Review of Educational Research

Peace Education in Societies Involved in Intractable Conflicts: Direct and Indirect Models

Daniel Bar-Tal and Yigal Rosen

The online version of this article can be found at:
http://rer.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/79/2/557

Published on behalf of

American Educational Research Association

http://www.aera.net

By

⑤SAGE

http://www.sagepublications.com

Additional services and information for *Review of Educational Research* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://rer.aera.net/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://rer.aera.net/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.aera.net/reprints

Permissions: http://www.aera.net/permissions

Peace Education in Societies Involved in Intractable Conflicts: Direct and Indirect Models

Daniel Bar-Tal
Tel Aviv University
Yigal Rosen
Harvard University

The present article deals with the crucial question: Can peace education facilitate change in the sociopsychological infrastructure that feeds continued intractable conflict and then how the change can be carried? Intractable conflicts still rage in various parts of the globe, and they not only cause local misery and suffering but also threaten the well-being of the international community at large. The present article examines the nature of peace education in societies that were, or are still, involved in intractable conflict. It presents the political–societal and educational conditions for successful implementation of peace education and describes two models for peace education: direct and indirect peace education. Finally, the article offers a number of conclusions.

Intractable conflicts (raging in Sri Lanka, Chechnya, and the Middle East) are usually characterized as lasting at least 25 years and as being fought over goals that are perceived as existential; they are violent, perceived as unsolvable, of a zero-sum nature, and preoccupying society members greatly; and the parties involved invest much in their continuation (see Bar-Tal, 1998, 2007a; Kriesberg, 1998b). One main reason for the existence and maintenance of this type of conflict is an evolved *culture of conflict* that is dominated by societal beliefs of collective memory and ethos of conflict and by emotions of collective emotional orientations (Bar-Tal, 2007a, 2007b). It functions as a major obstacle to any peace process. Thus, a collective memory of conflict represents the "history" of the conflict as remembered by society members (Cairns & Roe, 2003). The ethos of conflict constitutes a dominant orientation to the society involved in the conflict that gives meaning to its societal life now and directs its goals for the future (Bar-Tal, 2000). These narratives are selective, biased, and distorted as their major function is to satisfy the societal needs in conflict rather than provide objective account of the reality. They therefore justify

557

the position of the society in conflict and portray it in an exclusively positive light and as the sole victim of the conflict while delegitimizing the opponent.

The younger generation is exposed to this culture through family, through the societal channels of communication, including the mass media, and through other cultural agencies and products. An especially formative role is taken by the educational system, which serves as the major agent for socialization for conflict through school textbooks, instructional materials, teachers' instructions, school ceremonies, and so on. This form of socialization is so powerful because it reaches all of the younger generation in any society in which education is compulsory. Eventually, the acquisition of and participation in the culture of conflict are important indicators for membership in and identification with a society dominated by an ethos of conflict. By adulthood the majority of members share the same beliefs, attitudes, values, and emotions. As a result they will tend to have similar perceptions of reality and endorse, or indeed take, similar courses of action. Such a culture, however, the more solidly it is installed, acts as a major obstacle to any peace process as it inhibits and suppresses ideas that promote peaceful resolutions.

Still, some society members or groups may embark on the road of peace and try to move their society to this road. Their first challenge is to overcome the obstacles to peace, trying to change the dominant repertoire of culture of conflict (Bar-Tal & Halperin, in press). In essence, this is the beginning of the process of reconciliation. Reconciliation in regions of intractable conflict goes beyond the agenda of formal conflict resolution to changing the motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions that prevail among the great majority of the society—regarding the conflict, the nature of the relationship between the parties, and the nature of the parties themselves (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004; Kelman, 1999, 2004; Lederach, 1997; Staub, 2006). Reconciliation consists of mutual recognition and acceptance, investing in the development of peaceful relations, mutual trust, and positive attitudes, and fostering sensitivity and consideration of the other party's needs and interests.

As the process of reconciliation proceeds, there is wide agreement that a successful outcome requires a formation of a new common outlook of the past in which both parties not just get to know it but truly acknowledge what happened in the past (Gardner Feldman, 1999; Hayner, 1999; Lederach, 1998; Norval, 1998). Often, however, preoccupation with the past requires more than that because during the conflict both parties accumulate many grievances toward the other side. Years of violence leave deep scars of anger, grief, sense of victimhood, will of revenge, and so on. Thus, some researchers have gone a step further by asserting that collective acknowledgement of the past is not enough to promote a process of reconciliation. Instead, they argue, the process of reconciliation should ultimately lead to collective forgiveness and healing for the adversary's misdeeds (Arthur, 1999; Hayner, 1999; Lederach, 1998; Shiver, 1995; Staub, 2000). The element of forgiveness as an outcome of reconciliation is of special importance in cases when one or both parties in conflict are attributed with responsibility for the outbreak and/or maintenance of the conflict and/or misdeeds and atrocities performed during the conflict (see Auerbach, 2004). Forgiveness requires a decision to learn new aspects about own group, to open a new perspective on the rival group, and to develop a vision of the future that allows new positive relations with the perpetrator (see Noor, Brown, & Glasford, in press). It symbolizes psychological departing from the past to new peaceful relations (Lederach, 1998; Norval, 1999).

558

In essence, thus, reconciliation requires the setting of new societal goals of peace, the construction of an image of the rival as a human being with equal rights, the active reformation of the collective memory, and the fostering of positive affects and emotions about peaceful relations with the past opponent (Bar-Tal, in press-b). This is a profound challenge in view of the prolonged domination of a culture of conflict. It requires mass mobilization and support along with sophisticated policy, planning, and initiatives and a wide variety of other activities—all to convince the society members of the necessity, utility, value, and feasibility of the peace process (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004; Bloomfield, Barnes, & Huyse, 2003).

A prominent and efficient method for promoting reconciliation is peace education (Aall, Helsing, & Tidwell, 2007; Abu-Nimer, 2004; Kriesberg, 1998a). Peace education has many faces depending on the needs and objectives of the societies that engage in it (Bar-Tal, 2002; Harris, 1999; Salomon, 2002). When societies are involved in intractable conflict, the objective of peace education should be to advance and facilitate peace making and reconciliation. It aims to construct society members' (including students) worldview (i.e., their values, beliefs, attitudes, emotions, motivations, skills, and patterns of behavior) in a way that facilitates conflict resolution and peace process and prepares them to live in an era of peace and reconciliation (also see Abu-Nimer, 2004; Fountain, 1999; Iram, 2006; Salomon, 2004).

This is usually a process of societal change because peace education is launched when society members hold ideas that fuel the conflict and contradict the principles of peace making. Thus, there is a need to educate the society members, and we suggest differentiating between two approaches to peace education: a narrow approach that focuses on socialization for peace carried in schools and a broad approach that is concerned with socialization and persuasion of society members to support the peace process and function in it. The present article limits itself to the second type of peace education, focusing on the construction of a new repertoire for students in schools. But before doing this, we say a few sentences about the societal approach to peace education, which assumes that peace making requires major change in the repertoire of the whole society. Schools can play an important role in bringing about such change, but they constitute only one agent, and a major societal change requires the participation of political, societal, and cultural institutions, mass communication, leadership, and elites. This line of peace education can take place through various methods and techniques with thorough planning as well as via spontaneous acts. We provide a few illustrations. For example, the mass media can be a very powerful tool for providing peace education to the masses. They can be used to transmit information to a wide public about the new peaceful goals, the past rival group, one's own group, the developing relations, and so on (Bruck & Roach, 1993; Calleja, 1994; Elhance & Ahmar, 1995; Norval, 1999). In addition, communal interventions that empower the community members by relying on local cultural understandings and practices can advance peace making and reconciliation (Staub, Pearlman, Gubin, & Hagengimana, 2005; Wessells, in press). Also nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) either from the societies involved in conflict or from the international community may contribute to the peace making (e.g., Aall, 1996; Chetkow-Yanoov, 1986). They can help spread the message about the importance of constructing peaceful relations, help establish cooperative and friendly relations with the past adversary, and provide economic assistance to the society members and thereby show that peaceful relations have important benefits. They can serve as

559

peace movements, which actively support the process of peace making. The Peace People Movement in Northern Ireland organized by the Protestant Betty Williams and the Catholic Mairead Corrigan and the Peace Now Movement in Israel are examples of NGOs' functions (Beeman & Mahony, 1993). Finally, as the last illustration, truth and reconciliation commissions may be very helpful in the healing process. Their purpose is to reveal the truth about the past to the people and to serve as a mechanism of perpetuating justice. These commissions are of special importance in light of the fact that in most cases individual compensation is not possible. They expose acts of violence, violation of human and civil rights, discrimination, and other misdeeds perpetrated by the formal institutions of the state or by groups and individuals (Asmal, Asmal, & Roberts, 1997; Kaye, 1997; Liebenberg & Zegeye, 1998). In recent years, variants of such commissions have been established in South Africa, Chile, Argentina, El Salvador, Honduras, Uruguay, and Rwanda. Among them, the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission has received the most attention (Asmal et al., 1997; Liebenberg & Zegeye, 1998; Norval, 1998).

The school approach focuses on peace education within the school system. It views the school system as a major agent of socialization (Dreeben, 1968; Himmelweit & Swift, 1969). It recognizes the limitations of persuading the whole society of the importance of peace-making ideas and therefore focuses on one agent, assuming that it has the greatest power of influence. This assumption is based on a few reasons. First, education in schools is sure to reach a whole segment of a society (i.e., the young generation) because schools are compulsory and all children and adolescents are required to attend them. Second, schools are often the only social institution that can formally, intentionally, and extensively achieve the mission of peace education as they have the authority, the legitimacy, the resources, the methods, and the conditions to carry it out. Third, schooling takes place during children's formative years, and the young generation, which still is in the process of acquiring a psychological repertoire, is least affected by the dominating ethos and is more open to new ideas and information. Finally, the young generation is required to learn the messages and information transmitted in schools and often treats them as truthful, and, therefore, it is possible to ensure that students at least will be exposed to them.

Peace Education in Schools

To achieve the objectives of peace education, a school system must go through major changes. It requires setting new educational objectives, preparing new curricula, writing school textbooks, developing instructional material, training teachers, creating a school climate that is conducive to peace education, and so on. Peace education, if successful, socializes young generations in such a way that it facilitates the process of reconciliation and eventually the construction of a culture. But the success of peace education depends on a number of conditions in the political–societal sphere as well as in the educational sphere (see Bar-Tal & Rosen, in press).

Conditions for Successful Peace Education

The first set of political–societal conditions refers to intergroup as well as intragroup processes that come to legitimize peace education and draw support for its inclusion in school schedules. The second set of educational conditions refers to the concrete administrative and educational requirements for making peace education

560

come off the ground. If these conditions remain unfulfilled, peace education will face major difficulties and likely will be condemned to failure. In this article, we first elaborate on the political–societal conditions and then proceed to specify educational conditions.

Political–Societal Conditions

We propose the following four political–societal conditions for successful peace education in societies involved in intractable conflict (also see Danesh, 2006; Rippon & Willow, 2004).

Progress toward peace. Peace education, with its direct goals to establish peace with the rival, can evolve when there is at least well-publicized, palpable movement toward conflict resolution that includes negotiation with the rival. This greatly facilitates launching peace education and legitimizes its institutionalization in schools (Iram, 2006).

Support for peace process. Peace education requires substantial support among society members for conducting a peace process with the past rival. A majority, at least, have to support the peace process, including major political parties and organizations and a majority of the civil society. This support is essential because it legitimizes peace education (e.g., Obura, 2003; Smith & Neill, 2006). Children and adolescents bring to schools views of their parents and community, and when a majority of society members do not support the peace process peace education is met with distrust and hostility. Legitimization depends much on the strength and type of activity of groups that oppose the peace process.

Ripeness for reconciliation. An additional condition concerns society's readiness to hear the message of peace education. This is not the same as support for the peace process. Society members may be ready for the peace process but not yet ripe for changing their conflict-related repertoire, which includes collective memory and an ethos of conflict (Nets-Zehngut & Bar-Tal, 2007). The message of peace education runs counter to the longstanding dominant message. This relates to the openness of the society to alternative messages and the tolerance to hear them. Without this ripeness for reconciliation, peace education will be hard to successfully implement.

Governmental and political support. Peace education can succeed when peace education as a policy is formally supported by leaders (e.g., prime minister or president) because they see it as a very important part of their peace-oriented policy. This support puts peace education right at the front of societal objectives. It communicates to the public a high governmental commitment to and priority for peace. The declared support for peace education by leaders indicates the policy of peace education is a strategic choice supported by the whole administration, which sees it as national goal.

In sum, the above-described political–societal conditions create the social climate necessary for the implementation of peace education. But these conditions should not be viewed as sufficient because they do not refer to the actual

561

implementation of peace education in the educational system. The assumption underlying the following section is that several educational conditions are, in addition, required for successful institutionalization of peace education in schools.

Educational Conditions

Ministerial support. The first educational condition refers to support from the highest educational authority, often the minister of education. It renders the mission legitimate and creates a climate in the educational system that is conducive to the institutionalization of peace education (Clarke-Habibi, 2005; Danesh, 2006). It also rallies the support of the leaders of the educational system and provides teachers with legitimization and an incentive.

Well-defined peace education policy. The second condition concerns formulation of a well-defined and decisive policy, which includes detailed planning on how to carry out peace education. The objectives and contents of peace education imply major changes in the educational system that, as a major societal institution, was hitherto mobilized for the missions of intractable conflict (e.g., Gallagher, 1998). Thus, with regard to the policy, there is a need for short-term and long-term programs. The short-term programs should be seen as emergency programs that can satisfy the immediate needs of the changing situation until the long-term programs are ready and can be implemented. The long-term programs are supposed to construct the new culture of peace in which an ethos of peace plays a prominent role (Bar-Tal, in press-a; Rosen, 2007). To carry this goal, there is a need in long-term educational policy that is reflected in new curricula and new school textbooks, in the development of new programs, and in the development of new training curricula for teachers, school principles, and school staff.

Peace education authority. The ministry of education needs to have the authority as well as the infrastructure and resources to implement peace education (Amamio, 2004). An organizational framework, lasting efforts, and continuous devotion are all required. The implementation is also related to the availability of experts and professionals who can realize the institutionalization of peace education in schools. In addition, implementation requires continuous evaluation to find out what kinds of programs are efficient (e.g., Kupermintz & Salomon, 2005).

Given the above-stipulated conditions, the question presents itself of what should be done when such conditions do not exist. Should a society leave peace education and wait until the proper conditions have evolved? Our response to this question is unequivocal: Societies involved in intractable conflict should not wait until all the conditions for the development of peace education are manifest. We do not intend to discourage societies from launching peace education but want to point out the challenges they may meet. Political–societal conditions have an immense effect on peace education: They determine what kind of peace education can be launched. The educational conditions are in fact the basic requirements for implementing and instituting any kind of new policy that includes administrative and organizational practices. But they are not related to the political climate, only to organizational priorities and efficiency.

562

Indirect and Direct Models of Peace Education

To deal with the presented conditions, in the present section we describe two models of peace education that represent its two extreme types. We describe two models for peace education. The dimension that differentiates the two models concerns the political–societal conditions that serve as a background to the development of peace education. On one side of the dimension are political–societal conditions that are unfavorable to the development of peace education and do not allow direct reference to the intractable conflict in which the society in question is involved. These conditions limit the scope of themes that can be dealt with within the framework of peace education. But even under these conditions there is a place for the development of what we term *indirect peace education.*

Indirect peace education does not directly address the conflict (i.e., its goals, its historical course, its costs, or the image of the rival). Instead, it concerns itself either with very general themes relevant to peace making—avoiding direct clashes with the culture of conflict, especially the ethos of conflict—or with an array of themes and skills that do not refer to the ongoing conflict at all. This type of peace education may focus on a choice of themes such as identity, ecological security, violence, empathy, human rights, and conflict resolution skills.

At the other end of the dimension are political–societal conditions that are favorable to the development of peace education and allow direct reference to all the issues and themes that concern the societies involved in intractable conflict. Under these conditions it is possible to develop *direct peace education.* This type of peace education refers *to all the themes of the intractable conflict that contributed to the development and maintenance of the culture of conflict and served as barriers to its peaceful resolution.* Moreover, direct peace education directly presents themes that allow the construction of a new ethos of peace from which a culture of peace will evolve, which will also include a new collective memory reflecting the new emerging culture (Bar-Tal, in press-b). We do not suggest that the two models are always exclusive. Our basic claim is that under very unfavorable conditions for launching direct peace education, educators should still not give up and feel helpless because they can introduce the indirect type. All combinations of the two models are possible, depending on the conditions.

The two models outline possible themes of peace education, but they are not exhaustive. However, between them, they suggest an approach to various conditions that limit or favor the development of peace education. Because conflict situations differ and are not static, educators can select various combinations that fit the particular and current conditions of the conflict they are addressing as well as the context, culture, and structure of the society. Below we first describe the indirect model of education.

Indirect Model of Peace Education

As pointed out, the indirect model of education is suitable when conditions do not favor direct reference to the ethos of conflict that maintains the intractable conflict. Usually this is the case when conflict continues, violent acts are occurring, and a majority of society supports continuation of the conflict and holds a sociopsychological repertoire of ethos of conflict. In such cases, social institutions such as the ministry of education, together with large and significant segments of

563

society, object to direct peace education. In these cases there is a need to establish a new repertoire for students that is conducive to peace making but at the same time does not negate too directly the ethos of conflict and the collective memory of conflict. This type of education does not aim to bring deep change in the short run. But themes of indirect peace education may in the long run have a positive influence—on the young generation to begin with, and thus, eventually, it may strengthen peace making and reconciliation. Students may transfer studied themes to the conflict situation, and this may come to serve as a base from which it will be easier to engage in direct peace education. Peace education, even in its indirect form, may therefore open a window of hope for future conflict resolution and reconciliation.

A number of major themes lend themselves especially to this type of education. We focus on five of them that, we believe, help establish an infrastructure for the peace process. What they allow is an indirect movement toward a change in the held repertoire that supports conflict. Instead, a process of reconsideration is facilitated, eventually leading to the construction of new skills, beliefs, attitudes, emotions, and values that support peace making. We suggest the themes of *reflective thinking, tolerance, ethno-empathy, human rights,* and *conflict resolution.* All these encourage openness, criticism, and skepticism, exposure to and consideration of alternative ideas, sensitivity to human rights, empathy toward other groups, and knowledge and skills concerning conflict resolution. It should be noted that all these themes greatly contribute to the consolidation of democracy and humanism and should thus be part of every educational system that cherishes these values. However, we do realize that other educators of peace education may suggest other themes and consider them as equally important. Each of the themes within the conceptual model for indirect peace education is now described.

Reflective thinking. John Dewey (1933, 1938) provided one of the earliest expositions of reflective thinking. According to him, reflective thinking denotes questioning held beliefs including dominant assumptions and raising doubts and skepticism about the presently dominant understanding of an issue. To this type of thinking, open-mindedness is a prerequisite: Open-mindedness is a "freedom from prejudice, partisanship, and other such habits as close the mind and make it unwilling to consider new problems and entertain new ideas" (Dewey, 1933, p. 30).

This view prevailed through the years, and *reflective thinking* refers to the ability to not take any knowledge for granted but to consider and reconsider various alternatives to reach valid inferences, decision, or evaluations. Kruglanski (1989) conceptualized this skill as the *epistemic motivation of fear for invalidity,* which leads to desires to examine information, to be skeptical, and to openly search for alternative information to have valid knowledge. Moreover, reflective thinking facilitates learning and enables deeper understanding of the relationships and connections between ideas and/or experiences (Rodgers, 2002). Reflective ability increases awareness of the complexity of situations and enhances the ability to judge challenges in their complexity (Marsick, Sauquet, & Yorks, 2006; Marsick, & Watkins, 1990). In addition, reflection leads to the exploration of alternative information that might otherwise be ignored (Coleman, 2006). This type of thinking can be encouraged at the collective level in situations of conflict. Students can learn to critically evaluate and judge the nature and the course of the intractable conflict in which their society is engaged.

564

Tolerance. Tolerance refers to the recognition and acceptance of the right of all individuals as well as groups to have thoughts, opinions, attitudes, wills, and behavior (Agius & Ambrosewicz, 2003). Tolerance is related to a person's—or a group's—readiness to bear, to allow, and even to hear opinions (thoughts or attitudes) that contradict his or her own. Intolerant individuals are fundamentally uninterested except as the other's behavior confirms their own assumptions and prejudgments (Ignatieff, 2000). To become more tolerant means to reject negative stereotypes and prejudice, to learn about others' contributions to the world, to actively challenge bias, and to engage in thoughtful dialogue about controversial issues (Bullard, 1996; Vogt, 1997).

Perceived threat from an out-group, as well as anger and fear, lead people to become more intolerant toward those whose beliefs differ from their own (for reviews, see Gibson & Bingham, 1982; Skitka, Bauman, & Mullen, 2004). Therefore, a crucial component for developing tolerance is decreasing the perceived threat, anger, and fear of the other individual or group. As intolerance also is derived from the belief that one's own group, belief system, or way of life is superior to that of others, tolerance should challenge these societal beliefs. Tolerance is promoted by knowledge, communication, and freedom of thought (UNESCO, 1995).

Education for tolerance thus may engender and facilitate public debate about peaceful resolution in societies involved in intractable conflict. It offers the opportunity to consider views that contradict the dominant societal beliefs of ethos of conflict and encourage the development of alternative views about the conflict.

Ethno-empathy. Ethno-empathy is the ability of a person or a group to experience what the other ethnic group feels and thinks. According to Eisenberg (2000), empathy is an affective response that stems from the apprehension or comprehension of another's emotional state or condition and is similar to what the other is feeling or could be expected to feel. Hoffman (2000) postulates that empathy involves two interacting components: (a) *cognitive empathy* entails cognitive awareness of another person's thoughts, feelings, perceptions, and intentions and (b) *affective empathy* is the vicarious affective response to another person, meaning the ability to vicariously experience what the other feels.

One of the most promising routes for promoting empathy is fostering the development of perspective taking, which means putting oneself in the other's place and seeing the world through the other's eyes, feeling the other's emotions, and behaving as the other would behave in a particular situation (e.g., Deutsch, 2000; Hoffman, 2000; Selman, 1980). Moreover, empathy enables the ability to see members of other groups as human individuals who can be trusted and have legitimate needs and goals and with whom one would want to maintain peaceful relations (Halpern & Weinstein, 2004). Thus, ethno-empathy may direct attention to the needs and suffering of the opponent and change delegitimizing practices. Selman (2003) provides impressive evidence of how schools can develop social awareness toward "other group" members. This learning illuminates the meaning of the conflict and promotes understanding and cooperation among different ethnic groups.

Human rights. Human rights may be defined as "those rights which are inherent in our nature and without which we cannot live as human beings" (United Nations, 2003, p. 3). Human rights, generally, concern the dignity of the person—this

565

includes civil, political, social, economic, cultural, environmental, and developmental rights (e.g., United Nations, 1966a, 1966b). The main goal of education for human rights is strengthening the young generation's respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. In general, this line of education requires the development of appropriate knowledge, skills, and values (e.g., Andreopoulus & Claude, 1997; Davis, 2000; Flowers, Bernbaum, Rudelius-Palmer, & Tolman, 2000; Tibbits, 2005; United Nations, 2003). Human rights education presents the different types of human rights (e.g., cultural rights), explains their importance and relevance of those rights in a daily lives (including conflict situations), and attempts to persuade the students to behave according to them (Flowers et al., 2000).

Human rights education in regions of intractable conflict, even though it will have to be a form of indirect peace education, can promote more humane attitudes and a general awareness of the necessity to observe and respect the basic human rights of the opponent in the conflict. In addition, the perceived images of the rival may change as a result of promoting a better understanding of human rights and their importance (Mertus & Helsing, 2006). Increasing the ability to analyze situations in terms of human rights can also deepen awareness of both sides' abuses of those rights, of the costs for the societies caught up in the conflict, and of their respective contributions to the continuation of the conflict. Furthermore, becoming informed about human rights supposedly develops a sense of responsibility for defending the rights of other people, and this of course includes the rival.

Conflict resolution. Conflict resolution skills are abilities to negotiate, mediate, and collaboratively solve problems in the context of conflict situations. In essence, they provide the ability to resolve the conflict peacefully. The goal of learning conflict resolution is to develop the following main abilities and skills (e.g., Bodine & Crawford, 1998; Deutsch, 1993; Jones, 2004; Raider, Coleman, & Gerson, 2000): (a) understanding that conflict is a natural and necessary part of life; (b) becoming a better conflict manager, that is, knowing which type of peaceful conflict resolution method is best suited for a particular conflict problem; (c) becoming aware of how critical it is to understand the perspective of the other side and carry a constructive conflict resolution process; (d) effectively distinguishing positions from needs or interests; (e) expressing emotions in nonaggressive, noninflammatory ways; (f) reframing a conflict as a mutual problem that needs to be resolved collaboratively with compromises via negotiation and/or with the help of a third party; and (g) brainstorming to create, elaborate, and enhance a variety of peaceful solutions.

Conflict resolution skills can be seen as one of the central components of peace education (e.g., Johnson & Johnson, 2005). The main concept of conflict resolution education is to promote an understanding of conflict and to assist individuals in developing a nonviolent constructive approach to conflict resolution (Raider, 1995). According to Deutsch (2005), the key concept of conflict resolution education is "to instill the attitudes, knowledge, and skills which are conducive to effective, cooperative problem solving and to discourage the attitudes and habitual responses which give rise to win–lose struggles" (p. 18). Changing students' perspectives on different types of conflicts from a win–lose struggle to a mutual problem that can be resolved only collaboratively is an important component of peace education. It is assumed that this acquired perspective regarding conflict resolution

566

will be transferred to the particular intractable conflict in which the society is involved (Van Slyck, Stern, & Elbedour, 1999). It will tune students to the need to resolve the conflict peacefully via negotiation.

In sum, all of the five dispositions proposed above are essential to peace education in regions of intractable conflict. Each of them has a unique quality and potential contribution to the student outlook required for fostering the cognitive, attitudinal, emotional, and behavioral changes in societies engaged in intractable conflict. It is our hope that these skills and knowledge (including reflective and critical thinking about the intractable conflict and especially about peaceful conflict resolution) when fostered among the young generation will allow a new perception of and attitude toward the opponent and the expression of these new views, openly, in society.

Direct Model of Peace Education

Direct peace education, as already mentioned, can be launched when the societal and political conditions are ripe and the educational system is ready, both administratively and pedagogically, for this major endeavor. *Direct peace education directly refers to themes of conflict and tries to change societal beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviors related to culture of conflict.* An example of direct peace education is the Education for Peace project carried out in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the past decade, which attempted to transform the lives of the students, teachers, and the whole community by directly confronting participants with the issues that were at the heart of the conflict (Clarke-Habibi, 2005).

We selected as an example five themes that serve as illustrations to possible themes of direct peace education. But we stress that the above-noted themes of indirect peace education do not clash with the themes of direct peace education and should be used to complement them and strengthen them.

Conflict and peace. Here the aim should be to demonstrate in a concrete and detailed manner the essence of the conflict, the reasons for its occurrence, the different categories of conflict (especially the violent ones), their results (including genocide), the meaning of wars and their cost, conflict resolution methods, the nature of peace and reconciliation processes, the meaning of peace, the different kinds of peace, methods, and obstacles to achieving it, ways of sustaining it, the roles of international institutions and agencies in promoting peace, international treaties regarding principles of conduct at wartime, international courts, and human rights (e.g., Avery, Johnson, Johnson, & Mitchell, 1999).

Peace process. Teaching this subject, directly referring to the specific conflict in which the society has been engaged, should begin with a description of the violent conflict in which the society is involved and the heavy price it has paid and should move on to the peace process that is now underway with its difficulties and achievements and refer to the differential, but dynamic, relations between the society and (different segments of) the rival society. It is especially important to discuss the meaning of peace, closely consider the agreements that have been signed, describe obstacles to the peace process, and analyze the reconciliation process, which is crucial to sustaining peace (e.g., Fountain, 1999; Galtung, 1996).

567

Presentation of the rival. One of the very important themes concerns the presentation of the rival with whom the society was locked in intractable conflict (Bar-Tal & Teichman, 2005; Teichman & Bar-Tal, 2007). This theme concerns legitimization, equalization, differentiation, and personalization of the rival. Legitimization allows viewing the opponent as belonging to an acceptable human category, within international norms, and with whom it is possible and even desirable to terminate the conflict and build positive relations. Through equalization, the rival comes to be seen as an equal partner with whom it is possible to establish relations. Differentiation leads to heterogenization of the rival group, that is, it enables a new perception of the rival that has hitherto been viewed as a homogeneously and monolithically hostile entity. The new perception implies that the other group is made up of various subgroups that differ in their views and ideologies. This does more justice to its complex nature. Personalization allows a view of the rival group not as a depersonalized entity but as made up of individuals with ordinary human characteristics, concerns, needs, and goals. Differentiation among individuals allows the acknowledgement of individual differences, namely, viewing groups as composed of individuals who differ in appearance, characteristics, opinions, concerns, needs, and goals. As such, this makes it possible to perceive members of the former rival group in their concrete, differentiated, personal, and social roles, such as mothers, sons, students, teachers, physicians, peasants, and so on.

History of the conflict. The history of the conflict should be presented and analyzed in an unbiased way, including facts that do not show the involved societies in a flattering light. This means that direct peace education demands that both parties reconsider their own past acts as well as those of the rival. According to Salomon (2002, 2004), the main long-term goal of peace education in regions of ongoing violent intractable conflict is changing the perception of the others' collective narrative and the beliefs related to this narrative.

The new history, as provided by peace education, should put in a new light the background to the conflict, its development, its causes and results, the price paid by the involved societies, the failed mediation attempts, the atrocities, the violence, and so on (Bar-On & Adwan, 2006; Chirwa, 1997; Lederach, 1998). These themes should serve as a basis for the formation of a new collective memory that is in some sort of coherence with the former rival's collective memory.

New affect and emotions. On the affective level, two processes need to occur concomitantly: On one hand collective fear and hatred must be reduced, and on the other collective hope, trust, and mutual acceptance must be actively fostered (Bar-Tal, Halperin, & de Rivera, 2007). The collective emotion of hope arises when a concrete positive outcome is expected (Lazarus, 1991; Stotland, 1969). Developing a collective orientation of hope for peace implies the formulation of new goals such as living in peaceful coexistence and cooperation with yesterday's enemy. This implies stopping bloodshed, destruction, misery, hardship, and suffering and allowing peace, tranquility, prosperity, and growth to emerge. It also requires adopting new ways for achieving these goals such as negotiation, mediation, compromise, concession, and reciprocity (Jarymowicz & Bar-Tal, 2006). Moreover, a collective affective orientation toward accepting the former rival, to take the place of hatred, should be actively pursued. This denotes a positive evaluative reaction toward the

568

other group, which, minimally, requires trust and the intention to form positive relations. These emotional changes are necessary for the establishment of new relations.

Conclusions

Peace education socializes new generations to a new climate in which a culture of peace can emerge as a result of the process of reconciliation. For it is the educational system, to a considerable extent, that provides the young generations with the ideology, ethos, values, goals, myths, and beliefs that the society considers to be requisite for social functioning. Because school attendance is mandatory, the educational system can reach entire generations.

An important question is whether the proposed models can be applied to various conflicts that differ with regard to such characteristics as balance of power, the extent and locus of victimhood, and the ultimate striven-for solutions as there are conflicts in which the rivals live in one political entity (e.g., Guatemala or Nicaragua) and conflicts in which the parties strive to live in two separate political entities (e.g., Israelis and Palestinians, Chechnyans and Russians). The answer is a definite yes, as the proposed models are very general and basic and therefore can be applied to any conflict situation. This does not mean that the above-suggested content is exclusive. Additional content may be needed in the context of particular conflicts (e.g., Abu-Nimer, 2000).

Clearly, there is no one way to conduct peace education. The goals and the programs depend not only on the conceptions and creativity of the pedagogues but also on the specific needs and the context of each society. The general themes are more or less constant, but the particular contents, techniques, and methods must be adapted to the particular cases by the educators. They have to select and/or construct the programs and later implement them according to the general principles that facilitate good and meaningful outcomes.

Of special importance when launching peace education is an awareness of the political–societal conditions that may either facilitate or hamper peace education. Such awareness serves as a compass for what is possible in the society. But the main point we tried to communicate in this article is that peace education (whether direct or indirect) can flourish under any condition—including violence—because its themes fundamentally support humanism and democracy, core values shared by many societies. Most societies will not object to positively valued themes such as tolerance, reflective thinking, peace, acceptance of the "other," rejection of violence, and human rights. Nevertheless, societies that are ready to engage in peace processes and ripe for the painful cultural changes peace requires can go much further and, in addition to focusing on a general education for democracy and humanism, can directly tackle the causes that fuel the conflict, that is, the ethos of conflict, the collective memory of conflict, and the accompanying collective emotional orientations.

References

Aall, P. (1996). Nongovernmental organizations and peace making. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Managing global chaos: Sources of conflict of and responses to international conflict* (pp. 433–443). Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press.

569

Aall, P. R., Helsing, J. W., & Tidwell, A. C. (2007). Addressing conflict through education. In I. W. Zartman (Ed.), *Peace making in international conflict: Methods and techniques* (Rev. ed., pp. 327–354). Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press.

Abu-Nimer, M. (2000). Peace building in postsettlement: Challenges fro Israeli and Palestinian peace educators. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 6,* 1–21.

Abu-Nimer, M. (2004). Education for coexistence and Arab–Jewish encounters in Israel: Potential and challenges. *Journal of Social Issues, 60(2),* 405–422.

Agius, E., & Ambrosewicz, J. (2003). *Towards a culture of tolerance and peace.* Montreal, Quebec, Canada: International Bureau for Children's Rights.

Amamio, M. C. (2004). *The role of peace education in preventing conflict.* Paris: UNESCO.

Andreopoulus, G. J., & Claude, R. P. (Eds.). (1997). *Human rights education for the twenty-first century.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Arthur, P. (1999). The Anglo-Irish peace process: Obstacles to reconciliation. In R. L. Rothstein (Ed.), *After the peace: Resistance and reconciliation* (pp. 85–109). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Asmal, K., Asmal, L., & Roberts, R. S. (1997). *Reconciliation through truth: A reckoning of apartheid's criminal governance.* Cape Town, South Africa: David Phillips.

Auerbach, Y. (2004). The role of forgiveness in reconciliation. In Y. Bar-Siman-Tov (Ed.), *From conflict resolution to reconciliation* (pp. 149–176). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Avery, P. G., Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Mitchell, J. M. (1999). Teaching and understanding of war and peace through structured academic controversies. In A. Raviv, L. Oppenheimer, & D. Bar-Tal (Eds.), *How children understand war and peace: A call for international peace education* (pp. 260–280). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bar-On, D., & Adwan, S. (2006). The psychology of better dialogue between two separate but interdependent narratives. In R. I. Rotberg (Ed.), *Israeli and Palestinian narratives of conflict: History's double helix* (pp. 205–224). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bar-Tal, D. (1998). Societal beliefs in times of intractable conflict: The Israeli case. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 9,* 22–50.

Bar-Tal, D. (2000). From intractable conflict through conflict resolution to reconciliation: Psychological analysis. *Political Psychology, 21*(2), 351–365.

Bar-Tal, D. (2002). The elusive nature of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles and practice in the world* (pp. 27–36). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bar-Tal, D. (2007a). Sociopsychological foundations of intractable conflicts. *American Behavioral Scientist, 50,* 1430–1453.

Bar-Tal, D. (2007b). Lichyot yim haconflict: Nituach psychologi-chevraty shel hachevra hayechudit be Israel. [Living with the conflict: Sociopsychological analysis of the Israeli–Jewish society]. Jerusalem: Carmel.

Bar-Tal, D. (in press-a). Challenges for construing peace culture and peace education. In E. Matthews, D. Newman, & M. Dajani (Eds.), *The Israeli–Palestinian conflict: Parallel discourses.* London: Routledge.

Bar-Tal, D. (in press-b). Reconciliation as a foundation of culture of peace. In J. de Rivera (Ed.), *Handbook on building cultures for peace.* New York: Springer.

Bar-Tal, D., & Bennink, G. H. (2004). The nature of reconciliation as an outcome and as a process. In Y. Bar-Siman-Tov (Ed.), *From conflict resolution to reconciliation* (pp. 11–38). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

570

Bar-Tal, D., & Halperin, E. (in press). Overcoming psychological barriers to peace process: The influence of instigating beliefs about losses. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Prosocial motives, emotions and behavior.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Bar-Tal, D., Halperin, E., & de Rivera, J. (2007). Collective emotions in conflict: Societal implications. *Journal of Social Issues*, *63*, 441–460.

Bar-Tal, D., & Rosen, Y. (in press). Conditions for the development of peace education in societies involved in intractable conflict. In D. Berliner & H. Kupermintz (Eds.), *Fostering change in institutions, environments, and people.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bar-Tal, D., & Teichman Y. (2005). *Stereotypes and prejudice in conflict: Representations of Arabs in Israeli Jewish society.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Beeman, J. H., & Mahony, R. (1993). The institutional churches and the process of reconciliation in Northern Ireland: Recent progress in Presbyterian–Roman Catholic relations. In D. Keogh & M. H. Haltzel (Eds.), *Northern Ireland and the politics of reconciliation* (pp. 150–159). Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Bloomfield, D., Barnes, T., & Huyse, L. (Eds.). (2003). *Reconciliation after violent conflict: A handbook.* Stockholm: International IDEA.

Bodine, R. J., & Crawford, D. K. (1998). *The handbook of conflict resolution education: A guide to building quality programs in schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bruck, P., & Roach, C. (1993). Dealing with reality: The news media and the promotion of peace. In C. Roach (Ed.), *Communication and culture in war and peace* (pp. 71–95). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bullard, S. (1996). *Teaching tolerance: Raising open-minded, empathetic children.* New York: Doubleday.

Cairns, E., & Roe, M. D. (Ed.). (2003). *The role of memory in ethnic conflict.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Calleja, J. (1994). Educating for peace in the Mediterranean: A strategy for peace building. In E. Boulding (Ed.), *Building peace in the Middle East: Challenges for states and civil society* (pp. 279–285). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Chetkow-Yanoov, B. (1986). Improving Arab-Jewish relations in Israel: The role of voluntary organizations. *Social Development Issues, 10*, 58–70.

Chirwa, W. (1997). Collective memory and the process of reconciliation and reconstruction. *Development in Practice, 7,* 479–482.

Clarke-Habibi, S. (2005). Transforming world views: The case of education for peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Journal of Transformative Education, 3,* 33–56.

Coleman, P. T. (2006). Intractable conflict. In M. Deutsch, P. T. Coleman, & E. C. Marcus (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 533–559). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Danesh, H. B. (2006). Towards an integrative theory of peace education. *Journal of Peace Education, 3*(1), 55–78.

Davis, L. (2000). *Citizenship education and human rights education: An international overview.* London: British Council.

Deutsch, M. (1993). Educating for a peaceful world. *American Psychologist, 48*(5), 510–517.

Deutsch, M. (2000). Justice and conflict. In M. Deutsch & P. T. Coleman (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (pp. 41–64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deutsch, M. (2005). Cooperation and conflict: A personal perspective on the history of the social psychological study of conflict resolution. In M. A. West, D. Tjosvold, &

K. G. Smith (Eds.), *The essentials of teamworking: International perspectives* (pp. 1–35). New York: John Wiley.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process.* New York: D. C. Heath.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York: Collier.

Dreeben, R. (1968). *On what is learned in school.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51,* 665–697.

Elhance, A. P., & Ahmar, M. (1995). Nonmilitary CBMs. In M. Krepon & A. Sevak (Eds.), *Crisis prevention, confidence building and reconciliation in South Asia* (pp. 131–151). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Flowers, N., Bernbaum, M., Rudelius-Palmer, K., & Tolman, J. (2000). *The human rights education handbook: Effective practices for learning, action and change.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Human Rights Resource Center.

Fountain, S. (1999). *Peace education in UNICEF* (Working Paper Series, Programme Division, Education Section). New York: UNICEF.

Gallagher, A. M. (1998). *Education policy approaches in multiethnic societies.* Florence, Italy: UNICEF International Child Development Centre.

Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization.* London: Sage.

Gardner Feldman, L. (1999). The principle and practice of "reconciliation" in German foreign policy: Relations with France, Israel, Poland and the Czech Republic. *International Affairs, 75*, 333–356.

Gibson, G. L., & Bingham, R. D. (1982). On the conceptualization and measurement of political tolerance. *American Political Science Review, 76*(3), 603–620.

Halpern, J., & Weinstein, H. M. (2004). Rehumanizing the other: Empathy and reconciliation. *Human Rights Quarterly, 26*(3), 561–583.

Harris, I. M. (1999). Types of peace education. In A. Raviv, L. Oppenheimer, & D. Bar-Tal (Eds.), *How children understand war and peace: A call for international peace education* (pp. 299–317). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hayner, P. B. (1999). In pursuit of justice and reconciliation: Contributions of truth telling. In C. J. Arnson (Ed.), *Comparative peace processes in Latin America* (pp. 363–383). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Himmelweit, H. T., & Swift, B. (1969). A model for the understanding of school as a socializing agent. In P. H. Mussen, J. Langer, & M. Covington (Eds.), *Trends and issues in developmental psychology* (pp. 154–180). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ignatieff, M. (2000). Nationalism and toleration. In S. Mendus (Ed.), *The politics of toleration in modern life* (pp. 77–106). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Iram, Y. (2006). Culture of peace: Definition, scope, and application. In Y. Iram (Ed.), *Educating towards a culture of peace* (pp. 3–12). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Jarymowicz, M., & Bar-Tal, D. (2006). The dominance of fear over hope in the life of individuals and collectives. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36,* 367–392.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (2005). Essential components of peace education. *Theory Into Practice, 44*(4), 280–292.

Jones, T. S. (2004). Conflict resolution education: The field, the findings, and the future. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 22*(1–2), 233–267.

Kaye, M. (1997). The role of the truth commissions in the search for justice, reconciliation and democratization: The Salvadorean and Honduran cases. *Journal of Latin American Studies, 29,* 693–716.

Kelman, H. C. (1999). Transforming the relationship between former enemies: A social–psychological analysis. In R. L. Rothstein (Ed.), *After the peace: Resistance and reconciliation* (pp. 193–205)*.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Kelman, H. C. (2004). Reconciliation as identity change: A social psychological perspective. In Y. Bar-Siman-Tov (Ed.), *From conflict resolution to reconciliation* (pp. 111–124). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kriesberg, L. (1998a). Coexistence and the reconciliation of communal conflicts. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The handbook of interethnic coexistence* (pp. 182–198)*.* New York: Continuum.

Kriesberg, L. (1998b). Intractable conflicts. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The handbook of interethnic coexistence* (pp. 332–342)*.* New York: Continuum.

Kruglanski, A. W. (1989). *Lay epistemics and human knowledge.* New York: Plenum.

Kupermintz, H., & Salomon, G. (2005). Lessons to be learned from research on peace education in the context of intractable conflict. *Theory Into Practice, 44*(4), 293–302.

Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies.* Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press.

Lederach, J. P. (1998). Beyond violence: Building sustainable peace. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The handbook of interethnic coexistence* (pp. 236–245)*.* New York: Continuum.

Liebenberg, I., & Zegeye, A. (1998). Pathway to democracy? The case of the South African Truth and Reconciliation process. *Social Identities, 4*, 541–558.

Marsick, V. J., Sauquet, A., & Yorks, L. (2006). Learning through reflection. In M. Deutsch, P. T. Coleman, & E. C. Marcus (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 486–506). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (1990). *Informal and incidental learning in the workplace.* New York: Routledge.

Mertus, J., & Helsing, J. (2006). *Human rights and conflict: Exploring the links between rights, law, and peacebuilding*. Washington, DC: USIP Press.

Nets-Zehngut, R., & Bar-Tal, D. (2007). The intractable Israeli–Palestinian conflict and possible pathways to peace. In J. Kuriansky (Ed.), *Beyond bullets and bombs: Grassroots peacebuilding between Palestinians and Israelis* (pp. 3–13). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Noor, M., Brown, R., & Glasford, D. E. (in press). Prospects for intergroup reconciliation: Social psychological predictors of intergroup forgiveness and reparation in Northern Ireland and Chile. In A. Nadler, T. E. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup reconciliation.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Norval, A. J. (1998). Memory, identity and the (im)possibility of reconciliation: The work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa. *Constellations, 5*, 250–265.

Norval, A. J. (1999). Truth and reconciliation: The birth of the present and the reworking of history. *Journal of African Studies, 25*, 499–519.

Obura, A. P. (2003). *Never again: Educational reconstruction in Rwanda.* Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.

Raider, E. (1995). Conflict resolution training in schools: Translation theory into applied skills. In B. B. Bunker & J. Z. Rubin (Eds.), *Conflict, cooperation and justice* (pp. 93–122)*.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Raider, E., Coleman, S., & Gerson, J. (2000). Teaching conflict resolution skills in a workshop. In M. Deutsch & P. T. Coleman (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (pp. 499–521). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rippon, T. J., & Willow, S. (2004). Sierra Leone: A model for a program for action for a culture of peace. *Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution, 6*(1), 152–169.

Rodgers, C. (2002). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking. *Teachers College Record, 104*(4), 842–866.

Rosen, Y. (2007, August). *Long-term effects of peace education programs in the context of intractable conflict.* Paper presented at the European Conference for Research on Learning and Instruction, Budapest, Hungary.

Salomon, G. (2002). The nature of peace education: Not all programs are created equal. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 3–13). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Salomon, G. (2004). A narrative-based view of coexistence education. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*(2), 273–287.

Selman, R. L. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding.* New York: Academic Press.

Selman, R. L. (2003). *The promotion of social awareness: Powerful lessons from the partnership of developmental theory and classroom practices.* New York: Russell Sage.

Shiver, D. W., Jr. (1995). *An ethic for enemies: Forgiveness in politics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Skitka, L. J., Bauman, C. W., & Mullen, E. (2004). Political tolerance and coming to psychological closure following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks: An integrative approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(6), 743–756.

Smith, R., & Neill, J. (2006). Developing frameworks for school self-evaluation to improve school effectiveness for peace in Northern Ireland. *Improving Schools, 9,* 153–174.

Staub, E. (2000). Genocide and mass killing: Origins, prevention, healing, and reconciliation. *Political Psychology, 21,* 367–382.

Staub, E. (2006). Reconciliation after genocide, mass killing and intractable conflict: Understanding the roots of violence, psychological recovery, and steps toward a general theory. *Political Psychology, 27*(6), 867–894.

Staub, E., Pearlman, L. A., Gubin, A., & Hagengimana, A. (2005). Healing, reconciliation, forgiving and the prevention of violence after genocide or mass killing: An intervention and its experimental evaluation in Rwanda. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 24*(3), 297–334.

Stotland, E. (1969). *The psychology of hope.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Teichman, Y., & Bar-Tal, D. (2007). Acquisition and development of a shared psychological intergroup repertoire in a context of intractable conflict. In S. M. Quintana & C. McKown (Eds.), *The handbook of race, racism and the developing child* (pp. 452–482). New York: John Wiley.

Tibbits, F. (Ed.). (2005). Human rights education and transformational learning [Special issue]. *Intercultural Education, 16*(2).

UNESCO. (1995). *Declaration of principles on tolerance.* Paris: Author.

United Nations. (1966a). *International covenant on civil and political rights.* New York: Author.

United Nations. (1966b). *International covenant on economic, social and cultural rights.* New York: Author.

United Nations. (2003). *ABC: Teaching human rights: Practical activities for primary and secondary schools.* New York: Author. Retrieved February, 15, 2009, from http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu6/2/abc_text.pdf

Van Slyck, M. R., Stern, M., & Elbedour, S. (1999). Adolescents' beliefs about their conflict behavior. In A. Raviv, L. Oppenheimer, & D. Bar-Tal (Eds.), *How children understand war and peace: A call for international peace education* (pp. 208–230). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Vogt, W. P. (1997). *Tolerance and education: Learning to live with diversity and difference*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wessells, M. (in press). Community reconciliation and post-conflict reconstruction for peace. In J. de Rivera (Ed.), *Handbook on building cultures for peace.* New York: Springer.

Authors

DANIEL BAR-TAL is a professor of social psychology, School of Education, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel; e-mail: *daniel@post.tau.ac.il*. He served as a director of the Walter Lebach Research Institute for Jewish-Arab Coexistence through Education, Tel Aviv University (2002–2005), and was a coeditor in chief of the Palestine Israel Journal (2001–2005). He also served as the president of the International Society of Political Psychology (1999–2000). In 2006 his book, coauthored with Yona Teichman, *Stereotypes and Prejudice in Conflict* received the Alexander George Award of the International Society of Political Psychology for the best book in political psychology. In 2006 he also received the Peace Scholar Award of the Peace and Justice Studies Association for great scholarship and hard work in studying conflicts and peace making.

YIGAL ROSEN is a postdoctoral fellow of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard University and a teaching fellow of the Interdisciplinary Graduate Program on Conflict Management, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, 84105, Israel; e-mail: *roseny@bgu.ac.il*. In 2007 he completed a postdoctoral fellowship at the School of Education at the University of Tel Aviv. From 2004 to 2007 he was a research fellow of the Center for Research on Peace Education at the University of Haifa. In 2004 he received the Dr. Eugene Weiner Award for Arab-Israeli Coexistence from the Carmel Institute for Social Studies.

575