is clear, though, is that for education to mitigate conflict and build peace, it must be undertaken in certain ways. To mitigate conflict, education strategies must consciously be designed to address the social causes and manifestations of conflict. Designing post-conflict education strategies based on the goals and methods of peacebuilding can achieve this.

#### IV. Theory and Practice of Peacebuilding

As its ultimate goal, peacebuilding attempts to transform conflict from a destructive force to a means for constructive social change. Transforming conflict requires that both symptoms and causes of conflict be resolved. Conflict transformation presupposes that just rebuilding what existed prior to the conflict not only doesn’t address the causes of conflict but, conversely, can even re-trench them.<sup>31</sup> Instead, the institutions, discourses, and dynamics that reproduce conflict must be transformed, as must the relationships between the conflicting parties.<sup>32</sup> Transformation requires delving deeply into social, political, economic, cultural, ethnic, and any other dynamics that play into conflict. Peacebuilding recognizes that conflict is the result of multiple and multidimensional causes and it attempts to address these causes at their core. Peacebuilding is not a specific activity but a process, of which the outcome is conflict transformation.<sup>33</sup>

As the international community became involved in conflict and post-conflict interventions over the course of the 1990s, the term “peacebuilding” has broadened to incorporate a vast range of economic, political, security, and development tasks.<sup>34</sup> In many cases, any activity or task that was necessary after conflict came to be called “peacebuilding,” using the term as almost a catch-all phrase. The result is that, as many have rightly argued, the term is often utilized without clear intentions, understanding, or meaning.<sup>35</sup> It is necessary to understand the roots of the concept to understand the expansions and even mutations that it has undergone over recent years, and to retrieve meaning from the term.

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Evans-Kent, Bronwyn. “Reconstruction over Transformation: The Structural Appropriation of Peacebuilding.” *The UQ Printery*. University of Queensland, Australia. 2001. Pg. 147-158.

<sup>32</sup> Ramsbothan, Oliver, Tom Woodhouse, and Hugh Miall. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press, 2005.

<sup>33</sup> Goodhand, Jonathan and David Hulme. “From Wars to Complex Political Emergencies: Understanding Conflict and Peace-building in the New World Disorder.” *Third World Quarterly*. Vol. 20, No. 1 (February 1999) pages 13-26.

<sup>34</sup> Ball, Nicole. “The Challenge of Rebuilding War-Torn Societies.” *Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict*. Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (eds.) Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace Press, 2001.

<sup>35</sup> Call, Charles T. “The Problem of Peacebuilding: How UN Thinking has Evolved in Recent Years.” Draft. August 27, 2004.

*Origins of Peacebuilding: Society-Focused Peacebuilding*

In its original form, peacebuilding derived from a grassroots process that emphasized people and relationships as fundamental factors in social transformation and constructive social change. This vision of peacebuilding as a relationship-oriented process focused on building social cohesion is the view of John Paul Lederach, one of the giants in the field of peacebuilding. In this view, peacebuilding is primarily bottom-up, grassroots, and embedded in the relations and interactions of individuals and groups.

Lederach defines the term in his work, *Building Peace*, as a comprehensive concept that encompasses, generates, and sustains the full array of processes, approaches, and stages needed to transform conflict toward more sustainable, peaceful relationships. It is an approach to the transformation of conflict that addresses structural issues, social dynamics of relationship building, and the development of a supportive infrastructure for peace.<sup>36</sup> The focus is on social structures, and peacebuilding is a process of rebuilding the relational spaces that hold things together.<sup>37</sup> For Lederach, constructive social change – the objective of peacebuilding – must remake relationships defined by fear, recrimination, and violence into those characterized by mutual respect, trust, and proactive engagement.<sup>38</sup> For him, the process of peacebuilding is multifaceted and multi-track and relies ultimately on positive changes in personal and social relations.

Peacebuilding in this sense is characterized by a number of core assumptions and principles. Peacebuilding is premised on the belief that conflict is a natural process and can be a source of constructive change where nonviolent methods are understood to be more effective than violence.<sup>39</sup> When the relationships and the discourses that reproduce violence are transformed, these dynamics become constructive rather than destructive and peace is possible. Forging sustainable relationships is the lynchpin of peacebuilding and depends on those involved in the conflict truly believing that they can jointly and cooperatively resolve their differences. Peacebuilding assumes that it is possible for people to reconcile past and current differences and agree upon a future vision for constructive interdependence.<sup>40</sup>

The principles of this sort of peacebuilding manifest various methodologies. A collaborative problem solving process is an often-employed conflict resolution technique. Processes for reframing problems as shared concerns to be jointly addressed are essential.<sup>41</sup> Social complexities and unequal power relations that contribute to conflict dynamics must be addressed.<sup>42</sup> Individuals must be sought out and nurtured to act as change agents that will motivate others towards constructive, positive change.<sup>43</sup> Existing capacities on which peace can be built must be discovered because, as peacebuilding presumes, even in societies effected by violent conflict there will remain individuals, groups, attitudes, and processes that can promote peace.<sup>44</sup> These must be revealed from amidst the post-conflict chaos and reinforced.

---

<sup>36</sup> Lederach, John Paul. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997.

<sup>37</sup> Lederach, John Paul. *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> Sampson, Cynthia, Mohammed Abu-Nimer, Claudia Liebler, and Diana Whitley (eds.) *Positive Approaches to Peacebuilding: A Resource for Innovators*. Washington, DC: Pact Publications, 2003.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Pearce, Jenny. "The International Community and Peacebuilding." *Development*. Vol. 48, No. 3 (2005) pages 41-49.

<sup>43</sup> Sampson, Cynthia, Mohammed Abu-Nimer, Claudia Liebler, and Diana Whitley (eds.) *Positive Approaches to Peacebuilding: A Resource for Innovators*. Washington, DC: Pact Publications, 2003.

<sup>44</sup> Goodhand, Jonathan and David Hulme. "From Wars to Complex Political Emergencies: Understanding Conflict and Peace-building in the New World Disorder." *Third World Quarterly*. Vol. 20, No. 1 (February 1999) pgs. 13-26.

Underlying most of these peacebuilding methods is the vision of the peacebuilder as a facilitator, eliciting solutions from those involved in the conflict rather than imposing prescribed solutions. Peacebuilding is thereby an organic process by which mechanisms for constructive social change are sought out, discovered, and nurtured as socially and culturally embedded mechanisms for maintaining a sustainable peace.<sup>45</sup> Peacebuilding supports problem-solving and indigenous dispute resolution institutions as primary mechanisms for change and for sustaining peace by continuing to diffuse and resolve conflict.

As the concept of peacebuilding has expanded since the 1990s, this sort of societal-focused peacebuilding has grown to encompass approaches to statebuilding as well in which the structure of the state and the systems of governance are the focus of reconstruction. This expansion builds on the goal of a positive peace as first defined by Johan Galtung.<sup>46</sup> In contrast to a negative peace – defined as the absence of war or overt violence – a positive peace requires the complete transformation of the root causes of conflict and the eradication of structural violence. Positive peace then serves as the end goal of peacebuilding of any sort.

From this common end goal, the means and mechanisms for peacebuilding have multiplied conceptually and practically over the last decade and a half. The concept is now characterized by different emphases on types of activities (social, economic, or political), timeframes for strategies and responses (long-term v. short-term), engagement with actors (broad groups of stakeholders or top leaders/representatives), among other issues.<sup>47</sup> As the concept of peacebuilding has expanded from its original social focus it has grown to encompass a wide array of programming and interventions with the goal of positive peace.

#### *Structures for Peace: Statebuilding as Peacebuilding*

As opposed to a society-focused type of peacebuilding, statebuilding as peacebuilding focuses primarily on governance, and state institutions and their reconstruction. This is generally premised on some sort of transition to democracy, often heralded by elections, and the development of democratic institutions, such as a competent judicial system. The overall focus is on developing state institutions as a way of embedding conflict resolution mechanisms into society and improving governance so as to enhance participation and voice on the part of the constituency.

Polity-focused peacebuilding is premised on the belief that participatory, responsive, transparent, and accountable governance structures will ensure peace by serving as mechanisms that diffuse and resolve political conflict. With that assumption, peace and reconciliation are best achieved via political means – free and fair elections, development of political parties, good governance, effective state institutions. The range of methods and practice then tends to vary from the society-focused type of peacebuilding methods.

Prewar political institutions are often destroyed by conflict; where they do survive they may simply be appendages of a combatant group, dedicated to the war rather than to legitimacy and social reconciliation.<sup>48</sup> Structures of exclusion and elitism that perpetuate conflict may still exist. Power may be diffused amongst warlords and combatant groups; law and order may be scarce if not completely nonexistent. In these cases, central power must be re-concentrated and participation

---

<sup>45</sup> Galama, Anneke, Paul van Tongeren, and Bas Jongerius. *Towards Better Peacebuilding Practice: On Lessons Learned, Evaluation Practices, and Aid & Conflict*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: European Centre for Conflict Prevention, 2002.

<sup>46</sup> Galtung, Johan. *Essays in Peace Research*. 6 Volumes. Copenhagen: Ejlers, 1974-1988.

<sup>47</sup> Call, Charles T. "The Problem of Peacebuilding: How UN Thinking has Evolved in Recent Years." Draft. August 27, 2004.

<sup>48</sup> Paris, Roland. *At War's End: Building Peace After Civil Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

must be expanded to increase state legitimacy.<sup>49</sup> Polity-focused peacebuilding may include organizing elections during a transition or holding national political conferences to recognize collective needs for self-determination and expand participation in the system. Power-sharing arrangements including devolution or decentralization may be negotiated and implemented.<sup>50</sup> The overarching process is one of statebuilding, where building peace requires a process of building the state.<sup>51</sup>

For polity-focused peacebuilding to be successful, a minimally effective and legitimate state is necessary.<sup>52</sup> It is state institutions which will maintain the structures and mechanisms for conflict resolution and peace in the conflict-affected society. The process of statebuilding for peace then focuses on increasing legitimacy and accountability of the state with its constituents and building the capacity of the state to perform certain core functions.<sup>53</sup> State institutions are assumed to have the long-term potential for mediating and mitigating social conflicts.

### *Towards Conceptual and Practical Clarity*

The lack of clarity surrounding peacebuilding is not only conceptual but also operational.<sup>54</sup> In practice, there are differences between addressing the symptoms versus the causes of conflict, between dealing with more tangible or more intangible factors that can perpetuate conflict or resolve it. Moreover, broad use of the term can serve to dilute its transformative power from that which its grassroots origins gave it.<sup>55</sup>

The focus on transformation takes us back to John Paul Lederach's definition of peacebuilding as a "comprehensive approach to the transformation of conflict that addresses structural issues, social dynamics of relationship building, and the development of a supportive infrastructure for peace."<sup>56</sup> Such a comprehensive approach requires deeply integrating peacebuilding methods that are both society-focused and polity-focused so as to achieve the most constructive process and positive results. In the case of rebuilding a post-conflict education system, both society-focused and polity-focused peacebuilding must be critically incorporated if peace is truly to be built.

Some links between society-focused and polity-focused peacebuilding are clear. For one, building social cohesion – a primary focus of society-focused peacebuilding – serves a number of polity-focused peacebuilding goals. Linked to statebuilding processes, social cohesion can contribute to the emergence of shared norms and understandings concerning the rules governing political and social behavior.<sup>57</sup> More specifically, social cohesion can legitimize political authority or encourage

---

<sup>49</sup> Zartman, I. William. "Putting Things Back Together." in *Collapsed States: The Disintegration and Restoration of Legitimate Authority*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1995.

<sup>50</sup> Jeong, Ho-Won. *Peacebuilding in Post-Conflict Societies: Strategies and Process*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005.

<sup>51</sup> It is important to note that the concepts of statebuilding and peacebuilding should not be conflated. Not all methods and processes of statebuilding can or do contribute to peace. These contradictions aren't addressed in this paper.

<sup>52</sup> Call, Charles T. "Ending Wars, Building States." *Building States to Build Peace*. Charles T. Call with Vanessa Hawkins Wyeth (eds.). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, forthcoming 2007.

<sup>53</sup> "Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States (Draft)." Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD. April 7, 2005.

<sup>54</sup> Call, Charles T. "The Problem of Peacebuilding: How UN Thinking has Evolved in Recent Years." Draft. August 27, 2004.

<sup>55</sup> Evans-Kent, Bronwyn. "Reconstruction over Transformation: The Structural Appropriation of Peacebuilding." *The UQ Printery*. University of Queensland, Australia. 2001. Pg. 147-158.

<sup>56</sup> Lederach, John Paul. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997.

<sup>57</sup> "Rebuilding Post-Conflict Societies: Lessons from a Decade of Global Experience." Workshop Report. The World Bank and United Nations Development Program (UNDP). New York. September 19-21, 2005.

participation in decision-making. It can also shape the development of formal institutions and policies.<sup>58</sup>

The post-conflict education system is a formal state structure that encompasses within it informal norms and networks of engagement between the system's stakeholders. (Education stakeholders are all those that are involved and have a vested interest in the workings of the education system including teachers, parents, students, administrators, education officials, etc.) Integrating the concepts of society-focused and polity-focused peacebuilding leads us to a process for rebuilding the education system that focuses on both relationships and engagement between people on one hand, and formal structures of governance on the other. To build peace, both the formal and informal mechanisms that shape communication, interaction, and relationships within the education system must be transformed.

## V. Dual Goals for the Education System after Conflict

The integration of society-focused and polity-focused peacebuilding through the education system results in dual goals for that peacebuilding process: 1) to build the education system as a sustainable *formal* institution and 2) to build sustainable *informal* institutions within the education system. Building both formal and informal institutions is fundamental to post-conflict peacebuilding.<sup>59</sup> Mechanisms for collective action and conflict resolution within both formal and informal interaction are needed to facilitate constructive engagement. This means that both official structures within the state and unofficial relational linkages across and between stakeholders are necessary to build a long-term sustainable peace.

### *The Education System as a Formal Institution*

Peace-enhancing structures are a precondition for sustainable peace; transforming conflict depends on changing the structure and manners of interacting.<sup>60</sup> Post-conflict statebuilding focuses on rebuilding and reforming formal institutions that will serve as a framework for regulating political and social life.<sup>61</sup> Formal institutions are official structures of the state that carry out specific, legally-sanctioned responsibilities, tasks, and duties. Individuals within these institutions carry out prescribed tasks and communicate and interact through official channels. Education systems are characterized by specific roles at various levels (e.g. a central ministry, education officials at regional and/or local levels), formal policies (e.g. regarding curriculum content, teacher certification), and structured relationships (e.g. teachers supported by district supervisors, district education officials reporting to provincial education officials, etc.). These are the characteristics that organize the formal system and facilitate its effective and efficient operations.

From a peacebuilding perspective, these are also the structures that serve as institutionalized mechanisms for conflict resolution and facilitate collective action among various education stakeholders. An effective, capable, transparent, and accountable education system is not just necessary to achieve education outcomes – it is also necessary to facilitate peace in the longer term. Formal channels are needed for resolving conflicts about education, or those conflicts that may overtly be about specific education needs but are also underlined by continuing intergroup tensions.

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

<sup>59</sup> Cowen, Tyler and Christopher J. Coyne. "Postwar Reconstruction: Some Insights from Public Choice and Institutional Economics." *Constitutional Political Economy*. Vol. 16 (2005) pages 31-48.

<sup>60</sup> Reychler, Luc and Thania Paffenholz (eds.). *Peacebuilding: A Field Guide*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001.

<sup>61</sup> "Rebuilding Post-Conflict Societies: Lessons from a Decade of Global Experience." Workshop Report. The World Bank and United Nations Development Program (UNDP). New York. September 19-21, 2005.

Formal channels can engrain in those individuals and groups that work through them a sense of trust, consistency, and justice. Formal channels are needed to resolve conflicts in a public manner and to facilitate cooperation between stakeholders. Additionally, the official channels and prescribed relationships and interactions within the education system not only ensure a consistent, normal flow of education services but can also build legitimacy for the state and trust in the government.

Education requires a functioning, formal education system for sustainable support of quality services and their effective delivery. The UNICEF strategy for post-conflict education of “building back better” focuses on rebuilding the education system to be more viable and effective than it was prior to the conflict.<sup>62</sup> However, “building back better” should involve not just improving the system to produce enhanced education outcomes but also to better facilitate constructive formal relationships within it.

### *Informal Institutions of the Education System*

Peacebuilding after conflict is also about building those informal institutions of values, attitudes, and norms, which facilitate the nonviolent management of conflict.<sup>63</sup> Informal institutions are those relationships that link stakeholders, both individuals and groups, unofficially within the formal system. They are the networks and norms that develop between individuals and groups that shape communication and interaction even outside of official channels. They consist of the quality working relationships built between individuals horizontally and vertically; they build trust and create dynamics of openness, acceptance, and communication. The process of peacebuilding must serve to build and nurture these links whenever and wherever possible.

Informal institutions build social cohesion and social capital. The concept of social capital is premised on the interconnectedness that people within a society can have based on shared norms, networks, and social trust.<sup>64</sup> After conflict, it is critical that opposing sides and all affected groups rebuild linkages with each other. From a society-focused peacebuilding perspective, rebuilding after conflict is essentially about rebuilding the relational spaces that hold society together.<sup>65</sup> Sustainable peace requires a feeling of “we-ness” characterized by multiple loyalties and expectations of mutual benefits as a consequence of cooperation.<sup>66</sup> Informal institutions engrain in communities the ability to resolve conflicts and disputes by facilitating self-sustaining coordination, communication, and cooperation for mutual benefit.<sup>67</sup> Informal institutions build on existing linkages and social intersections, expand and deepen them, and develop and nurture more of them. In this way, societies and communities can maintain integration, respect, and trust; social cohesion spreads and the risk of return to violence is lessened.

Stakeholders involved in the education system are already minimally connected by their shared interests in education. The goal then is to build off the existing intersections of individuals and groups both officially and unofficially within the education system to develop further linkages. If these stakeholders can engage in constructive interaction based on trust, respect, and dialogue during the process of re-opening schools, for example, then it is possible that different cross-

---

<sup>62</sup> Wright, Cream. “UNICEF Education Strategy 2006-2015.” In “Education and Conflict: Research, Policy, and Practice.” Forced Migration Review, Supplement. Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University and UNICEF. July 2006.

<sup>63</sup> Bächler, Günter. “Conflict Transformation through State Reform.” *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation*. Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management. August 2004.

<sup>64</sup> Putnam, Robert D. “Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital – An Interview with Robert D. Putnam.” *Journal of Democracy*. Vol. 6, No. 1 (1995) Pages 65-78.

<sup>65</sup> Lederach, John Paul. *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

<sup>66</sup> Reychler, Luc and Thania Paffenholz (eds.). *Peacebuilding: A Field Guide*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001.

<sup>67</sup> Goodhand, Jonathan and David Hulme. “From Wars to Complex Political Emergencies: Understanding Conflict and Peace-building in the New World Disorder.” *Third World Quarterly*. Vol. 20, No. 1 (February 1999) pages 13-26.

sections of them will interact the same way during a curriculum reform process. As these constructive interactions take place, they are learning how to dialogue and engage in ways that can transfer into interaction on other issues, education related or not. At the same time, these individuals and groups are forming relationships with each other based on mutual concern, trust, and willing collaboration. These behaviors build shared norms and values that carry into the post-conflict context at large and can positively contribute to peace. The linkages are transplanted and cross-fertilize other interactions and relationships.

## VI. Methods for Peacebuilding for the Post-Conflict Education System

As is evident, it is the process of reconstruction following conflict that will determine whether peace is built or not. The needs are great for both education outcomes and peace outcomes. Education stakeholders have very real and practical educational needs to address after conflict. Given the context of violent conflict, destruction, trauma, and residual tension, the process of addressing these needs requires building both constructive formal and informal relationships that will simultaneously sustain education and peace. It is the process of building these formal and informal institutions that can contribute to fulfilling needs for both peace and education.

The methods by which the process is undertaken are the lynchpin for successful peacebuilding through the education system. This section will outline methods for designing the reconstruction process for the education system in a manner that contributes to peace by integrating the approaches of both society-focused and polity-focused peacebuilding and focusing on the dual goals stated above. These methods derive from the principles, objectives, and best practices for peacebuilding and attempt to provide a practical roadmap for integrating peacebuilding into the process of post-conflict reconstruction of the education system. The methods are not listed in any particular, pre-determined order of use. As is characteristic of peacebuilding, the sequencing of methods is should be determined as needs require when designing strategies and responses, in any sequence or overlapping.

The relevance of the peacebuilding methods to education system reconstruction is defined via examples that demonstrate how these methods could be employed. Examples are offered from post-conflict case studies in the processes of rebuilding education systems including case studies for Timor-Leste, El Salvador, Palestine, Rwanda, Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and southern Sudan. The examples provided are meant to illustrate how aspects of actual rebuilding process have or have not been utilized in the service of peacebuilding and to give insight into how the peacebuilding methods can be incorporated into practice.

*Method: Analyze the situation based on deep knowledge of the context*

Post-conflict strategies and responses to build peace must be organic in that they naturally integrate into and flow from the given country context. Truly organic responses, however, cannot be developed and facilitated without a deep knowledge and understanding of the context in which they take place. Such knowledge requires an almost anthropological understanding of that country and its various dynamics. Best practice in post-conflict statebuilding has proven that responses must be rooted in historical, political, economic, social, and cultural trajectories.<sup>68</sup> This is perhaps even more applicable for education, given the intimate connections between education and conflict, politically, socially, economically, and culturally. In-depth analysis of the cultural and social understandings of

---

<sup>68</sup> “Rebuilding Post-Conflict Societies: Lessons from a Decade of Global Experience.” Workshop Report. The World Bank and United Nations Development Program (UNDP). New York. September 19-21, 2005.

peace and conflict in the given situation facilitates linkages and revised interpretations that contribute to peacebuilding.<sup>69</sup>

Broadly and deeply assessing post-conflict education needs has been exhibited in prior situations of reconstruction. After a quarter century of Indonesian occupation, Timor-Leste (also known as East Timor) held a popular consultation in 1999 to determine its future status within or independent of Indonesia. Widespread violence and massive displacement followed the resultant consensus calling for independence. Following the violence surrounding the popular consultation, the first step in organizing the emergency education response in Timor-Leste was to undertake a broad assessment. The Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) collected data throughout the country on the extent of the damage to schools and infrastructure. A team of East Timorese specialists along with representatives from donors, UN agencies, and multilateral groups carried out a ten-day mission including field visits and meetings, ultimately developing recommendations for short-term reconstruction priorities and estimates of funding needs. Additional data collection and analysis was carried out over the course of reconstruction including a school mapping project, two periods of school data collection, and a primary school achievement survey to establish student performance levels. This was supplemented by additional information from assessments on the education system completed directly prior to and in preparation for the popular consultation. All in all, this meant that peacebuilders in Timor-Leste were fairly well-equipped with information on the education system and its needs.

While post-conflict education needs were well documented, the links between education and the violence, either destructive or constructive, were not fully analyzed in Timor-Leste. However, for education and the process of rebuilding the system to contribute to peace, these are the links that must be specifically analyzed. It is not enough to just know how the conflict has affected the system and what the resultant educational needs are. Peacebuilders also require knowledge on how the system has contributed to violence and how it can contribute to peace. Peacebuilders must know how education stakeholders (parents, teachers, students, administrators) are struggling with the conflict – be it trauma and injuries or continuing tensions, even residual violence – and how the process of rebuilding the system can positively address those issues. Peacebuilders must analyze what functions and capacities of the system can be utilized in the service of peace. Assessments such as those produced by the US Agency for International Development’s (USAID) Education and Fragility Assessment Tool,<sup>70</sup> which explore the effects of fragility on education and of education on fragility, are necessary to truly understand how best to develop post-conflict strategies for rebuilding the education system.

#### *Method: Construct joint visions*

Transforming relationships is fundamental to peacebuilding approaches. The method of constructing joint visions is derived from the critical need in post-conflict settings to envision a positive, constructive future relationship between conflicting parties.<sup>71</sup> A joint vision conceptualizes a future, both near and distant, that reflects deeply held hopes and expectations for what can be constructed. That joint vision can be an idealized end point as well as hopes and expectations for the process of arriving at that end point. A joint vision is premised on a mutual recognition of the need

---

<sup>69</sup> Galama, Anneke, Paul van Tongeren, and Bas Jongerius. *Towards Better Peacebuilding Practice: On Lessons Learned, Evaluation Practices, and Aid & Conflict*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: European Centre for Conflict Prevention, 2002.

<sup>70</sup> USAID Education and Fragility Assessment Tool. US Agency for International Development (USAID). September 2006.

<sup>71</sup> Abu-Nimer, Mohammed. “Toward the Theory and Practice of Positive Approaches to Peacebuilding.” *Positive Approaches to Peacebuilding: A Resource for Innovators*. Cynthia Sampson, Mohammed Abu-Nimer, Claudia Liebler, and Diana Whitney (eds.) Washington, DC: Pact Publications, 2003. Pages 13-23.

and ability to create a positive future situation with the other. The vision must be first conceptualized, then implemented via responses and strategies rooted in it.

Post-conflict education reconstruction recognizes that rebuilding a quality system is a continual process that requires national consensus around a wider vision of where a country is heading.<sup>72</sup> The process by which this takes place is imperative for success. Stakeholders within the system must construct a joint vision of the future education system and of that education system as an integral part of the vision for a peaceful country. The process of educational reform that followed El Salvador's civil war undertook such a process of constructing a national vision for education and its role in building peace in that country.

Civil conflict tore El Salvador apart for over a decade from 1979 to the early 1990s. Following the end of civil war in El Salvador, a process of dialogue and negotiation took place that exemplifies the process of constructing a joint vision, bringing a broad range of key actors into the conversation including the government's main opponents. The process began with the National Forum on Education and a Culture of Peace organized by the government (with UNESCO support) in 1993, with political and social leaders voicing opinions on national education and the idea of educational reform for the first time. This was followed by the creation of a presidential commission in 1994 that formulated a proposal as the basis for a reform process. MINED (Ministerio de Educación de El Salvador) then declared 1995 the "Year of Consultation" for educational reform. Dialogue and consultation was encouraged with teachers, students and parents; initiatives were begun by civil society organizations; and MINED reached a key agreement with the main teachers' organization. At the end of 1995, the government presented guidelines for a 10-year educational reform plan to the nation.<sup>73</sup> The extensive consultations that had been fundamental to the process meant that the guidelines represented a national vision for education reform. The broad participation within that process of constructing the joint vision meant that there was far-reaching buy-in and support for it. The country could then move towards that vision, as represented by the education reform that followed.

*Method: Reframe divisions into issues of mutual concern with the potential to be resolved*

A basic principle of peacebuilding is the belief that conflict is necessary but that it can both be resolved and serve a constructive social function if channeled the right way.<sup>74</sup> There is a widely held belief among conflict resolution practitioners that the positions that individuals or groups stake out and the interests that lie beneath those positions are two different things. While a position may be uncompromising, it may be possible to satisfy the needs or interests from which it derives. Once the true interests underlying the position can be revealed, often through dialogue and collaborative engagement, it is possible to discover mutual needs and mutual understanding. The potential exists, then, for problems to be reframed as shared concerns between the parties that can then be jointly and constructively addressed.<sup>75</sup> This approach – of reframing divisions into mutual concerns – is essential to peacebuilding and requires not only reframing the issues but integrating the belief that the issues can be resolved. This belief, this hope, is what will facilitate motivation and willingness to work together.

---

<sup>72</sup> "Education and Conflict: Research, Policy, and Practice." Forced Migration Review, Supplement. Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford University and UNICEF. July 2006.

<sup>73</sup> Guzmán, José Luis. "Chapter 2: Educational Reform in Post-War El Salvador." *From Bullets to Blackboards: Education for Peace in Latin American and Asia*. Emily Vargas-Barón and Hernando Bernal Alarcón (eds.) Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank, 2005.

<sup>74</sup> Coser, Lewis. *The Functions of Social Conflict*. New York: The Free Press, 1956.

<sup>75</sup> Sampson, Cynthia, Mohammed Abu-Nimer, Claudia Liebler, and Diana Whitley (eds.) *Positive Approaches to Peacebuilding: A Resource for Innovators*. Washington, DC: Pact Publications, 2003.

Decades of conflict and social upheaval seemed to be near an end when the Oslo Accords were signed between Israel and the Palestinian Authority in 1994. A new education system had to be developed in Palestine after education was handed over to the Palestinian Authority from Israel following the Accords. A point of continuous contention over the next few years as the system was in development was the relationship between the teachers unions and the Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MoEHE). A series of teachers' strikes took place from 1996 to 2000, often over pay and salaries, to which the MoEHE responded harshly, exacerbating tensions. The MoEHE resorted to the use of punitive measures – including firing teachers, relocating them far from their homes, and, in one case, even holding a teacher incommunicado in detention – as their means of dealing with the teachers' unions and the strikes. Far from fostering cooperation, the mutually combative stances served to entrench opposing positions and contribute to tensions and conflict as opposed to peace.<sup>76</sup>

In Palestine, antagonistic relations between the MoEHE and the teachers unions contributed to a conflictive environment and diminished the capacity to jointly envision win-win outcomes. An attempt to reframe the divisions at play in this type of situation could facilitate dialogue and interaction between the Ministry and a key stakeholder in the system, the teachers unions. The two sides required an understanding of not only the positions that each had taken but also the interests and needs that underlie those positions and that can be addressed more easily than uncompromising positions. The process of reframing the divisions between the MoEHE and the teachers' unions would have facilitated a joint re-conceptualization of the issues at hand and instilled a feeling of hope that the divisions could be bridged. This would have been the starting point for problem-solving. Such a critical relationship within the education system must be transformed into a constructive one built around consensus on the problems and potential for solutions.

*Method: Collaboratively problem-solve*

Interactive problem solving is a common and highly lauded conflict resolution methodology. This approach emphasizes not solutions per se but the facilitated communication required between conflicting groups in order for them to resolve their own practical problems. The peacebuilder seeks not just for parties to interact with the goal of an agreement in mind; the objective is rather to generate a constructive setting that facilitates mutual analysis and recognition of the conflict and problems and, from there, facilitated joint problem solving by the parties.<sup>77</sup> The peacebuilder serves as the facilitator for the opposing parties to re-conceptualize the conflict and thereby develop a new view for discovering creative, win-win outcomes as the basis for conflict resolution.<sup>78</sup>

The interactive problem solving approach can be utilized for post-conflict institution building as well. Clearly valuable for building informal institutions, the objectives and procedures of interactive problem solving overlap with those of building formal institutions after conflict. Perceptions and attitudes must be transformed, shared interests must be discovered underneath contradictory positions, and common ideas for the transformation of power structures must be

---

<sup>76</sup> Nicolai, Susan. *Fragmented Foundations: Education and Chronic Crisis in the Occupied Palestinian Territories*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO/Save the Children UK, 2007.

<sup>77</sup> Kelman, Herbert. "Interactive Problem-Solving: A Social-Psychological Approach to Conflict Resolution." *Conflict: Readings in Management and Resolution*. John Burke and Frank Duke (eds.) New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990. Pg. 199-215. <http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/transform/kelminte.htm>

<sup>78</sup> Ramsbothan, Oliver, Tom Woodhouse, and Hugh Miall. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press, 2005. Page 30.

produced – all of which are relevant to state reform and rebuilding state sectors after conflict.<sup>79</sup> These are thereby also relevant to the process of rebuilding the education system after conflict.

Within the education system, collaborative problem-solving between stakeholders and opposing groups is necessary to reduce conflict tensions and engrain conflict resolution methods in the general operation of the system and the interactions of stakeholders. This method does this by facilitating collaboration around very real, practical problems. The interethnic war and massive genocide that occurred in Rwanda in the mid-1990s left deep scars between Hutus and Tutsis. Years after the genocide in 1994, a major practical issue continues to face education in Rwanda as the teaching of history remains suspended. Stakeholders have been unable, even more than a decade later, to determine how to reintegrate history back into the structure and content of education in Rwanda, given the pre-war use of education in the service of exclusionary and discriminatory agendas along ethnic lines. Some efforts have been made to revise history curricula and syllabi but the ban remains.<sup>80</sup> No textbooks have been written or published since 1994 and teachers have been given no guidance on how to deal with this subject in the classroom. The Ministry of Education has taken some efforts to address the issues, including holding a number of workshops and conferences. These have demonstrated consistent consensus on the need to reconstruct Rwandan history and incorporate it into children's learning. However, history has yet to reach the classrooms.<sup>81</sup>

To be able to teach history appropriately in Rwanda, the fears, anger, and tensions integral to the issue have to be deeply explored, analyzed, and understood. A process of collaborative problem-solving could offer a constructive and safe environment in which such difficult and complicated issues as teaching history could be openly discussed and investigated. This process could bring stakeholders to understand and address the underlying interests and needs that have for over a decade resulted in history being banned from the classroom. Such a collaborative investigation into the problems could serve as the stepping off point for joint problem solving on how to reconstruct history in Rwanda and integrate it back into the classrooms.

*Method: Create responses that address root and proximate causes of conflict*

Addressing symptoms of conflict – economic devastation, displaced populations, political chaos – is not always enough to serve the cause of peace. To truly build peace, it is necessary to address not just the symptoms of conflict but also its root and proximate causes. The education needs following conflict are great – schools must be rebuilt, schooling restarted, teachers trained, curriculum reformed, students supported, the system revamped. But simply addressing those needs does not always contribute to peace. Just rebuilding a school, for example, doesn't build peace if the original location of that school had been determined so that only one ethnic group had access to it or if it was a place for teaching extremism prior to the conflict. Dealing with the underlying causes is critical if peace is to be sustainable. The processes of addressing the symptoms of conflict within the education system should then be used to address the causes of conflict to the extent possible.

The divisions between Serbs and Albanian were the fundamental cause of the interethnic conflict in Kosovo and the resulting NATO intervention in 1999. Following the NATO intervention, the United Nations set up reconstruction activities to rebuild Kosovo and resolve continuing tensions. The work of United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) in education,

---

<sup>79</sup> Bächler, Günter. "Conflict Transformation through State Reform." *Berghof Handbook of Conflict Transformation*. Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management. August 2004.

<sup>80</sup> Cole, Elizabeth A. and Judy Barsalou. "Unite or Divide? The Challenges of Teaching History in Societies Emerging from Violent Conflict." Special Report 163. United States Institute of Peace (USIP). June 2006.

<sup>81</sup> Obura, Anna. *Never Again: Educational Reconstruction in Rwanda*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO, 2003.

however, did little to bridge interethnic divisions. In post-war Kosovo, Joint Civil Commissions (JCC) for different sectors were established by UNMIK as a mechanism for communication and contact between the Serb and Albanian stakeholders within those sectors. The JCC on Education (JCCE), however, failed to fulfill this task. Though the JCCE could have served as a negotiating forum, UNMIK officials decided, after initial discussions with Serbs and Albanians revealed a lack of consensus, that they would limit the JCCE participants. The first meetings of the JCCE that were held ended badly with tension between the two sides. Then, after only two multilateral meetings, UNMIK officials decided to continue discussions separately with both Serbs and Albanians. After less than four months the JCCE substantially ceased to exist.<sup>82</sup> What could have served as a means of communication and mediation failed to even facilitate contact within only a few months of its initiation. Bringing Serbs and Albanians together for dialogue and collaboration on education in post-war Kosovo should have been a priority and facilitated almost at all costs. Without addressing the divisions from which the conflict stemmed, true peace is impossible.

Just as UNMIK efforts with the JCCE failed to facilitate interethnic dialogue, the very processes of UNMIK education responses after the conflict seemed to re-entrench the rigid structures of the pre-war formal education system in Kosovo. Top-down approaches dominated, decision-making was concentrated at high levels, and exclusion of both Serbian and Albanian education specialists was prevalent. This approach by UNMIK resulted in deep cleavages of trust between international and local education officials and resentment on the part of Albanian and Serbian educators and education professionals that felt overlooked.<sup>83</sup> UNMIK's authoritarian manner took on a feeling similar to the pre-war formal system that had contributed to ethnic divisions. Where the post-war systems embody the same negative structures and processes as those that contributed to the outbreak of conflict, not only are root causes of conflict not being addressed but they are being re-entrenched both within the formal and informal post-conflict institutions.

*Method: Empower individuals, groups*

The facilitative nature of peacebuilding requires that those within the conflict, whose futures are vested in its transformation, be empowered to change both their perceptions and their reality. Peacebuilding is premised on constructive social change based on transforming people's attitudes towards conflict. Such change requires people taking responsibility for their own destinies.<sup>84</sup> The process of rebuilding must then ultimately empower them to do so. Those that are involved in the conflict, directly and indirectly, are those that have the power to resolve the conflict and its consequences. To be able to do so, they must be empowered to transform their own perceptions and, thereby, their own realities.

Post-conflict strategies that empower the people within conflict will empower them to change their lives for the better, thus transforming the conflict. Efforts at expanding education in post-civil war El Salvador demonstrate the ability of post-war strategies to empower a broad spectrum of the population in a way that they become involved in constructively transforming their own futures. The post-conflict Educación con Participación de la Comunidad (EDUCO) program initiated by the Salvadoran Ministry of Education was fundamental to the education reform process. The goal of EDUCO was to spread education throughout previously marginalized rural areas by

---

<sup>82</sup> Sommers, Marc and Peter Buckland. *Parallel Worlds: Rebuilding the Education System in Kosovo*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO, 2004.

<sup>83</sup> Sommers, Marc and Peter Buckland. *Parallel Worlds: Rebuilding the Education System in Kosovo*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO, 2004. Pages 137-8.

<sup>84</sup> Galama, Anneke, Paul van Tongeren, and Bas Jongerius. *Towards Better Peacebuilding Practice: On Lessons Learned, Evaluation Practices, and Aid & Conflict*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: European Centre for Conflict Prevention, 2002.

mobilizing rural communities around education. EDUCO spread organized educational services throughout rural areas affected by the conflict by organizing, legalizing, and training parent associations. Financial resources were then provided to the associations to hire teachers and develop preschool and primary school services. EDUCO gained widespread acceptance from communities and education officials alike. It served as a mechanism for decentralization of the education system that gave a primary role to the communities and built off of the social capital within them.<sup>85</sup> EDUCO was widely successful because of the primary role, power, and responsibility that it gave to local communities. The ministry empowered local communities to improve their own situations and transformed relationships by doing so.

*Method: Identify and support “change agents”*

Peacebuilding believes that social change is possible and necessary to resolve conflicts and that it is thereby necessary to prepare disputants to be change agents.<sup>86</sup> Change agents are those individuals who have the influence or charisma to facilitate and accelerate constructive social change within their communities and societies. Either wittingly or unwittingly, change agents can bring people together, facilitate dialogue, and open minds to the possibility of change. Change agents may or may not hold official positions of power or influence but their ability to mobilize people towards constructive action will be visible. Change agents are critical to successful peacebuilding. They should be sought out and supported within their community and society, and their work further facilitated.

One example of the power of change agents is demonstrated by the process of re-opening schools in Rwanda. The Ministry of Education in Rwanda was able to reopen schools just two months after the end of the genocide with an effective social mobilization campaign. The people that were essential to the success of the process – the Minister of Education and other colleagues within the Ministry – could be considered change agents. This is not due to their prescribed positions of power within the Ministry but rather because of their actions and ability to mobilize communities towards constructive change.

In the process of reopening the schools, the Minister of Education took personal charge of the mobilization campaign. He traveled across the country, visiting schools, reassuring heads and teachers, and convincing parents to send their children back to the schools. His grassroots mobilization efforts were able to win the day in the face of continuing fear and interethnic tensions as well as memories of schools used just months earlier as places of massacres during the genocide. As the Minister toured the country to appeal to the people to send their children back to school, he also brought with him other ministry officials from Kigali, the capital, who were originally from the districts he was visiting. It was these local officials that talked to and persuaded people in their home districts to send their children back to school. The Minister, and the process of reopening schools, gained from the credibility that these officials had in their home regions. Both the Minister and those colleagues he tapped to persuade those in their home regions served as change agents, successful opening the minds of education stakeholders across the country that it was safe to come back to the schools and resume that normal function of life. The Minister himself and the colleagues he tapped served as change agents by utilizing the unique character they had for mobilizing others

---

<sup>85</sup> Guzmán, José Luis. “Chapter 2: Educational Reform in Post-War El Salvador.” *From Bullets to Blackboards: Education for Peace in Latin American and Asia*. Emily Vargas-Barón and Hernando Bernal Alarcón (eds.) Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank, 2005.

<sup>86</sup> Sampson, Cynthia, Mohammed Abu-Nimer, Claudia Liebler, and Diana Whitley (eds.) *Positive Approaches to Peacebuilding : A Resource for Innovators*. Washington, DC: Pact Publications, 2003.

around change. Had it not been for the influential capabilities of these individuals, reopening schools would not have achieved the success that it did.

*Method: Build on existing “capacities for peace”<sup>87</sup>*

Too often reconstruction efforts after conflict undertake statebuilding strategies without being sufficiently informed by what institutions existed prior to the conflict. Peacebuilders will then reinvent the wheel based on the assumption of *terra nullius*, rather than building on pre-existing institutional structures and systems. Research and practice on peacebuilding has proven that institutions as well as community and transitional structures will remain in some form after conflict. Formal or informal institutions that remain may be even more useful given that managing to sustain at least some minimal level of functioning through conflict most likely means that these institutions were flexible and able to adapt well to the constraints of the difficult context.<sup>88</sup> Approaches to peacebuilding assume that there are always social elements that work well or have in the past which can be identified, analyzed, and built upon as a foundation for system change.<sup>89</sup>

As with any other system, capacity in the education system must be built upon existing mechanisms, relationships, and people. The primary goal is not to design a new system and find new people to administer it. Instead, the idea is to identify where education capacity exists and support it.<sup>90</sup> Though this is the ideal, the reality is often different. In post-war Kosovo under the UN mission, UNMIK, the education system experienced quite the opposite type of intervention in which the former systems – both the formal Serbian education system and the parallel underground Albanian system – were essentially bypassed. Structures, people, and capacity from the pre-war systems were generally ignored by UNMIK under its watch. This primarily stemmed from beliefs and attitudes among UNMIK international education officials, all the way up to the Principal International Officer of the Department of Education and Science, who premised their interventions on reinventing the system, believing that little within the educational heritage of Kosovo could be simply altered.<sup>91</sup> In practice, this meant that former Kosovar education officials were bypassed, failing to build on their knowledge and resulting in many Kosovar education officials distancing themselves from education under UNMIK. Particularly, many Albanian educators believed that UNMIK’s approaches missed an opportunity to access the parallel system’s potential for community mobilization in coordination with UNMIK efforts.<sup>92</sup>

The belief within UNMIK that there was nothing to build on prevailed to a great extent, and to the detriment of improved peace and education outcomes. In fact, the education heritage of Kosovo, though contentious, was quite rich and worthy of gleaning its best mechanisms and capacities. Not only did UNMIK fail to benefit from the use of these systems and capacity, but its dismissive attitudes and actions built resentment and anger among the teachers, administrators, and education professionals that were ignored during reconstruction. Rather than easing tensions, this approach entrenched others.

---

<sup>87</sup> Anderson, Mary B. *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—Or War*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1999.

<sup>88</sup> Cliffe, Sarah and Nicholas Manning. “Cross-Cutting Challenges.” *Building States to Build Peace*. Charles T. Call with Vanessa Hawkins Wyeth (eds.). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, forthcoming 2007.

<sup>89</sup> Sampson, Cynthia, Mohammed Abu-Nimer, Claudia Liebler, and Diana Whitley (eds.) *Positive Approaches to Peacebuilding: A Resource for Innovators*. Washington, DC: Pact Publications, 2003.

<sup>90</sup> Rose, Pauline and Martin Greeley. “Education in Fragile States: Capturing Lessons and Identifying Good Practice.” DAC Fragile States Group, Service Delivery Workstream, Sub-Team for Education Services. May 2006.

<sup>91</sup> Sommers, Marc and Peter Buckland. *Parallel Worlds: Rebuilding the Education System in Kosovo*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO, 2004. Page 20.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.* Page 47, 51.

*Method: Work in genuine partnerships*

Genuine partnerships are premised on equality and equity, open communication and full disclosure. In a partnership, neither party has all the answers and neither party can solve the problems at hand without full cooperation and collaboration with the other party. Instead, constructive working relationships must be built based on shared risk, shared accountability, and shared power. Working in a genuine partnership requires the willingness to hand over some control to the other party – it is the realization that, because resolution can't be reached without the other party, it is necessary to give a degree of control over the situation and decision-making to that party. Genuine partnerships, then, require building strong mutual trust.

The most frequently cited example of a post-conflict partnership is between external actors, such as NGOs or donors, and internal actors, such as the ministry of education, where power and resource differentials skew working relationships. Lessons learned on working in these relationships indicate that genuine partnerships are most effective for statebuilding strategies – but that they require improved risk-sharing, shared accountability, and a common agenda. Collaborative, constructive relationships are based on equality and understanding, not patron-client dichotomies.<sup>93</sup>

Experiences of the tension and lack of collaboration in Rwanda between the Ministry of Education and the Catholic Church, a major education provider, prove the missed opportunities that result from failing to work in genuine partnership. Tensions between the Ministry and the Church had persisted since before the war and genocide regarding roles and regulations as the state took over education from the Church during the decades following independence. During colonization, the Catholic Church had at one time been the sole provider of education, a situation that changed after independence with the growing role of the Ministry in administering education. The Church continued to run numerous schools throughout the country, however, and there was ongoing contention regarding regulatory and operational control and differentiation of roles between the Ministry and the Church.

Despite a brief period of openness following the end of the war when cooperation between the two seemed more possible, the Ministry and Church have failed to collaborate or integrate strategies in any substantial way. Disputes remain regarding ownership of schools and property for those schools originally founded by churches, and the Church has not committed itself to the overall goals of the national education system. Though the Ministry relies on the Church for day-to-day school operations, it has failed to build a solid partnership with the Church that would allow it to work collaboratively with the Church to ensure broad and effective support from such a significant national education partner.<sup>94</sup> The failure to create a genuine partnership with such a major education stakeholder in the country is a significant loss not only to education but also social networks that have not been built because of this failure. Contention between the Ministry and Church remains and serves as an unnecessary source of tension and a limit on cooperation and constructive engagement.

*Method: Facilitate cooperation*

The true peacebuilder is no more than a facilitator. The peacebuilder facilitates constructive communication, problem solving, and collaboration between those conflicting parties that may otherwise remain at odds. As a facilitator, the peacebuilder recognizes that she or he can never have the answers to the problems at hand, but that only those deeply entrenched in the problems can

---

<sup>93</sup> “Rebuilding Post-Conflict Societies: Lessons from a Decade of Global Experience.” Workshop Report. The World Bank and United Nations Development Program (UNDP). New York. September 19-21, 2005.

<sup>94</sup> Obura, Anna. *Never Again: Educational Reconstruction in Rwanda*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO, 2003.

come cooperatively to mutual solutions that will be durable and lasting. Necessity then requires facilitating cooperation between parties and stakeholders, building on what each has to offer to a process of constructive social change.

Suggestions from the Minister of Education of the Tuzla Canton in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina demonstrate an alternative model to cooperation between Ministries there. Interethnic conflict between Bosniaks, Serbs, and Croats wracked Bosnia and Herzegovina for three years in the early 1990s before the Dayton Agreement was signed in December 1995. Three parallel education systems, comprised of 13 separate Ministries of Education, have been developed in Bosnia and Herzegovina since the conflict ended there, all along ethnic divisions. (The three systems exist in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Republika Srpska, and Brčko District. Each of these has a separate Ministry of Education as do the 10 cantons that comprise the Federation, for a total of 13 Ministries.) To avoid the danger of ethnic disintegration that the separate education systems contribute to, cooperation across the Ministries is critical. First, cooperation between all of the Ministries of Education is necessary for the development of a national education framework, identifying those aspects of the education system that need to be common to all entities and providing space for specific educational concerns within the different entities.<sup>95</sup> Similarly, projects need to be undertaken that broaden out from involving a single canton to numerous cantons, for example, or that are regional in scope, crossing ethnic lines. Teachers could be invited from neighboring parts to participate in activities; pedagogical institutes could offer professional services to others in order to design and implement common projects together. Cooperation between the Ministries would build on the strengths within them and build social linkages across them. Such linkages are those that maintain cooperation in the face of potential disintegration. They serve the function of not only practically contributing to the capacities of the formal institutions but also enhance the informal institutions across Bosnia and Herzegovina.

*Method: Utilize elicitive methods; don't prescribe solutions*

Conflict resolution methodologies are often premised on the idea of a facilitator – an individual that generates the desired atmosphere in which positive cooperation and constructive change can occur among conflicted groups. As mentioned, the facilitator understands that durable solutions must come from within. The facilitator must only provide the space and security for those conflicted groups to collaboratively come to their own joint conclusions and solutions. Anything more imposing than that would invalidate the facilitator's purpose. Peacebuilders that attempt to rebuild the education system must then focus on facilitating active communication, problem-solving, and collaboration by those who are vested in the situation and must live with the outcomes. The facilitator must not impose solutions. Fundamentally, the peacebuilder elicits solutions rather than prescribing them.

Rebuilding the state after conflict must examine society's evolving image and expectations of the state.<sup>96</sup> In rebuilding the education system, the peacebuilder must elicit from stakeholders both a vision and then a reality of what the system should be. Stakeholders must determine from their own rich knowledge set both the problems and the solutions. The broad spectrum of education

---

<sup>95</sup> "Creating a New Education System in Bosnia and Herzegovina: The 'Model for System Change in Secondary Education' Project." Open Society Fund, Bosnia and Herzegovina. 2002.

<sup>96</sup> Call, Charles T. "Ending Wars, Building States." *Building States to Build Peace*. Charles T. Call with Vanessa Hawkins Wyeth (eds.) Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, forthcoming 2007.

stakeholders is the key resource to rebuilding the system; they are the experts on their own needs and how to best fulfill them.<sup>97</sup>

Strategies that fail to build off the elicited solutions and inputs of those within the conflict risk a missed contribution to peace. School rehabilitation in Timor-Leste is an example of a failure to successfully elicit local community solutions. The extensive infrastructural damage following the violence – original estimates immediately after the conflict claimed up to 95% of classrooms were destroyed – there necessitated a broad reconstruction and rehabilitation effort for schools. The Emergency School Readiness Project (ESRP) began under joint international and local auspices in early 2000 and ran for the next two years. Though the project was able to achieve rehabilitation levels beyond their original reconstruction targets, satisfaction at the local level remained weak. Some teachers claimed that, had it been known how long it would take for school repairs to be completed, they would have done the job themselves. Others claimed that the communities could have created doors and chairs on their own from local materials but were afraid that such initiatives would jeopardize their chances of getting their allocation of international reconstruction funds.<sup>98</sup> Such dynamics within the project meant that it failed to capitalize on potential contributions from the local communities. Responses for school rehabilitation were imposed and community contributions – ideas or actual rehabilitation results – weren't even considered.

In addition, a planned block grant program to provide funds to school-community councils under the School System Revitalization Program in Timor-Leste had to be cut due to funding shifts. School-community councils were supposed to have been provided with an opportunity to be funded for school improvements as they saw fit.<sup>99</sup> This sort of opportunity for local community is integral to an elicitive rebuilding methodology. It facilitates the type of problem-solving that elicitive methods are built upon. Community initiatives and inputs should be prioritized and rewarded; they should determine the framework for responses.

*Method: Ensure transparency, accountability*

At the interpersonal level, peacebuilders are honest about what they're trying to promote and demonstrate a clear willingness to listen. They keep those they are facilitating with well informed and keep the parameters of interaction clear and the rules simple. Primarily, they seek to build trust – between themselves and the parties they are trying to assist, and between those parties themselves. They do so with honesty and transparency, taking full responsibility for their actions.

Building trust is fundamental to transforming conflict and building peace; it is essential as the basis for both formal and informal institutions. Building trust requires a conducive environment for it, which depends on ensuring transparency and accountability. To rebuild the education system, vertical accountability must be built between all levels from the national level to the school level. Horizontal accountability must be generated between regions, districts, or communities, across stakeholder groups and formal channels.<sup>100</sup> Decision-making must be public and follow consistent processes and clear procedures. Information must be made widely available and accessible in a proactive effort on the part of officials. Mechanisms and channels for feedback between stakeholders should be designed and implemented. The education system must be fully and consistently accountable to communities and transparent to stakeholders.

---

<sup>97</sup> Maiese, Michelle. "Elicitive Training." *Beyond Intractability*. September 2004. Accessed July 30, 2007. [http://crinfo.beyondintractability.org/essay/prescriptive\\_elicitive\\_training/?nid=1361](http://crinfo.beyondintractability.org/essay/prescriptive_elicitive_training/?nid=1361)

<sup>98</sup> Nicolai, Susan. *Learning Independence: Education in Emergency and Transition in Timor-Leste since 1999*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO, 2004. Page 108.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid. Page 104.

<sup>100</sup> "Governance Interventions in Post-War Situations: Lessons Learned." CMI Report R. Chr. Michelsen Institute. Bergen, Norway. 2005.

Institutionalizing mechanisms for transparency and accountability is the means by which trust is built and then sustained over the long-term. In Timor-Leste, the process of teacher selection demonstrates the sense of responsibility towards teachers and other educational stakeholders. Following the popular consultation, the need for teachers was intense – the majority of teachers pre-conflict had been recruited from other parts of Indonesia and over 90% of secondary school teachers and almost 25% of primary school teachers had left Timor-Leste following the violence there.<sup>101</sup> To fill the many empty positions, a selection process was initiated to formalize teacher positions where these slots were empty or where volunteers were filling the need. The selection of primary teachers was based on an examination of skill levels and knowledge, while secondary teachers were selected based on questionnaires and interviews on subject matter qualifications.

The significant point of this process that illustrates the importance of transparency and accountability was the management of problems with selection and the sense of accountability demonstrated towards the teachers and communities. When corruption allegations arose following primary teacher position announcements, the newly appointed Inspector General initiated his first inquiry. Both simple misunderstandings and apparent collusion were dealt with systematically and effectively through a series of recommendations. For secondary school teachers allocated improperly, issues were corrected with an appeals process through the Inspector General.<sup>102</sup> In this case, the presence of the Inspector General was critical to ensuring transparency and accountability for teachers and local level education stakeholders. The presence and actions of the Inspector General built public confidence in the system as well as eased potential tensions among communities and stakeholders. These types of responses enable the environment of trust necessary for peacebuilding.

*Method: Focus on consensus when setting expectations*

It is an inescapable fact that not all of everyone's expectations can be fulfilled immediately after conflict. Funds, resources, time, energy, and capacity are all extremely limited. Expectations must be in line with these constraints – it is absolutely necessary to set realistic expectations about what can be accomplished within a given time period. Given that post-conflict reality, the focus should then be on how these expectations are established. Given the potential for fueling tensions and creating rifts, setting expectations must be a consensus-building exercise. The process of deciding what the prioritized outcomes will be is more important than the actual prioritized outcomes. Expectations set must reflect as broad a consensus as possible so as to base decision-making on dialogue, respect, and inclusion and to ensure buy-in on necessary trade-offs and continued motivation for peace.

Evidence from interactions between an NGO and communities in southern Sudan during the conflict (as opposed to post-conflict) poses a great example for the need to build consensus around expectations. Schooling in southern Sudan was almost nonexistent during the course of the civil war between north and south from 1983 to 2004 and education services were provided by NGOs in the face of a complete lack of governance and a formal education system. Attempts to engage community participation in school rebuilding in southern Sudan during the civil war exemplify the tensions created when expectations are determined without broad consensus. Communities in Akon Payam were asked to contribute labor and resources to build schools with a return of support from the World Food Program's (WFP) Food for Work program. However, mismatched expectations between the communities and the NGO running the program contributed

---

<sup>101</sup> Nicolai, Susan. *Learning Independence: Education in Emergency and Transition in Timor-Leste since 1999*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO, 2004. Page 73.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid. Pages 115-6.

to tension and produced limited results. Community contributions were constrained by the parameters of the NGO's pre-determined expectations. Communities were expected to construct school compounds but the structures were required to conform to program regulations (such as the inclusion of cooking and eating facilities in all compounds). Even where compounds were constructed, the community did not always automatically receive the stipulated WFP support given the differences in expectations. Similarly, expectations regarding the ability of war-affected and potentially dysfunctional communities to organize effectively didn't match the reality of the communities' experiences.<sup>103</sup> In general, the program parameters were based on preconceived expectations that didn't take community expectations into account. Expectations regarding the sufficient levels of construction were not matched between the NGO and the communities and there were no efforts made to redraw the parameters of the program based on dialogue and consensus of expectations.

*Method: Facilitate broad-based participation*

It is well known that fostering participation and democratization enhances social and political stability.<sup>104</sup> Broad participation in education systems has long been touted as a means of ensuring accessible, quality education. Rebuilding the post-conflict education system requires consolidating the central education authority while at the same time ensuring that such consolidation fosters, rather than limits, community participation and involvement in schools and education.<sup>105</sup> Facilitating broad participation within the system can serve to open up dialogue and engage previously conflicting groups in mutually constructive action within the process of rebuilding education. Additionally, prioritizing participation of those previously disenfranchised sectors of the population provides a concrete basis for hope among these groups as well as incentives for continued engagement.<sup>106</sup> This is particularly significant where exclusion and elitism between groups have been major contributors to conflict.

The education reform process following civil war in El Salvador emphasized social participation in the reform plan as a means of overcoming social polarization. The MINED emphasized participation in curriculum and institutional practices in four ways. MINED focused its goals on increasing involvement in program design and implementation; transferring responsibility to private entities for managing public services; increasing the participation of NGOs and private entities in MINED contracts; and strengthening opportunities for school participation at the local level. In general, the overriding outlook taken by the Ministry was that no single actor could solve the country's education problems and therefore broad participation and support for reform were fundamental.<sup>107</sup> This approach led to broad engagement and dialogue in practice that resulted in improved education outcomes as well as stronger relationships between stakeholders. Basing strategies on extensive participation invests education stakeholders in the vision and process for education reconstruction after conflict.

---

<sup>103</sup> Sommers, Marc. *Islands of Education: Schooling, Civil War and the Southern Sudanese (1983-2004)*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO, 2005. Pages 104-5.

<sup>104</sup> Bächler, Günter. "Conflict Transformation through State Reform." *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation*. Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management. August 2004.

<sup>105</sup> Buckland, Peter. *Reshaping the Future: Education and Postconflict Reconstruction*. Washington, DC: The World Bank. 2005.

<sup>106</sup> Orr, Robert. "Governing when Chaos Rules: Enhancing Governance and Participation." *The Washington Quarterly*. Vol. 25, No. 4 (Autumn 2002) pages 139-152.

<sup>107</sup> Guzmán, José Luis. "Chapter 2: Educational Reform in Post-War El Salvador." *From Bullets to Blackboards: Education for Peace in Latin American and Asia*. Emily Vargas-Barón and Hernando Bernal Alarcón (eds.) Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank, 2005. Pages 46-7, 55.

## VII. Next Steps: Implementation and Further Analysis

The expanse of peacebuilding methods available is broad and extends even beyond those methods outlined above. Currently there exists very little research or documentation, however, on the use of these methods as related to the education system or any other sector. What also became abundantly clear during the research for this study was the lack of documentation and analysis specific to the processes of rebuilding education after conflict. Much of the current research focuses on the passive relationship between the devastation of conflict and substantial educational needs following its cessation. Few studies emphasize a more contributory relationship of education's role in conflict or the potential involvement of education in peacebuilding. Far fewer studies consider the actual processes of education reconstruction following conflict. In combination that means that there is little knowledge or analysis on how the processes of education reconstruction can contribute to peacebuilding.

Not only must the peacebuilding methods outlined in this paper begin to be implemented in practice, but considerable research on post-conflict education reconstruction processes is necessary to analyze the characteristics of processes undertaken and the impacts of these processes. Best practices for peacebuilding methods in education must be deduced. Considering the current paucity of this type of knowledge, much research is required to understand how peacebuilding methods can best be incorporated into the processes of rebuilding the education system.

## VIII. Conclusions: A Focus on the Process

The focus on process emphasizes what can be built or transformed during that process, both for education and peace simultaneously. Relationships must be reformed and strengthened, channels for ongoing dialogue must be developed, and mechanisms for acting collectively and resolving conflict must be embedded – not only in the formal system but in the social networks that grow and operate within the formal system. The peacebuilding methods outlined above demonstrate how the process of rebuilding the education system can be designed and implemented in a manner that simultaneously restores education and builds peace. In rebuilding the education system, education outcomes and goals will be met; in utilizing peacebuilding methods to do so, education reconstruction can contribute to peace. Employing these methods hopes to open minds, alter perceptions, nurture social linkages, and develop constructive relationships. These processes are integral to building the education system as an effective formal institution. They are also fundamental to reforming and rebuilding communities and societies via informal institutions, which is critical after conflict and the bedrock of peacebuilding.

Some general tactics can be gleaned from the methods above. First, both external and internal peacebuilders must serve primarily as facilitators, eliciting solutions from those who are embedded in the conflict. Peacebuilders cannot assume to have all – or perhaps any – of the answers. Imposing solutions runs the risk of creating unsustainable changes that may be rejected by those embedded in the conflict or even cause further damage. The most productive and effective work of peacebuilders is to generate the environment in which conflicting parties are able and willing to risk changing their minds, their actions, and their realities. Where conflict has occurred, facilitating dialogue and problem-solving on education outcomes requires knowing and understanding the undercurrents of broader, residual tensions and social divisions. Dialogue and problem-solving can serve not just to reach solutions on practical education outcomes but, in the process, can address those underlying issues and build general social cohesion. By facilitating these

kinds of processes, those embedded in the conflict can both resolve their practical problems on education and chip away at the broader conflict. Only facilitation can serve these dual goals.

Second, trust must be built. Both formal governance systems and informal social networks are built on the existence of mutual trust among parties. Trust is an absolute requirement for long-term sustainable relationships, either official or unofficial. Stakeholders must have confidence in a formal education system that is accountable and responsive to their needs and consistently delivers quality education services. This is the very basis of good governance through the education sector. The informal institutions that accompany this formal system – the unofficial relationships across and between stakeholders such as between parents and teachers, teachers and administrators, administrators and central ministry officials, or any other configuration – also require trust. These social networks and linkages, where built on trust, contribute to the social cohesion that will begin to repair social trauma and divisions and retain social connections over the long-term. Without a minimal of trust, processes of rebuilding either formal or informal institutions will be at a stand-still.

Finally, channels and mechanisms for continued conflict resolution must be embedded in formal and informal institutions. Peacebuilding must be a self-perpetuating process. Perpetuating peacebuilding requires institutionalizing mechanisms, both formal and informal, that give individuals and groups ongoing access to ways that they can reframe divisions and jointly collaborate. Social networks and norms can serve as informal mechanisms just as official channels within the education system can serve as formal mechanisms. Mechanisms for effective collective action must be in place to facilitate future engagement. Peacebuilding methods employed in the process of rebuilding the system can embed these methods both formally and informally in the system in a sustainable manner.

The actual processes of peacebuilding are fundamental for the post-conflict education system because they will bring the necessary results both for education and for peace. The post-conflict education system can by no means singularly bring peace to a country. However, given the known devastation of conflict, every possible measure should be taken following conflict to avoid a relapse into violence and war. Utilizing peacebuilding methodologies in the process of rebuilding the education system employs the system in a critical attempt to mitigate conflict. The process of rebuilding the post-conflict education system, implemented and designed for peacebuilding, can link necessary education outcomes with necessary peace outcomes, developing a quality education system within a peaceful society.