Berghof Foundation

Peace Education and Conflict Transformation

Uli Jäger

Content

About the author:

Uli Jäger is Programme Director of Peace Education and Global Learning at the Berghof Foundation and responsible for its peace education activities. He was co-director of the Institute for Peace Education, Tübingen e.V. (Institut für Friedenspädagogik, Tübingen e.V. [IfT]) in Germany from 1986 to 2012. He is an experienced workshop facilitator, both in Germany and abroad. Since 2006 he has been responsible for the education programme of the international project "Peace Counts on Tour". Uli is a member of the advisory board of the German Foundation for Peace Research (Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung [DSF]) and the advisory board of the Peace Advisory Group for the Protestant Church of Baden-Württemberg (Arbeitskreis "Friedensauftrag der Kirche" der Evangelischen Landeskirche in Württemberg). He has published, edited and co-edited more than 20 books and CD-ROMs. Uli holds an MA in Political Science, Sociology and Educational Science from Tübingen University.

Note:

The Berghof Handbook for Conflict transformation has a new home: www.berghof-foundation.org/handbook

www.berghof-foundation.org/handbook

1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been an upsurge in interest in peace education in the international context. The renowned *Journal of Peace Education* describes peace education not only as a flourishing academic discipline but, indeed, as an active global social movement "that can collectively unify, fuel, and inspire dialog among scholars, researchers, activists, educators, government leaders, and the myriad of public peacemakers committed to creating cultures of peace throughout the world" (Lum 2013, 121). A network of individuals, groups and organisations has formed, whose activities reflect the full diversity of peace education approaches practised worldwide. A good insight into the "scene" is provided by the Newsletter of the Global Campaign for Peace Education.[1] Launched in 1999, the Campaign's goal is to provide peace education with an internal forum and an external voice (Wintersteiner 2013).

Along with this heightened attention, there are also growing expectations and, indeed, challenges. In view of what appear to be constantly self-reproducing cultures of violence in many societies, there are increasingly urgent calls for a reliable peace education tool box. Organisations engaged in non-violent conflict management and development cooperation now generally regard education programmes as extremely important, and peace education is being integrated into many of them. As a result, the question which increasingly arises is what contribution it can make, focusing, on the one hand, on the theoretical foundations of peace education and, on the other, on developing context-appropriate practical approaches and documenting and analysing the impacts. The United States Institute of Peace, in a review of its grantmaking in the area of peace education, pays tribute to the successes achieved and the progress made on conceptualisation and implementation, but also calls emphatically for greater differentiation and focusing of approaches, and proposes more intensive dialogue between academics and practitioners in this context (Fitzduff/Jean 2011).

The first part of this paper therefore develops a basic concept of internationally oriented, context-related and process-oriented peace education with clearly defined target groups. Against this background, the second part presents a comprehensive and practical approach to peace education in crisis and conflict regions, the aim being to promote conflict transformation. In this context, a fundamental distinction is made between direct peace education (encounter, inspiration, training) and structural peace education (pilot projects, curricula, implementation). The context-related interaction between these two basic forms is identified as a promising approach and offered up for discussion. Brief case studies from the practice of peace education are presented for the purpose of illustration. The summary at the end of the paper presents conclusions, unanswered questions and development priorities for researchers, practitioners and policy-makers.

2 The Basic Concept: Learning Spaces for Peace

It is not surprising that although now in its 10th year, the Journal of Peace Education is still asking one key question: "What is peace education?" (Lum 2013, 121). Researchers and practitioners agree that a single recognised definition does not, and probably cannot, exist. The approaches are too diverse, as are the contexts in which peace education programmes are discussed, conceptualised, trialled and evaluated. The diversity ranges from programmes to prevent violence among preschool children and mediation

---

[1]   www.peace-ed-campaign.org/

programmes in schools to encounter workshops with members of different conflict parties in crisis regions and ideas on how to redesign education systems in a conflict-sensitive manner and develop curricula and learning materials in post-conflict societies. Numerous recent monographs, collections of articles and manuals bear witness to this state of affairs (Frieters-Reermann 2009; Grasse/Gruber/Gugel 2008; Harris 2013; Kössler/Schwitanski 2014; Lenhart/Mitschke/Braun 2010; Nipkow 2007; McGlynn et al. 2009; Salomon/Cairns 2010).

In the past, various attempts have been made at structuring the field. A good example is the much-discussed approach advocated by Gavriel Salomon, Emeritus Professor at the University of Haifa, who has worked tirelessly for many years for more clarity and conceptual thinking about peace education. In his view, the *contextualisation* of peace education is crucial. Salomon distinguishes between

- contexts of relative tranquillity with no tension
- contexts of latent ethnopolitical tensions
- contexts of collective, intractable and belligerent conflicts.

In the latter, peace education, according to Salomon, faces its real test, for here, it is about making peace with a real enemy: "[W]ith somebody you really hate, who really threatens you" (Salomon 2004, 10). From his perspective, a prototype can be developed from this – albeit without devaluing peace education in the other contexts. The proposed contextualisation sharpens awareness of the need for peace education programmes to be precisely aligned to the specific conflict setting. At the same time, some of the individual measures can be deployed in different contexts.

In addition to contextualisation, the process-, personality- and relationship-forming aspects of peace education are important. Together with his colleague Ed Cairns, he writes: "Peace Education is primarily an educational process operating within the context of war, threat, violence, and conflict that addresses attitudes, beliefs, attributes, skills, and behaviors" (Salomon/Cairns 2010, 5).

The ideas presented in this paper are based on these principles. The key question addressed in the paper concerns the concept of peace education in the international context and focuses especially on the second and third categories defined above, with the involvement of external actors. In addition, the development of peace education in Germany, as a "relatively tranquil" country, is outlined for the purpose of illustration (see Case study 1).

Case study 1: Peace education in Germany

Since the Second World War, the development of peace education (*Friedenspädagogik / Friedenserziehung / Friedensbildung*) in Germany has been significantly influenced by the global political situation and events or by challenges arising within the society of Germany itself. For example, the nuclear arms race led to intense debate that focused on how to develop an appropriate pedagogical response to children's fears of war. On the other hand, issues such as right-wing extremism, xenophobia and images of violence in the media have always determined the peace education agenda to a high degree as well. The resulting diversity of topics and approaches can be viewed as a strength, but it also creates major challenges in the quest for a clear (academic) profile.

Peace education has always dealt with central issues relating to human co-existence, albeit in something of a niche area. Even after the Second World War, peace education did not feature in the re-education programmes promoted by the Allies, i.e. the democratisation of the nation through education. Educationist Hermann Röhrs pointed out back in the 1980s that the Cold War began at a very early stage to define the thinking and action of those bearing political responsibility, doing so through its new enemy stereotypes (Röhrs 1983). Later, there were repeated calls for peace education to be introduced as a subject on the school curriculum, but this demand failed to gain the support of academics or the public.

Although school as a place of learning is at the heart of peace education, the non-school education sector has always been addressed as well. Besides some committed teachers, it was mainly youth groups and peace organisations which began at an early stage to build on the momentum generated by peace education for greater international understanding and the management of individuals' and societies' potential for violence. In the 1970s and 1980s, youth groups were therefore among the key target groups for peace education expertise; today, it is mainly non-governmental organisations.

In Germany, discussions about current challenges facing peace education take place at events organised by relevant networks, such as the conferences of the Peace Education Working Group of the German Association for Peace and Conflict Studies and conferences organised by the North German Peace Education Network. In addition, specialist journals publish articles analysing current developments. In 2014, for example, the question was what might constitute an appropriate peace education response to the growing presence of the *Bundeswehr* (German armed forces) in schools and in teacher training (Jäger 2013a). Another challenge relating to schooling arises from the interaction between children and young people with different experiences of war: children of soldiers deployed in military operations involving the *Bundeswehr*, refugee children from conflict and crisis regions, and children who (only!) find out about war via the media (Jäger 2013b). Against the backdrop of new wars and military interventions, critics are now asking to what extent the unconditional moral rejection of war can continue to be upheld in peace education (Sander 2005, 449).

2.1 Learning processes, learning spaces and learning arrangements

Peace education aims to initiate and support integrated, holistic learning processes that are guided by the concept of peace. In these learning processes, the main goal is generally to promote constructive ways of dealing with the potential for conflict and violence and thus help to build the peace skills of individuals and groups alike. There are four core and interlocking objectives:

- recognition of conflicts as an opportunity for positive change, which means developing the skills for the constructive management of conflicts and a respectful relationship with those who are "other"
- recognition of different individual, social and political forms of (every-day) violence and the fascination of violence, which means promoting analysis of individual and collective experiences of violence, both past and present
- analysis of the causes, impacts and after-effects of war, which means looking at possible mechanisms against and alternatives to war at the individual, social and international level
- the development of visions of peace and community life and ways of translating these visions into practical action.

Another specific feature of peace education is the interaction between pedagogical approaches to negative and destructive phenomena (war, violence), on the one hand, and the systematic search for positive responses (conflict, peace), on the other. Pedagogical responses are therefore developed to deal with the continuing violence and peacelessness in and between societies/states around the world. At the same time, based on differentiated concepts of violence, conflict and peace, a contribution is made to promote and build cultures of conflict transformation and peace. Peace education supports the development of concepts of peaceful human co-existence and thus promotes attitudes and identities of individuals, groups and communities as peacemakers.

Figure 1: Reference points for peace education

Violence (neg.)	Conflict (pos.)
War (neg.)	Peace (pos.)

To implement these goals, it is necessary to create spaces in which learning processes can develop. These learning spaces for peace are based on the concept and implementation of "learning arrangements": context-specific, bespoke settings that take account of factors such as learning objectives, target groups, methods, timeframes and available facilities. Learning arrangements do not prescribe any form of instruction or use manipulation. They encourage an ethical, political and practical focus and open-ended dialogue. At seminars in conflict regions, doubt and scepticism about non-violent approaches are taken seriously and become an equal part of the discussion. In peace education, learning arrangements focus on every-day situations, because these are the best fields of learning (e.g. Faldalen et al. 2011).

Overcoming habitual patterns of behaviour is a key challenge in initiating learning processes. "Peace education has the difficult task of transforming habits that entrench a lack of peace as the normality," according to theologian Karl-Ernst Nipkow (2007, 354). How are these habitats manifested? Very often, people are habituated to the use of violence because this is perceived to be, or has validity as, a successful, if not the only option for action in conflict situations. Even habituation to war as an apparently legitimate means of doing politics and asserting interests can be observed. But there is also habitual self-perception as a helpless victim or a powerless individual buffeted by the violent upheavals taking place in the locality or the world. Peace education aims to challenge these habits by initiating shared learning experience and facilitating the formation of "counter-habits". This includes the experience that a life in diversity is possible, that fair play in dealing with others pays off, and that conflicts can be managed constructively. However, unless account is taken of the learning environment, all this is impossible.

Faced with non-peaceful and violent conditions, peace education must always consider the possibility of failure and recognise the limits to one-off educational interventions. At the same time, the opportunities for change increase if people learn to discover and recognise "their peace-relevant imaginations", as Christoph Wulf, educationist and co-founder of critical peace education in Germany, emphasises. He underlines that "the development of an historical awareness of the emergence and fundamental changeability of conflict formations [plays] a decisive role; for this makes a contribution to the development and implementation of utopian designs for changing the world. At the same time, it ensures a future-oriented approach in the consideration of problems and in education. Peace education is a social learning process, in which problems and conflict formations can be addressed" (Wulf 2007, 4).

If it is true that habits take time and profoundly affect attitudes and behaviours, this makes it clear how much more time is needed for the development of counter-habits whose purpose is to change attitudes and behaviours.

2.2 Peace as value orientation

Peace education has for many years drawn on the definitions of peace and violence pioneered by Norwegian researcher Johan Galtung. His tripartite typology (direct, structural and cultural violence) has triggered numerous controversies in academic and policy-making circles and has also had repercussions in peace education (Galtung 1990; for commentaries, see Brantmeier 2013, 246; Wintersteiner 2011, 356). For peace education, the concept primarily serves as a useful instrument for awareness-raising about various forms

of violence, while the controversies also offer an opportunity for the debates about matters of substance that are undoubtedly required. These discussions form part of the peace education learning arrangements which are tailored to specific target groups and contexts. The work with conflict parties in particular and in different cultural contexts has clearly revealed the need to focus very precisely on the context-specific meanings and definitions of violence in dialogue with all stakeholders. This approach also applies to the concept of peace. Galtung defines peace as a process at international, societal and individual level. In this process, small steps can also be identified and can acquire meaning. The comprehensive peace process which is not concluded anywhere in the world aims to achieve a continuous decrease in violence and a simultaneous increase in justice. However, both peace and justice are wide open to interpretation.

The concept of the civilisational hexagon, developed by Bremen-based peace researcher Dieter Senghaas, has also provided an important basis and key impetus for the theory and practice of peace education. Senghaas has analysed the bases of peace between Western societies for many years and has defined six conditions that can guarantee peace: (1) a legitimate monopoly of force by the state; (2) the rule of law; (3) the indispensability of interdependencies and affect control (4) democratic participation; (5) social justice, and (6) a culture of constructive conflict management (Senghaas 2004). Peace education programmes are generally based on condition number six of the hexagon (culture of constructive conflict management). Focusing on the hexagon model enables us to widen our view to encompass additional conditions, and identifies interesting linkages, e.g. between conflict culture and participation. This sharpens the awareness of the need to address transformation processes in a holistic manner and to include political dimensions, such as participation, as well. In peace education practice, analysing the state's monopoly of force in relation to conflict culture, the rule of law and participation can be useful in the dialogue with individuals and groups that have not yet finally broken with violence as a strategy for dealing with conflict.[2] This appears to be borne out by initial experience with appropriate workshop modules (Jäger/Ritzi/Romund 2012). The development of a differentiated learning setting that can be used in various conflict contexts has already been discussed at expert meetings and identified as a desirable step, but has yet to be achieved in practice (Schell-Faucon/Kelemen 2008).

To make progress here, the focus must be on integrated development, trialling, implementation and evaluation of learning arrangements, learning spaces and learning materials. Participatory and dialogue-oriented methods are used in workshops and training of trainers (ToT) programmes (Berghof Foundation 2012, 76 f). The defining feature of learning arrangements in peace education is that they initiate, implement and evaluate an open and participatory learning process that promotes reflection on notions and strategies of peace. The fact is that for many people, especially in conflict and crisis regions, damaged or destroyed relations make it difficult even to think about future forms of coexistence. Here, at the individual level, it is essential to develop not only the relevant skills and knowledge, but also the willingness to engage for peace. This can be done by strengthening resilience to violent influences in the locality, by changing attitudes and behaviours (overcoming apathy, powerlessness and even a willingness to resort to violence) and through empowerment (strengthening conflict management skills and capacities).

2.3 Target groups for peace education

Policy-makers and educationists often take the view that children are the main target group for peace education – regardless of which conflict setting is being discussed. "The earlier the better" is the premise which applies, not only in relation to conflict prevention; it is equally apt where peace education is concerned. A study by the non-governmental organisation Save the Children looks at early, age-appropriate peace education: "Peace begins in the minds of children. But how do we make sure children receive the quality education that will help them to build peace?" (Save the Children 2008, 5). This question draws attention to a major challenge: how much responsibility should be transferred to children in relation to the

---

2   In this sense violent actors are also partners and target groups for peace education.

issue of peace? Of course children can explore the topics of peace and war. But how much peace can they create, and above all, what role are the adults playing? Ultimately, the main burden of responsibility lies with them.

Around 50 per cent of the population in developing countries are under 16 years of age. The fact is that children and young people (a distinction between these terms is almost impossible to make in the global context) are not only victims but also perpetrators of violence in war (as child soldiers, for example). But they can also be agents for peace: "in zones of conflict all over the world, youth are coming together, seeking to protect their own rights and to promote peace" (Carter/Shipler 2005, 150). However, if peace education aims to adopt a broad-based approach that holds out the promise of success, then it is not only a matter of involving the children: the family, the community and, ultimately, decision-makers in politics and society must also play a role. Evaluations of peace education programmes with children in refugee camps clearly show that the success of these programmes depends on the extent to which they reach the community (Allen 2009). Two lessons can be learned from this: (1) Peace education programmes for children must involve the local community. (2) Specific programmes for adults are also required. After all, it is adults who engage in warfare and are responsible for making peace.

Multipliers from the education sector have proved to be important target groups for peace education. They include teachers in schools and in higher education, and education professionals working in non-school settings, such as refugee camps and youth centres. Education decision-makers at the local, municipal and national level are also important. A further target group is the staff from non-governmental organisations and peace activists, who are not only interested in peace education and conflict transformation but also have political skills. And finally, a number of peace education programmes and learning arrangements are based on the recognition that children and young people learn best from their peers, creating touchpoints with peer education programmes (Fountain 1999).

The exploration of target groups in peace education is guided by the fundamental recognition that individuals can make a difference, especially in less individualistic societies with entrenched inter-community conflicts (Lübbe 2013, 144). Peace education programmes therefore aim to empower people and strengthen their capacities to act as "changemakers". As a Policy Paper for Ökumenische Diakonie (Ecumenical Social Service – OED), entitled Conflict Transformation and Peace Work, points out: 'It has repeatedly been shown to be the case that it depends on individual people whether opportunities for conflict transformation are recognised and utilised. Conflict resolution is like juggling with "irregular verbs', which do not fit within the usual template. This requires people to show great perspicacity and a willingness to take risks. The risk of failure is continuously present here. These people who pursue a ray of hope at the end of the tunnel often take unconventional routes. They come up against brick walls and tend to find routine procedures a hindrance rather than a help" (Diakonisches Werk 2009, 30).

2.4 Individual aptitudes, social contexts

In designing its learning arrangements, peace education considers as many perspectives on individual and collective learning as possible. An important frame of reference is provided by interdisciplinary peace research on the causes and prevention of violence. Here, it is important to reveal blind spots. This applies at the individual level, for example in relation to the role of emotions. Here, the Minerva Research Project "Violence & Emotion" at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in Berlin offers some fresh perspectives. It held an initial workshop in October 2013 to transfer results and methods to the fields of violence prevention and peace education.[3]

Neurobiology is another new resource. "To cooperate, help others and allow justice to be served is a global, biologically anchored fundamental human motivation. This pattern is prevalent across all human

---

cultures" (Bauer 2011, 39). The (re-) interpretation of the Milgram experiment, often referred to in peace education, also offers new entry points. The experiment measured the willingness of study participants to *obey* an *authority figure* when put under pressure. Neurobiologist Joachim Bauer points out, in this context, that people who are not put under pressure and are not provoked find it repugnant to inflict suffering on others. It is interesting that from a brain research perspective, affection, encouragement and support, on the one hand, and guidance towards compliance with social rules, on the other, are regarded as prerequisites for the development of peace-ability.

The important shared analysis of concepts, strategies and visions of peace can also be inspired by the recognition that "internal images" provide indispensable impetus that guides action. This is pointed out by Gerald Hüther, Head of the Center for Neurobiology Prevention Research (Hüther 2011). According to a study into the peace education relevance of mirror neurons: "something that we experience often becomes strongly embedded in the neurobiological programming of our actions. Mirror neurons thus offer great potential for initiating a spiral of nonviolence, if we regard this, rather than a spiral of violence, as being natural and if we regularly experience non-violent action and consciously perceive it as such" (Niermann 2012, 73).

The basic question about the relationship between the human, the social and the political levels is raised primarily in discourses at international level (Dupuy 2008; Harris 2013; Salomon/Cairns 2010). Here, the focus is on the role of peace education in initiating the processes that are necessary to bring about change in violent conflict settings. One of the very few German academics currently involved in this debate is the education scientist Norbert Frieters-Reermann. He calls for a new concept of peace education as an element of non-violent international conflict management: "The micro level and a strong relationship to individual learning are key elements of peace education, but not the only ones. Rather, the focus on the prevention of violence, and peace education should also encompass broader social linkages and other levels of society and include collective learning processes." At the same time, however, he warns against overextending the concept and calls for "a balance to be achieved in the field of tension between unrealistically high expectations and realistic, important and necessary steps for action" (Frieters-Reermann 2013, 166).

There is still a lack of comprehensive empirical studies about the impact of peace education programmes in regions of conflict and war that take account of long-term processes and the linkages between the individual and societal level. An evaluation study conducted at Heidelberg University's Institute for Education Studies with funding from the German Foundation for Peace Research (Lenhart/Mitschke/ Braun 2010) offers some interesting initial findings. Based on empirical surveys in ten conflict countries, the study identified more than 800 individual activities, which were bundled into 25 "measure patterns" and evaluated. These packages of measures reflect the diversity mentioned at the start, and include exchange programmes, civic education, curriculum development, memory work, peace education[4] with a focus on gender justice, peace education and protection of vulnerable groups, peace education packages, peace education by means of vocational/professional education and practical training for life, peace initiatives, community participation, integrated education facilities, intercultural and inter-community encounter, capacity-building, arts for peace, teaching/learning materials, teacher training, human rights education, sport for peace, civil society, strengthening the media for peace, trauma counselling, learning/teaching processes for schools, value-based education, and access to good quality primary education.

A summary of the findings of the Heidelberg study ran under the title "Peace education does matter!" (Lenhart/Karimi/Schäfer 2010, 67). It shows that participation in peace education projects has a clearly positive effect on individuals' peace-ability. They are more willing to approach members of other conflict parties and to believe in the success of civil conflict management than members of the control group who were unable to take part in the programmes. The study also attests to the motivational significance of external actors' role in entrenched conflict situations. This finding goes so far that the principle of local

---

4   The project refers instead to "peace-building educational projects".

ownership, which is often given primacy in the context of cooperation, is questioned. Indeed, it was found that in projects with exclusively local ownership, the lack of distance to the conflict and the lack of external support and facilitation significantly decrease the programme's success in many cases (Lenhart/Karimi/Schäfer 2011, 62).

> **Case study 2: Peace Education Programme (PEP) as a model project**
> Numerous international organisations and NGO networks are involved in the conceptual development and implementation of development assistance programmes that focus on education and include a peace education component. The Peace Education Programme (PEP) launched by the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) is regarded as "the most distinctly profiled peace education concept implemented to date in the context of humanitarian assistance and development cooperation" (GIZ 2011, 39). It has been trialled and evaluated in various countries, including Kenya's refugee camps. Several manuals have been produced, and the programme has been adapted by various organisations (including UNESCO, UNHCR and UNICEF) for specific contexts over the past 10 years.[5]
>
> The strength of the Programme lies in the interaction between three strands: the formal education (school) programme; the non-formal (community workshop) programme, and the training manuals for teachers and facilitators. Evaluations have shown that success (e.g. increased problem-solving skills in relation to local conflicts, falling crime rates, and increased community ownership) depends on interaction between these components.
>
> Pamela Baxter, the international consultant who developed the Programme, sums up one of the key recommendations: "Because PEP promotes internal change in attitudes, skills, and values, it should be implemented on a small, local scale first. It should grow organically and incrementally before any national implementation" (cited in Allen et al. 2009, 39).

3 Direct and Structural Peace Education as a Contribution to Conflict Transformation

Conflicts are a defining feature of daily life and an integral part of politics and society, reflecting divergent interests and sometimes diametrically opposed needs. Articulating these interests and needs can enrich community life. Indeed, conflicts can be productive, as long as the parties discover ways of managing them fairly and non-violently, recognising the benefits that such an approach affords, and putting it into practice. However, if the parties are unwilling or unable to act in this way, conflicts can quickly become destructive, often leading to violence in all its forms.

In these situations, the concept of conflict transformation offers a fresh perspective. Conflict transformation is best described as "a complex process of constructively changing relationships, attitudes, behaviours, interests and discourses in violence-prone conflict settings" (Berghof Foundation 2012, 23ff). The concept is based on systemic thinking and is discussed and developed in an ongoing dialogue among academics and practitioners (Austin/Fischer/Giessmann 2011). Conflict transformation differentiates

---

5   www.ineesite.org/en/peace-education

between various forms of transformation: the relevant literature makes reference, for example, to context transformation, structure transformation, actor transformation, issue transformation and personal transformation (Miall 2004, 78). For peace education, this offers starting points for building the willingness and capacities of individuals and groups to engage in conflict transformation. Due to the complexity of protracted violent conflicts and the resulting need for transformation efforts at various levels, a comprehensive approach is required. This must bring together two fundamental types of peace education:

(1) *Direct peace education:* Key elements of this approach are generally about encounter, inspiration and training. It could also be described as peace education for empowerment, with a focus on personal capacity development or identity-building.

(2) *Structural peace education:* This approach brings together elements which, with the aid of pilot projects, aim to develop learning modules, media and curricula, with a focus on the sustainable delivery of peace education in the formal and non-formal education systems. The objective is to bring about a positive change in the structural conditions for peace.

The two forms are closely linked. The interaction between them is regarded as an essential prerequisite for sustainable peace education and its contribution to conflict transformation.

3.1 Direct peace education

Encounter, inspiration and training

Direct peace education focuses on the conflict-transformative power of human encounter. Indeed, it could be said that without encounter, peace education cannot take place at all. However, these are not random encounters but "staged" forms of encounter, at which people (such as members of different conflict parties) are invited to workshops, seminars and even major (sports) events for which a specific dialogue format or learning arrangement has been developed. The encounters also bring together members of conflict parties who are hostile to one another. In ethnopolitical conflict societies, it is important to facilitate contact between people with different ethnic or religious affiliations. In every case, peace education deliberately creates learning spaces in order to increase the likelihood that these encounters will have positive, conflict-transformative effects. It is about initiating learning processes that facilitate the development of the counter-habits described in Section 2.1. Providing opportunities for inspiration is part of these processes.

Case 3: Peace Counts on Tour

The Peace Counts on Tour project (Prinzing 2010; Romund 2014)[6] is an example of direct peace education and is based on cooperation between experienced journalists and peace educationists. Peace Counts on Tour offers people all over the world the opportunity to work together and explore examples of successful conflict transformation and peacebuilding and to learn from them in order to develop their own work in schools, with youth groups and with members of conflict parties. Reports about and photographs of people and projects worldwide, e.g. from Sri Lanka, Egypt, Nigeria, Afghanistan and Colombia, form the basis for the peace education programme. Using the life stories of people who have successfully initiated peace projects, a dialogue-oriented workshop format was developed in order to establish platforms for encounter and exchange for various target groups. The programme can be adapted to diverse social, political and cultural contexts. It was initially piloted in Germany and then went on tour around the world. So far, it has visited Afghanistan, Armenia, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, India, Jordan, Macedonia, Philippines, Russia and Sri Lanka. The main aim is to create spaces for learning and encounter in order to enable participants to work together on devising ways of achieving peace in their own environment.

---

6 www.peace-counts.org

The "best practice" examples of successful peacemakers were developed into multimedia materials (posters and a DVD) and, together with a manual, were published as a Peace Counts Learning Package (Jäger/Ritzi/Romund 2012). The manual contains five modules which map out the individual steps in the workshop: (1) Visions of peace; (2) Conflict escalation and de-escalation; (3) Pathways into violence – pathways out of violence; (4) Examples of successful peacemaking; (5) How to make peace.

Evaluation of the projects and feedback from participants show that inspiring the partners and participants in the workshop and engaging their senses with extraordinary photographs and high-quality journalism is extremely important (Serto 2013, 227).

Direct peace education has another goal as well: to provide the right inspiration for the right people at the right time at the right place. This can have a lasting effect, as an example from Peace Counts on Tour in India shows. After a workshop in New Delhi in March 2009, several participants took the Peace Counts concept back to their own regions (primarily the crisis regions in North-East India) and, since then, have run a steadily growing number of workshops either independently or with support from the Peace Counts team in Germany. They are also working on the delivery of a Peace Counts curriculum at several universities.

The life history approach adopted in the Peace Counts reports is very much in keeping with this form of peace education. Biographical learning, or learning from best practice models, has an important role to play in direct peace education, especially when working with young target groups. A critical exploration of role models who are "different" may prove fruitful: "Their conflict-rich life situations and the options for action that were available to them create productive learning opportunities for peace education," says theologian Hans Mendl in direct reference to the Peace Counts approach (2006, 198). The prerequisite is value-oriented model-based learning. For Mendl, model-based learning is successful if the attitudes, positions and behaviour patterns of a person who has been the subject of reflective and value-oriented learning can be expressed/integrated in the daily life of the (young) target groups. What is more, as Mendl sees it, an approach which uses others' life stories as a basis for reflection on one's own thinking and action necessarily creates scope for more differentiated consideration of negative role models.

Direct peace education teaches people that peace counts – on a micro and a macro level. In an impressive study conducted at Malmö School of Education, various dimensions of the linkage between the micro and macro levels were examined from a violence prevention, conflict management and peace education perspective (Carlsson 1999). Two key findings are: (1) If, based on their personal experience, people favour violence as a way of resolving conflicts, they will favour violent conflict resolution at the international level as well. (2) If people gain positive experience of non-violent conflict management, their feelings of powerlessness and lack of influence on conflicts in the international context diminish, and there is an increased willingness to opt for non-violent engagement for peace.

Opportunities and limits to staged encounter

Fortunately, the body of research about opportunities and limits to staged encounters has increased substantially in recent years. Some detailed studies provide information on how dialogue and encounter arrangements can be designed, taking peace education into account, and how their effectiveness can be assessed (e.g. Yablon 2012; Schell-Faucon 2001; Halabi/Philipps-Heck 2001; Schimpf-Herken/Jung 2002). Gavriel Salomon and his colleagues at the Center for Research on Peace Education have been intensively investigating the extent to which, in deeply entrenched conflict settings, changes in attitudes and perceptions of the conflict can be brought about through peace education-oriented encounter and dialogue seminars, with a view to promoting acceptance of the "other side". He concludes: "Peace education in this context must deal with collective narratives and deeply rooted historical memories and societal beliefs" (Kupermintz/Salomon 2005, 293).

Salomon and his team focus primarily on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the findings of their research are only partly encouraging. For example, the studies show that "carefully designed peace education programs [...] are likely to foster participants' ability to acknowledge the adversary's collective narrative, engage in constructive negotiations over issues of national identity, and express a less monolithic outlook of the conflict" (ibid.); on the other hand, the question of how deep-rooted the observed changes in attitudes are, and how stable they remain in the face of continuing or worsening violence, remains unanswered: "[I]t is hypothesized that peace education programs can affect more peripheral attitudes and beliefs which may not be as deep as one would want, but may be 'good enough' changes" (Salomon 2006, 13).

Case study 4: School for Peace[7]

The aim of the School for Peace, an educational institution in the village of Neve Shalom/Wahat al-Salam, is to convey the experience that the conflict between Israelis and Arabs is a conflict between two nations, not between individuals. It seeks to make participants in its seminars aware of their identity as group members and show that transforming the conflict does not only require sympathy between individuals from the different groups. "Understanding and sympathy alone don't solve conflicts between groups," says Nava Sonnenschein, founder of the School of Peace (cited in Wörtz 2009, no page number).

According to a report about the School's seminar concept: "The whole point of the School for Peace is for people to confront painful issues. The dynamics of the conflict must become visible; after the sessions no one needs to think that another participant is 'a pretty nice guy'. It often happens that the emotional split between the groups has deepened. 'And yet we achieve our aim,' says Sonnenschein. 'The participants become aware of the role they play in the conflict. From then on, they can no longer consider themselves as victims.'" (Wörtz 2009). In the short term, this approach tends to lead to resignation, but in the long term, it creates a greater willingness to embrace change. This involves moving away from settings which focus purely on individual encounters (Halabi/Sonnenschein 2001).

And the report continues: "This method used by the School for Peace [...] is considered a model for working out conflicts. Hostile groups from Cyprus, Kosovo and Northern Ireland have already spent time at the school, as well as Northern Italians and Sicilians, Europeans and Americans. A comparative study by the Guttman Centre of Applied Social Research concluded that the School for Peace offers the most effective model for Jewish-Arab contacts. Peace experts from Neve Shalom/Wahat al-Salam teach at the Universities of Tel Aviv, Haifa and Jerusalem, and explain at conferences across the world what makes their method so new and promising. Some 35,000 participants have passed through the School for Peace. Four hundred have attended the moderator course and are now working for peace projects in Israel and abroad." (Wörtz 2009[8]).

The reach of encounter arrangements in conflict and crisis regions, in terms of their political impacts, is a matter of dispute. One criticism is that the number of persons reached by these measures is too small and that they have very little effect in the social and political arena. Another criticism is that many measures taken place outside the state education system. "If negative stereotypes and hate are preached against other groups, intermittent peace projects [...] can achieve very little" (Paffenholz 2008, 10).

Against this background, it is extremely important to utilise encounter projects as a basis for more far-reaching structural initiatives.

---

7   http://sfpeace.org/
8   While the original report is in German, an English version can be found here: http://oasisofpeace.org/press/Learning_to_fight_
    for_peace_Ode_Magazine_June04.pdf.

3.2 Structural peace education

In recent years, there has been growing interest in peace education among international organisations and policy-makers, reflecting the fact that the issue of promoting peace processes through education has gained in significance overall. At the international level, the relevant UN organisations are increasingly highlighting the possible positive peace-promoting effects of education: "Education is not a marginal player in peacebuilding but a core component of building sustainable peace" (Novelli/Smith 2011, 7). And according to UNESCO's *Education for All Global Monitoring Report*: "Intra-state armed conflict is often associated with grievance and perceived injustices linked to identity, faith, ethnicity and region. Education can make a difference in all these areas, tipping the balance in favour of peace – or conflict" (UNESCO 2011, 16).

This reference to the Janus faces of education is backed by numerous studies (see Bush/Saltarelli 2000), which rightly highlight the need "to demystify the apparent peace-building power of education" (Seitz 2004, 49). The fact is that education can be deliberately misused to build enemy stereotypes, hate, excessive nationalism and militarised thinking. This problem is especially evident in the formal education sector: although schools all over the world are regarded as outstanding places for delivery of peace education, they are also hotbeds of personal, structural and cultural violence and not only worsen but also help to entrench and internalise (ethnic, religious and social) tensions, lines of conflict and discrimination over the long term (Davies 2004, 2005, 2013).

The challenge facing peace education, therefore, is to make education programmes and, indeed, education systems as a whole "conflict-sensitive". After many years of discussions, the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) has systematised the experience gathered to date and published various documents, including guidelines for the development and delivery of conflict-sensitive education programmes and policies. In this context, "conflict sensitive education" is defined as a process with three core elements (INEE 2013, 12):

1. Understanding the context in which education takes place
2. Analysing the two-way interaction between the context and education programmes and policies (development, planning and delivery)
3. Acting to minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts of education policies and programming on conflict, within an organisation's given priorities.

The transitions from direct to structural peace education are fluid and are located at the interface between encounter, capacity-building and joint action/implementation. The exchange of experience and training for key stakeholders in the conflict transformation process can culminate in a peace education pilot project that focuses on the joint development of learning modules and media on selected topics from the fields of conflict, violence, war and peace, as a basis for initial steps towards their delivery in schools or higher education institutions. One of the key lessons learned from peace education is that sustainable changes in the formal education sector originate in transparent pilot projects which are devised, trialled and evaluated by key stakeholders, i.e. responsible persons from all sectors of education, including teaching staff, and enable these stakeholders to gain positive experience. Many of the issues addressed in detail in the context of direct peace education (controversial topics; stereotypes; enemy images; taboo topics; collective historical narratives; participatory methods; development of concepts of peace and community) can lead to structural peace education, if the right conditions are in place and opportunities are utilised.

Textbooks and curricula

Education is affected by war in many places around the world. In more than 30 countries, including Afghanistan and Thailand, UNESCO has recorded systematic attacks on schools and other educational institutions. The physical and psychological impacts on the affected persons (children, teachers and

parents) are dramatic (UNESCO 2010a, 27). Nonetheless, the revision of curricula and textbooks that is demanded primarily in post-conflict societies has a role to play in this context too. For many years, the Georg Eckert Institute, as part of its international textbook research, has looked at how wars and conflicts in and between states impact on textbooks and how it is possible to prevent enemy stereotypes and resentment towards minorities or neighbouring countries from being passed on. For example, the Institute looks at how the conflict between India and Pakistan is reflected in textbooks, what is happening in textbook development in South-East Europe, and whether there is a discrepancy between the ambitious curricula and the actual teaching of history in post-apartheid South Africa. Initial results show that textbooks can contribute to reconciliation, understanding and mutual respect, but this is a long and difficult process. Political conditions can pose particular problems. For example, the wars in Yugoslavia have featured in textbooks in Bosnia and Herzegovina since 2012, but in practice, the authorities are still giving preferential treatment to specific publishers, placing obstacles in the way of rival products or alternative approaches (Georg-Eckert-Institut 2012, 38f). Synergies have yet to be created between this research and peace education.

Case study 5: Alternative textbook development (PRIME)

The Peace Research Institute in the Middle East (PRIME) has developed a very unusual textbook, entitled *Learning Each Other's Historical Narrative*. It describes Israeli and Palestinian history in the 20th century from the two conflict parties' different perspectives. The Israeli view of events is presented in one column, and the Palestinian view in the other. This makes it clear that there are different interpretations of the same facts. The book, published by PRIME, was written by six Israeli and six Palestinian history teachers in cooperation with academic experts. It was published in Hebrew and Arabic and is aimed at senior high-school students.

Another component of the project aimed to trial the textbook in schools and develop a curriculum on this basis.[9] The use of the book was banned by the Israeli and the Palestinian authorities in 2010. The Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research was involved in the project in an advisory capacity.[10]

Model projects

Schools, like universities and non-school education facilities, may also be suitable as learning spaces for pilot projects. The *Education for All Global Monitoring Report*, for example, proposes making schools non-violent places. The conclusion draw in this highly respected report, which is important in terms of stepping up efforts in the education sector, is clear: "One strategy is unequivocally good for education, for children and for peacebuilding: making schools non-violent places. Challenging the normalization of violence in society relies in part on the effective prohibition of corporal punishment." (UNESCO 2011, 23). This is a good example of what is needed in the interaction between direct and structural peace education: an initial understanding of why centuries-old practices (e.g. corporal punishment) have to be overcome and which steps are necessary in this regard can only be developed in manageable groups. Without this basic work and visible support from affected persons (families, communities and schools), and civil society as a whole, it is difficult to implement such measures in a formal sense and establish appropriate legal frameworks. It is useful, in this context, to remind ourselves of the German experience: the legal right to a non-violent education was established only after protracted social learning processes and resulted

---

9   http://vispo.com/PRIME/leohn.htm

10   www.gei.de/forschung/abteilung-konflikt/3-lernen-unter-konfliktbedingungen/schulbuchprojek-israel-palestina.html. In 2009, the book was translated into German by the Berghof Foundation in cooperation with PRIME and is available as a PDF document (http://image.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Other_Resources/PrimeTextbuch.pdf).

from favourable political circumstances at the start of the millennium (Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend 2003).

Individual (pilot) schools can take the first steps towards becoming non-violent places of learning. Here, it is about improving teacher training, but also the rights of students. It is about the recognition, establishment and acceptance of values such as respect and dignity, which are lost in wars and cultures of violence. And it is about practising shared rules for co-existence (Davies 2013, 5). In the international debate, too, there is a growing recognition that teacher training throughout the world must focus to a greater extent on how controversial issues are addressed in the classroom: "There is a desperate need across the world for training in teaching controversial issues" (Davies 2008, 55).

Case study 6: "Fostering a Civic and Nonviolent Education in Jordan"

The project "Fostering a Civic and Nonviolent Education in Jordan", launched in 2013, has the potential to become a model of best practice in linking direct and structural peace education. The pilot project was in preparation for several years, both thematically and organisationally, in order to establish a sustainable stakeholder network.

The potential for violence in every-day life in Jordan – in families, schools, universities and other sectors – is considerable. The country's current economic and social problems and tensions at home and abroad exacerbate the situation. From a peace education perspective, learning to deal constructively with diverse value systems and visions for the future is essential. Spaces are needed in which various conflict transformation methods can be discussed and trialled. As described above, schools can be groundbreaking places in which to accustom children and young people to these change processes while also establishing contact with parents and thus influencing families and the culture of conflict within the home. An appropriate culture in school enables valuable experience to be gained with participatory group processes, constructive conflict management, co-existence of different cultures and faiths, and participation and tolerance. However, socialisation, school and education cultures in Jordan tend to be dominated by exclusion and struggles over power and status, with children being judged according to their family background. There is also considerable potential for violence. Furthermore, teaching staff lack the requisite qualifications to manage potential conflict and violence.

In order, nonetheless, to achieve the defined objectives over the long term, well-qualified and committed stakeholders are needed who are willing and able to devise and try out context-specific learning methods and modules for universities and schools, based on peace education. In order to ensure that the experience gained is structurally relevant, entry points into formal education must be explored in order to assess their viability and utilise them at various phases in the implementation process. Although there are many who cling to the status quo, Jordan's education system and, indeed, society as a whole are engaged in a transition process, with increasingly vociferous calls for specific teacher training in civil non-violent education in order to prepare for emerging conflicts. A starting point is "civic education", which already exists as a subject in teacher training and in schools.

This is where the project comes in: after intensive preparations, a team of staff from various universities (Al Balqa' Applied University, University of Jordan, Princess Alia University College, Petra University Amman), non-governmental organisations, foundations, schools and the Theodor Schneller Educational Centre and the Berghof Foundation was formed. In a systematic process based on shared learning and inspiration, the team is developing a training strategy for advanced teacher education at universities and schools and a manual with multimedia components (posters, educational videos). The materials, which have gone through several phases of testing with multipliers, show what form non-violent education methods can take and how they can be put into practice. The officials from Jordan's Education Ministry who are involved in the project have indicated that forthcoming piloting in schools will be supported and selected materials will be made available to all schools.

According to the key stakeholders, their view of the extent to which there is scope to influence and transform situations of conflict and violence has changed for the better. In addition to the provision of spaces for the sharing of experience and training, the joint development and piloting of learning media and the prospect of implementation have made a key contribution here. It will take some time, however, before any firm conclusions can be drawn about the possible long-term effects of the learning processes and measures initiated.

4 Summary

The interaction between direct and structural peace education offers new prospects for sustainable peace education whose aim is to promote conflict transformation. Improving the structural conditions for a long-term conflict transformation culture can do much to enhance the development of learning spaces for peace.

Opportunities to trial and implement this approach exist in development cooperation, civil conflict management and related project settings. Experience has shown that several steps are typically involved in project implementation. The first step is to offer learning spaces for educationists who are interested in and have a commitment to peace education, so that stable groups can develop. Mutual inspiration, shared learning and project work create the basis for cooperation among individuals with different backgrounds (political, cultural, religious, ideological) and levels of experience (university, school, non-school education) so that training opportunities for third parties can be developed. Following on from this, pilot projects can be carried out, the aim being to develop learning media and curricula through a shared process and to trial materials and curricula in an appropriate setting. At the end of the pilot phase, the next step is to integrate them into the education system. This is supported by practical activities taking place in parallel.

Figure 2: Comprehensive peace education

Approach	Elements	Implementation phases
Direct Peace Education	Encounter Inspiration Training	1. Establishment of groups 2. Joint work in groups 3. Multiplication through training of trainers
Structural Peace Education	Pilot projects Learning modules and media Curricula	4. Joint project development 5. Development of pilots 6. Integration into the education system

A systematic analysis of the peace education approaches described above in conflict and crisis regions in the context of development cooperation and civil conflict management is still in its infancy, however. The current debate brings together stakeholders with various professional affiliations, interests and objectives. In Germany, they include the Civil Peace Service (CPS) organisations that operate in crisis regions. Peace experts deployed by the CPS are involved in peace education and therefore require appropriate training. Church-based non-governmental organisations (e.g. the Church Development Service – EED) and official development agencies (Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit – GIZ) have relevant expertise. GIZ has developed various country programmes that focus on the prevention of violence (GIZ 2011).

This discussion is welcomed by experts and practitioners in other countries and with different cultural backgrounds and can draw on local and regional expertise and experience (e.g. Huda 2010).

There is no shortage of open questions for discussion. For example, how can the long-term success of similar peace education programmes in diverse contexts and under different conditions be measured? In order to capture changes in schoolchildren's attitudes and behaviour, for example, surveys have to be conducted at the start of the project, and must be repeated many years later, in order to measure whether students' willingness to engage in society (or for peace) has increased and whether the atmosphere in schools has changed. At another level, it must be determined how long-term cooperation in the field of international peace education can be organised. Here too, pilot projects are likely to play an essential role. It is also important to ensure that the requisite resources are available for long-term evaluations.

Key priorities for the development of conflict-transforming peace education are:

≡ systematic analysis, from a theoretical and practical perspective, of the different definitions and interpretations of basic terms, and the ensuing options for action

≡ greater reflection on the role of peace education programmes in initiating, supporting and evaluating collective learning processes in various contexts, and ensuring the reliability of the findings

≡ identification of the factors determining success or failure in the interaction between direct and structural peace education, with discussion of their implications.

Against this background, it may be appropriate to consider the establishment of a new platform for the targeted sharing of experience, as a means of meeting the need for more intensive researcher-practitioner dialogue, mentioned at the start. This must draw on experience gained with peace education in Germany and in other countries and contexts. The exchange of experience across borders and the discussion and analysis of why projects have failed should be recognised as a fundamental element of peace education and a key component of a shared learning process.

5 Bibliography

Allen, Lydia, Chantal LaParl-Green, Mana Miyakawi, Nelson Monroe, Siri Siripanich & Brandon Thompson (eds.) 2009. Peace Education Programme Evaluation. Columbia: School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA). www.ineesite.org/uploads/documents/store/SIPA_PEP_Report_2009.pdf.

Austin, Beatrix, Martina Fischer & Hans Joachim Giessmann (eds.) 2011. Advancing Conflict Transformation. The Berghof Handbook II. Opladen/Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers. www.berghof-foundation.org/handbook.net.

Bar-Tal, Daniel, Yigal Rosen & Rafi Nets-Zehngut 2010. Peace Education in Societies Involved in Intractable Conflicts, in: Gavriel Salomon & Ed Cairns (eds.). Handbook on Peace Education. New York/London: Psychology Press, 21–43.

Bauer, Joachim 2012. Aggression und Friedenskompetenz aus Sicht der Hirnforschung, in: Pädagogik, 64, 11, 11–14.

Bauer, Joachim 2011. Schmerzgrenze. Vom Ursprung alltäglicher und globaler Gewalt. München: Blessing Verlag.

Berghof Foundation (ed.) 2012. Berghof Glossary on Conflict Transformation. 20 notions for theory and practice. Berlin. www.berghof-foundation.org/publications/category/glossary/.

Brantmeier, Edward J. 2013. Toward a Critical Peace Education for Sustainability, in: Journal of Peace Education, 10, 3, 242–258.

Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (Hg.) 2003. Aktionsleitfaden. Gewaltfreie Erziehung. Anregungen und Ideen für die praktische Arbeit. Berlin.

Bush, Kenneth D. & Diana Saltarelli 2000. The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict. Towards a Peacebuilding Education for Children. Florence: UNICEF, Innocenti Research Centre. http://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/insight4.pdf.

Carlsson, Karin Utas 1999. Violence Prevention and Conflict Resolution. A Study of Peace Education in Grades 4–6. Malmö: Department of Educational and Psychological Research, Malmö School of Education.

Carter, L. Randolph & Michael Shipler 2005. Youth: Protagonist for Peace, in: Paul van Tongeren, Malin Brenk, Marte Hellema & Juliette Verhoeven (eds.). People Building Peace II. Successful Stories of Civil Society. Boulder, CA/London: Lynne Rienner, 147–157.

Davies, Lynn 2013. Education, Change and Peacebuilding. FriEnt Essay 1/2013. Bonn: Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Frieden und Entwicklung. www.frient.de/nc/publikationen/dokumente/library/education-change-and-peacebuilding.html.

Davies, Lynn 2008. The Contribution of Formal Education Systems to Non-Violence in Contexts of Fragility, in: AGFP (Hg.). Friedenspädagogische Analysen zur Gewalt und aktuelle Handlungsansätze. Dokumentation der Tagung vom 18./19. November 2008 in München. München: Arbeitsgemeinschaft Friedenspädagogik e.V. (AGFP). www.agfp.de/projekte/friedenspaedagogische-fachtagung/doku.html.

Davies, Lynn 2005. Erziehung zum Krieg. Erziehung zum Frieden, in: Zeitschrift für Entwicklungspolitik, 1–2/2005, 24–28.

Davies, Lynn 2004. Education and Conflict. Complexity and Chaos. London/New York: Routledge.

Diakonisches Werk 2009. Konflikttransformation und Friedensarbeit: Orientierungsrahmen der Ökumenischen Diakonie. Stuttgart: Diakonisches Werk der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland.

Dupuy, Kendra 2008. Education for Peace. Building Peace and Transforming Armed Conflict Through Education Systems. Oslo: International Peace Research Institute (PRIO).

Faldalen, Ase Marie, Synove Faldalen, Vigdis R. Faldalen & Lars Thyholdt (eds.) 2011. Sabona. Searching for Good Solutions. Learning Solving Conflicts. Oslo: Kolofon Press.

Fitzduff, Mari & Isabella Jean 2011. Peace Education. State of the Field and Lessons Learned from USIP Grantmaking. Washington: United States Institut for Peace.

Fountain, Susan 1999. Peace Education in UNICEF. UNICEF Staff Working Papers, PD-ED-99/003. New York: UNICEF.

Frieters-Reermann, Norbert 2013. Eine permanente Aufgabe. Friedensbildung und Friedenspädagogik als zentraler Bestandteil ziviler Konfliktbearbeitung, in: Erwachsenenbildung. Vierteljahreszeitschrift für Theorie und Praxis, 4/2013, 163–166.

Frieters-Reermann, Norbert 2012. Friedenspädagogik, in: Georg Lang-Wojtasik & Ulrich Klemm (Hg.). Handlexikon Globales Lernen. Münster/Ulm: Klemm + Oelschläger, 65-68.

Frieters-Reermann, Norbert 2009. Frieden lernen. Friedens- und Konfliktpädagogik aus systemisch-konstruktivistischer Perspektive. Duisburg/Köln: WiKu-Verlag.

Galtung, Johan 1990. Cultural Violence, in: Journal of Peace Research, 27, 3, 291–305.

Georg-Eckert-Institut – Leibniz-Institut für internationale Schulbuchforschung 2012. Jahresbericht. Braunschweig.

GIZ (Hg.) 2011. Systemische Jugendgewaltprävention. Ein Leitfaden zur Planung und Umsetzung von maßgeschneiderten Maßnahmen der Jugendgewaltprävention. Eschborn: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit.

Grasse, Renate, Bettina Gruber & Günther Gugel (Hg.) 2008. Friedenspädagogik. Grundlagen, Praxisansätze, Perspektiven. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch-Verlag.

Gugel, Günther & Uli Jäger 2007. Frieden gemeinsam üben. Didaktische Materialien für Friedenserziehung und Globales Lernen in der Schule. Tübingen: Institut für Friedenspädagogik.

Halabi, Rabah & Ulla Philipps-Heck (Hg.) 2001. Identitäten im Dialog. Konfliktintervention in der Friedensschule von Neve Schalom/Wahat al-Salam in Israel. Schwalbach/Taunus: Wochenschau Verlag.

Halabi, Rabah & Nava Sonnenschein 2001. Wie wir an unsere Arbeit herangehen, in: Rabah Halabi & Ulla Philipps-Heck (Hg.). Identitäten im Dialog. Schwalbach/Taunus: Wochenschau Verlag, 52–64.

Harris, Jan M. (ed.) 2013. Peace Education from the Grassroots. Charlotte NC: Information Age Publishing.

Harris, Ian 2010. History of Peace Education, in: Gavriel Salomon & Ed Cairns (eds.). Handbook on Peace Education. New York: Psychology Press, 11–20.

Huda, Qamar-ul 2010. Peace Education in Muslim Societies and in Islamic Institutions, in: Die Friedens-Warte. Journal of International Peace and Organization, 35, 3, 69–83.

Hüther, Gerald 2011. Die Macht der inneren Bilder. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG.

Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) 2013. INEE Guidance Note on Conflict Sensitive Education. New York: INEE.

Jäger, Uli 2013a. Bundeswehr und Friedensbildung, in: Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, 44, 30–35.

Jäger, Uli 2013b. Zwischen Gewalterfahrung und Friedensstiftung. Aktuelle Herausforderungen der Friedenspädagogik und Bildung, in: Erwachsenenbildung. Vierteljahresschrift für Theorie und Praxis, 4/2013, 167–171.

Jäger, Uli, Nadine Ritzi & Anne Romund 2012. Peace Counts Learning Package. Berlin/Tübingen: Berghof Foundation.

Kemper, Yvonne 2005. Youth in War-to-Peace Transitions. Approaches of International Organizations. Berghof Report 10. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.

Kössler, Till & Alexander J. Schwitanski (Hg.) 2014. Frieden Lernen. Friedenserziehung und Gesellschaftsreform im 20. Jahrhundert. Essen: Klartext.

Kupermintz, Haggai & Gavriel Salomon 2005. Lessons to Be Learned from Research on Peace Education in the Context of Intractable Conflict, in: Theory into Practice, 44, 4, 293–302.

Kurtenbach, Sabine, Rüdiger Blumör & Sebastian Huhn (Hg.) 2010. Jugendliche in gewaltsamen Lebenswelten. Wege aus den Kreisläufen der Gewalt. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Lenhart, Volker, Alamara Karimi & Tobias Schäfer 2011. Feldevaluation friedensbauender Bildungsprojekte. Forschungsbericht 30. Osnabrück: Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung.

Lenhart, Volker, Alamara Karimi & Tobias Schäfer 2010. Peace Education Does Matter! Zwischenergebnisse eines Forschungsvorhabens zur Friedenspädagogik in Konfliktgebieten, in: Die Friedens-Warte. Journal of International Peace and Organization, 35, 3, 53–68.

Lenhart, Volker, Reinhard Mitschke & Simone Braun 2010. Friedensbauende Bildungsmaßnahmen bei bewaffneten Konflikten. Abschließender Forschungsbericht über das von der Deutschen Stiftung Friedensforschung (DSF) Februar 2006 bis April 2008 geförderte Vorhaben. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Lübbe, Anna 2013. Aufstellungsarbeit als systemischer und szenischer Bearbeitungsansatz im Kontext von Großgruppenkonflikten, in: Andreas Heinemann-Grüder & Isabella Bauer (Hg.). Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung. Vom Anspruch zur Wirklichkeit. Opladen: Barbara Budrich, 133–149.

Lum, Jeannie 2013. Peace Education: Past, Present, Future. In: Journal of Peace Education, 10, 2, 121–123.

Magill, Clare, Alan Smith & Brandon Hamber (eds.) 2008. The Role of Education in Reconciliation. The Perspectives of Children and Young People in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Northern Ireland. Coleraine: University of Ulster.

Maoz, Ifat 2010. Education for Peace through Planned Encounters between Jews and Arabs in Israel: A Reappraisal of Effectiveness, in: Gavriel Salomon & Edward Cairns (eds.). Handbook on Peace Education. New York: Psychology Press, 303–315.

McGlynn, Claire, Michalinos Zembylas, Zvi Bekerman & Tony Gallagher (eds.) 2009. Peace Education in Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies. New York: Macmillan.

Mendl, Hans 2006. Vorbilder, in: Werner Haussmann, Hansjörg Biener, Klaus Hock & Reinhold Mokrosch (Hg.). Handbuch Friedenserziehung. Interreligiös, interkulturell, interkonfessionell. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 198–204.

Miall, Hugh 2004. Conflict Transformation: A Multi-Dimensional Task, in: Alex Austin, Martina Fischer & Norbert Ropers (eds.). Transforming Ethnopolitical Conflict. The Berghof Handbook. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 67–89. www.berghof-foundation.org/handbook/.

Niermann, Anja 2012. Gewaltfrei in die Zukunft. Die friedenspädagogische Relevanz der Spiegelneuronen. Berlin/Münster: LIT Verlag.

Nipkow, Karl-Ernst 2007. Der schwere Weg zum Frieden. Geschichte und Theorie der Friedenspädagogik von Erasmus bis zur Gegenwart. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.

Novelli, Mario & Alan Smith (eds.) 2011. The Role of Education in Peacebuilding. A Synthesis Report of Findings from Lebanon, Nepal and Sierra Leone. New York: United Nations Children's Fund.

OECD (ed.) 2007. Breaking Cycles of Violence: Key Issues in Armed Violence Reduction. Paris: OECD. www.oecd.org/dac/incaf/48913388.pdf.

Paffenholz, Thania (ed.) 2010. Civil Society and Peacebuilding. A Critical Assessment. Boulder, CA: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Paffenholz, Thania (ed.) 2008. Zivilgesellschaft und Friedensförderung, in: FriEnt-Impulse, 4, 8-10.

Peace Research Institute in the Middle East (PRIME) (Hg.) 2010. Das Historische Narrativ des Anderen kennen lernen. Palästinenser und Israelis. Deutsche Übersetzung von der Berghof Foundation (Original März 2003) Berlin: PRIME/Berghof Foundation. http://image.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Other_Resources/PrimeTextbuch.pdf.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. & Linda R. Tropp 2008. How Does Intergroup Contact Reduce Prejudice? Meta-Analytic Tests of Three Mediators, in: European Journal of Social Psychology 38, 6, 922–934.

Prinzing, Marlis 2010. The Peace Counts Project: A Promotor of Real Change or Mere Idealism?, in: Richard L. Keeble, John Tulloch & Florian Zollmann (eds.). Peace Journalism, War and Conflict. New York: Peter Lang, 257–269.

Röhrs, Hermann 1983. Frieden. Eine pädagogische Aufgabe. Idee und Realität der Friedenspädagogik. Braunschweig: Agentur Pedersen.

Romund, Anne 2014. Frieden lernen und lehren mit Reportagen und Medien von Peace Courts. Berlin/Tübingen: Berghof Foundation.

Salomon, Gavriel 2006. Does Peace Education Really Make a Difference?, in: Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 12, 1, 37–48.

Salomon, Gavriel 2004. The Context of Peace Education, in: Institute for Peace Education/InWent (eds.). International Expert Meeting. Promote Peace Education around the World. Tübingen: Institut für Friedenspädagogik.

Salomon, Gavriel 2002. The Nature of Peace Education: Not All Programs Are Created Equal, in: Gavriel Salomon & Baruch Nevo (eds.). Peace Education. The Concepts, Principles, and Practices around the World. Mahwa, NJ/London: Taylor & Francis.

Salomon, Gavriel & Ed Cairns (eds.) 2010. Handbook on Peace Education. New York: Psychology Press.

Sander, Wolfgang 2005. Friedenserziehung, in: Ders. (Hg.). Handbuch politische Bildung. Schwalbach/Ts.: Wochenschau Verlag, 442–455.

Save the Children (ed.) 2008. Where Peace Begins. Education's Role in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding. London: International Save the Children Alliance. www.savethechildren. org.uk/resources/online-library/where-peace-begins.

Schell-Faucon, Stephanie 2001. Erinnerungs- und Versöhnungsarbeit in ethnopolitischen Spannungsgebieten: das Beispiel Südafrika. Implikationen für die Bildungsarbeit. Frankfurt am Main: IKO – Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation.

Schell-Faucon, Stephanie & Monika Kelemen 2008. Bildung in Krisenregionen. Erwägungen aus der Perspektive der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, in: AGFP (Hg.). Friedenspädagogische Analysen zur Gewalt und aktuelle Handlungsansätze. Dokumentation der Tagung vom 18./19. November 2008 in München. München: Arbeitsgemeinschaft Friedenspädagogik e.V., 36–45.

Schimpf-Herken, Ilse & Ingrid Jung 2002. Das Fremde als Chance. Wie entstehen Lernprozesse? Erfahrungen in der Bildungsarbeit mit chilenischen und deutschen LehrerInnen. Frankfurt am Main/ London: IKO – Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation.

Schwartz, Stefanie 2010. Youth and Post-Conflict Reconstruction: Agents of Change. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Seitz, Klaus 2004. Bildung und Konflikt. Die Rolle von Bildung bei der Entstehung, Prävention und Bewältigung gesellschaftlicher Krisen – Konsequenzen für die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. Eschborn: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit. http://www2.gtz.de/ dokumente/bib/04-5980.pdf.

Senghaas, Dieter 2006. On Perpetual Peace. A Timely Assessment. New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Senghaas, Dieter 2004. Zum irdischen Frieden. Erkenntnisse und Vermutungen. Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp.

Senghaas, Dieter 2004. The Civilisation of Conflict. Constructive Pacifism as a Guiding Notion for Conflict Transformation, in: Alex Austin, Martina Fischer & Norbert Ropers (eds.). Transforming Ethnopolitical Conflict. The Berghof Handbook. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 25–39. www.berghof-foundation.org/ handbook/.

Serto, Leban 2013. Peace Education from the Grassroots in Northeast India, in: Jan M. Harris (ed.). Peace Education from the Grassroots. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 213–231.

Sinclair, Margaret 2001. Education in Emergencies, in: Jeff Crisp, Christopher Talbot & Daiana Cipollone (eds.). Learning for a Future: Refugee Education in Developing Countries. Geneva: UNHCR, 1–83.

Smith, Alan 2011. Education and Peacebuilding: From 'Conflict-Analysis' to 'Conflict Transformation'?. FriEnt Essay 4/2011. Bonn: Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Frieden und Entwicklung. http://eprints.ulster. ac.uk/19794/1/FriEnt_Essay_series_ Smith%5B1%5D.pdf.

UNESCO 2011. The Hidden Crisis: Armed Conflict and Education. EFA Global Monitoring Report 2011. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/ images/0019/001907/190743e.pdf.

UNESCO 2010a. Education under Attack. A Global Study on Targeted Political and Military Violence Against Eduction Staff, Students, Teachers, Union and Government Officials, Aid Workers and Institutions. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

UNESCO 2010b. Protecting Education from Attack. A State-of-the-Art Review. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Wintersteiner, Werner 2013. Building a Global Community for a Culture of Peace: The Hague Appeal for Peace Global Campaign for Peace Education (1999–2006), in: Journal of Peace Education, 10, 3, 138–156.

Wintersteiner, Werner 2011. Von der „internationalen Verständigung" zur „Erziehung für eine Kultur des Friedens". Etappen und Diskurse der Friedenspädagogik seit 1945, in: Peter Schlotter & Simone Wisotzki (Hg.). Friedens- und Konfliktforschung. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 345–381.

Winterseiner, Werner 2010. Friedenspädagogik als transformative Bildung, in: Die Friedens-Warte. Journal of International Peace and Organization, 35, 3, 11–27.

Wörtz, Tilman 2009. Ein Lernort für den Frieden. www.peace-counts.org/lernort_fuer_frieden/.

Wulf, Christoph 2007. Zukunftsfähige Bildung, Frieden, kulturelle Vielfalt und Nachhaltigkeit, in: Zeitschrift für Internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik, 30, 2, 2-6.

Yablon, Yaacov B. 2012. Are We Preaching to the Converted? The Role of Motivation in Understanding the Contribution of Intergroup Encounters, in: Journal of Peace Education, 9, 3, 249–263.

Zembylas, Michalinos 2007. The Politics of Trauma: Empathy, Reconciliation and Peace Education, in: Journal of Peace Education, 4, 2, 207–224.

[All links last accessed on 22 May 2014.]