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Between July 2014 and June 2016 the Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding, a partnership between UNICEF and the University of Amsterdam, the University of Sussex, Ulster University and in-country partners, addressed one of the UNICEF Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Programme (PBEA) key objectives, ‘contributing to the generation and use of evidence and knowledge in policies and programming related to education, conflict and peacebuilding’.

Consortium teams carried out research in four countries over the course of the project: Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa, and Uganda. Each team will produce a specific country report which, alongside thematic Literature Reviews, which formed the basis for three synthesis reports addressing the following specific thematic areas:

- the integration of education into peacebuilding processes at global and country levels;
- the role of teachers in peacebuilding;
- the role of formal and non-formal peacebuilding education programmes focusing on youth.

In addition, throughout the research project and as a cross cutting theme in all three areas, the research project aims to understand the dynamics and impact of various forms of direct and indirect violence in relation to education systems and educational actors in situations of conflict. Each thematic focus will also include a gender analysis.

The research seeks to generate evidence that can inform policy and practice aimed at the global and national peacebuilding community, and the global and national education and international development communities.
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**Programme**

**1. Foundations**

**Wednesday 20th April**

16.30 Arrival and Registration.
17.00-19.00: • Keynote Address: Alan Smith (Ulster University), ‘Is There a Future for Education in Peacebuilding?’
   • Panel Discussion: ‘Education and Peacebuilding – Stakeholder Perspectives.’
19.00 Drinks Reception.

**2. Findings**

**Thursday 21st April**

8.45-9.00 Registration.
9.00-9.15 Welcome: Mieke Lopes Cardozo and Brian Burgoon, Academic Director of the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR), (University of Amsterdam).
9.15-10.15 Session 1: The Consortium’s Contribution: The 4Rs Framework and Research Methodology, by Mario Novelli (University of Sussex).
10.15-10.45 Coffee Break.
10.45-12.45 Session 2: Plenary – Synthesis of Research Findings on the Integration of Education and Peacebuilding, the Role of Teachers and Youth Agency.
12.45-14.00 Lunch.
14.00-15.30 Session 3: Interactive Sharing of research Insights from Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa and Uganda.
15.30-16.00 Coffee Break.
16.00-17.15 Session 4: Critical Responses from Country Representatives (Burundi, Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa, Uganda).
17.45-19.00 Boat Tour with Drinks, from the seminar venue to the dinner venue.
19.00-21.00 Dinner at ‘De Waag’, Amsterdam City Centre.

**3. Futures**

**Friday 22nd April**

9.00-10.00 Session 5: Key Note Address: Jordan Naidoo, (Director, UNESCO Education for All), ‘Education, Peacebuilding and the SDGs’.
10.00-11.00 Session 6: Interactive Session for Collective Reflection - What do we Now Know, and What do we Need to Know?
11.00-11.30 Coffee Break.
11.30-12.45 Session 7: Implications and Future Challenges for Donors, Governments, Policy Makers and Practitioners.
12.45-13.15 Final reflections by Consortium Directors and “Rap up” performance by artist Quinsy Gario
13.30 Lunch.
Opening, Keynote Speeches and Panel Discussion

Introduction

On Wednesday, 20th of April 2016, over 100 academics, practitioners, and policy makers in the field of education and peacebuilding gathered in the heart of Amsterdam for the opening event of the research findings dissemination seminar “The Role of Education in Peacebuilding - Foundations, Findings and Futures.”

Hosted by the Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding, the first session started with a warm welcome by Mieke Lopes Cardozo from the University of Amsterdam who introduced the keynote speaker, Alan Smith of Ulster University, one of the three co-directors of the consortium (together with Mario Novelli, University of Sussex, and Mieke Lopes Cardozo, University of Amsterdam). The consortium is a partnership between the University of Sussex, University of Amsterdam, Ulster University, UNICEF and in-country partners which aims generate evidence that can inform policy and practice aimed at the global and national peacebuilding community as well as the global and national education and international development communities.

Summary Keynote Address

Titled “Is there a Future for Education in Peacebuilding,” Alan Smith analysed the current situation of the role of peacebuilding in education in the world. During his address, he highlighted key research findings as well as country reports and thematic areas within the 4Rs framework (redistribution, recognition, representation, reconciliation) that has been developed by the research consortium.

In his presentation, Alan Smith drew links to the newly developed Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), in particular Goal 4 which focuses on ensuring “inclusive and equitable quality education” and Goal 16 which is about promoting “peaceful and inclusive societies.” Despite the positive impact that education in peacebuilding can have on individuals and societies, closer interactions and collaborations between the two concepts are necessary to transform these goals into reality. This also means recognising the challenges that arise with the use of the term “peace” in general and with education in the context of conflict specifically: peace conceptualised as an absence of violence, or peace as the promotion/presence of social justice.

Concluding, Alan Smith pointed to the four peacebuilding priorities established by the consortium including, 1) protecting children from violence and creating safe learning environments, 2) addressing education inequalities, 3) contributing to social cohesion, and 4) promoting reconciliation. All in all, Alan Smith’s keynote speech laid a solid and important foundation that not only encouraged all to think critically about peacebuilding and education, but also enabled fruitful discussions in the following sessions of the seminar.
Panel Discussion

The keynote speech was followed by a lively panel discussion that was chaired by Friedrich Affolter (UNICEF). Panellists were Dorothea Coppard from GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit), Amy West from American Institutes for Research (AIR), Sarah Rowse from Children in Crisis, Margaret Sinclair for Education Above All, and James Lawrie from Save the Children.

Friedrich Affolter examined the diverse perspectives of stakeholders with regard to education and peacebuilding. After giving a brief overview of the role and experience of each organisation with peacebuilding education, it became clear that in four out of the five represented organisations the terms “peace” and “peacebuilding” are avoided due to varying understandings, definitions, and stigmas attached to them. Other phrases such as “social cohesion” and “social inclusion” are used instead.

The panellists elaborated on best practice examples from their work in various conflict affected situations. For example, in Sri Lanka, GIZ helped to pass legislation to promote the use of various national languages from ethnic minority groups to benefit social cohesion as Dorothea Coppard explained. Whereas in South Sudan, conflict sensitive education was implemented through social science textbooks with the aim to reach equity and safety according to Margaret Sinclair.

These current examples invited the audience to engage in a dialogue bringing up questions mainly about the practical matters of education and peacebuilding, political concerns in working with governments, cultural sensitivity, and the struggles for organisations to find sustainable funding. James Lawrie from Save the Children addressed issues surrounding the need for institutional improvements as well as new pathways to teacher accreditation with a gender focus. Echoing James Lawrie, Amy West from the American Institutes for Research discussed the importance of rigorous processes on doing research and collecting data to help local organizations to build capacity and inform their strategic programming and policy decisions.

The urgent need for peacebuilding education is not only important in light of the current refugee crises, we also need to look at the consequences of a lack of education for peacebuilding in relation to triggers of conflict, forced migration or even violent extremism. Sarah Rowse from Children in Crisis spoke of clear evidence that shows when there is an absence of stability in a country, children are at greater risks for being recruited in or joining violent extremist groups.

The panel ended with a reminder from Margaret Sinclair who stated that 90 percent of existing development projects disappear quickly once funding runs out. This argument was strengthened by Amy West who questioned the lack of successful marketing strategies to attract public and private donors to ensure more long-term funding and a greater understanding of the role and value that peacebuilding education can bring to any society not only in the short, but more importantly, in the long-term.
View from the balcony during the first seminar panel discussion.
Session 1 - The Consortium’s Contribution: The 4 Rs Framework and Research Methodology

The 4Rs Framework

- **Redistribution**: Respecting diversity and identities through education.
- **Recognition**: Ensuring equitable participation in decision making at all levels of the education system.
- **Reconciliation**: Transformational in terms of education access, non-discrimination, allocation of resources, education outcomes affecting equal opportunity.
- **Representation**: Transitional Justice, dealing with the legacies of the past, developing new relationships of trust.
- **Legacies of Conflict**: Addressing historical and contemporary economic, political and cultural injustices that underpin conflict.
- **Drivers of Conflict**: Dealing with the legacies of the past, developing new relationships of trust.

Summary

After a warm introduction by Laila Kadiwal, Mario Novelli opened his keynote address by setting out the three things he hoped to achieve with his presentation; 1) to give a sense of what has been done by the consortium, how they arrived here, and to give an idea of the learning processes and the journey therein; 2) to give an outline of the 4Rs framework, and how the whole research approach is embedded in policy networks; and 3) to give a sense of the research itself, in the four countries and in the three research areas. He stressed the importance, throughout the research, of understanding violence in all its forms - direct and indirect. Similarly, gender dynamics must be seen to address not just women, but also young men, so often seen through a securitising lens.

In discussing what learning and thinking underpinned the research of the consortium, Mario Novelli traced how they raised issues with the mainstream security and education approaches and posed what he termed the most basic question: why do people go to war? He stated that the biggest debate has come down to the greed versus grievance (whether genuine or perceived) explanations. He disputed the individualistic, economic argument of greed as the primary driver for conflict, as put forth by Collier and embraced by the World Bank. While accepting there is an element of truth in this theory, he stated that it tends to ignore structural inequalities, and that at the root of all conflict you will find grievances, be they political, economic, cultural or social.

The research was interested in understanding how education might work on different dimensions of inequality. Education is important, something stressed by all groups, and is important before, during, and after conflict. He went on to critique how...
education has been marginalised in mainstream peacebuilding, and how there is seen to be a magic formula of firstly dealing with security, secondly with political reform and then thirdly opening markets, which somehow then all leads to social development. He says this maintains a negative peace, without addressing underlying issues, preventing a move to a more positive peace.

Following a discussion on the obstacles faced by the education sector, particularly a growing trend towards what he termed a “neo-liberal packet” and the different versions of peace education, Mario Novelli moved onto the 4Rs framework itself, laying out what is meant by redistribution, recognition, and representation, and how these three elements of social justice can be complemented with the ‘fourth R’ of reconciliation for transformative peace with social justice. He finished by speaking of the difficulties faced by those aiming to foster sustainable peacebuilding with social justice, particularly the problem of political will and vested interests, and the hegemony of human capital approaches. Another obstacle was that the development institutions themselves must “curry favour” with the various governments of the countries in which they operate. As a result, some of the more radical potential is undermined, resulting in more de-politicised responses. The importance of not doing harm to relationships with governments, and acknowledgement of political sensitivities must thus be emphasized. These are some of the challenges faced, but great strides have been made, putting social services and these broader debates of social cohesion on the agenda.
Session 2 - Plenary: Synthesis of Research Findings on the Integration of Education and Peacebuilding, the Role of Teachers and Youth Agency

The plenary session for the synthesis of research findings on the integration of education and peacebuilding, the role of teachers and youth agency was chaired by Drew Dunbrack from UNICEF, and through three speakers, laid out the three research areas and themes addressed by this research.

The Integration of Education and Peacebuilding, by Simone Datzberger

Simone Datzberger (Ulster University) opened by giving a few words on how the research fits into the global context, and of the risks faced by education in fragile states. Using the 4Rs framework, she revealed how education is integrated into broader peacebuilding processes, and also how peacebuilding can be integrated into the education sector, both explicitly and implicitly.

Looking specifically at education governance, and how education is most often equated with redistribution when analysed through the 4Rs framework, assuming that other aspects of social justice (recognition, representation, reconciliation) will automatically occur when redistribution takes place, or so those in education governance argue; there is a tendency towards a human capital approach. This economic focus, evident too in macro education governance, marginalises the role of education in increasing agency and voice, and in processes of social change.

This point was followed by a discussion on why the political economy context matters in these situations, where issues of elite domination, decentralisation, politicisation and privatisation can all complicate and hinder transformative policies. Simone Datzberger stressed the importance of addressing inequalities, as poor quality education and social segregation along class and other lines was evident in all the cases examined by the research. She argued further research and policies must deal with social segregation, national unity alongside cultural diversity and issues of language, curricula, refugees, IDP’s and religious concerns. With the exception of South Africa, education has not been successfully used for truth and reconciliation, to create multiple versions of the past, as there is a fear education could revive past conflicts. As such there is a need to move away from strict peacebuilding approaches, towards addressing underlying problems and grievances.

Simone Datzberger concluded by coming back to how redistribution has dominated the agenda, and education has been equated with the economic, the human capital approach. Reconciliation needs to be debated by in-country actors, in their specific social, cultural, political and economic contexts.
The Role of Teachers in Peacebuilding and Social Cohesion, by Naureen Durrani

Naureen Durrani (University of Sussex), discussed the role of teachers in education and peacebuilding, based on the second synthesis report of the research consortium.

She opened by saying it was important to locate the way teachers fit into international policy agendas. Teachers play an important role in any transformative agenda. However, teachers can be both victims and perpetrators of violence, and this can cross political and economic boundaries. Building on insights from the 4Rs framework, Naureen Durrani argued that teachers’ capacity to influence their environment can change the nature of conflict. This capacity is influenced by the cultural political social economic context, both nationally and globally. National and global policy can both inhibit and promote teacher agency for social cohesion and peacebuilding. International actors have expanded the role and function of teachers, which at times has been too ambitious.

Following a deeper discussion on violence and teachers, Naureen Durrani moved on to discuss how there has been a weak focus on teacher education and development, and that peacebuilding has been largely implicit in this. There has been a focus on generic issues, rather than addressing the difficult issues of conflict. For instance, curricula and textbooks more often than not emphasise living together, but still ignore root causes of conflict. She singled out history curricula, as representing the views of the central government, which is often counterproductive to the peacebuilding agenda.

She then moved on to lay out the ten key findings from the research. These included the importance of transitional moments, how teacher agency is conditioned by and also shapes context, a need for explicit state policy and curricula on peacebuilding, definable and measurable targets, a more radical approach beyond awareness of the other, dealing with legacies of the past, increasing recognition of significance of education on peacebuilding, and finally aligning donors with priorities of governments so that there is a sustainable future for these programmes. She finished by saying that to achieve this there must be three enabling conditions; political will and a committed bureaucracy; shared consensus and participation, understanding the significance of the agenda; and finally mutual trust and binding behaviours.
The Role of Formal and Non-Formal Education for ‘Youth Agency’, by Mieke Lopes Cardozo

Mieke Lopes Cardozo (University of Amsterdam) explored the agency of young people and their potential as agents for or against peacebuilding. She stressed that the research was not on youth, but rather aims to engage with youth voices, while also engaging with other stakeholders, including ministries, international actors, civil society, faith based movements, and youth movements.

Youth are typically framed as ‘perpetrators’ or ‘victims’ of violence. Based on the findings of the Research Consortium’s third synthesis report, Mieke Lopes Cardozo argued that there is a need to move away from this simple binary of violent angry men or passive (female) victims. She called for a more nuanced engagement with a wide diversity of youth constituencies and their varying needs, while acknowledging that youth engage at multiple scales of interaction (at the community level, the national and international levels). From the same vein, defining youth can be problematic as it often counts for half the population of a given country. This means other identifiers than age, of for instance gender, disability, LGBT, ethnicity, or being ex-combatants may be more useful. The research of the consortium offers a cultural political economy analysis of the context in the four countries, and then locates youth in relation to that context.

Challenges faced by youth relate to unemployment, education not serving its purpose, and exclusion from decision making. Analysing this from the 4Rs framework, it is revealed how these challenges can be both drivers and solutions of conflict. There is a focus within both formal and non-formal education policy and interventions on redistributive and economic aspects of education, and while addressing economic forms of youth empowerment are crucial, this narrow understanding of education often misrecognises other crucial (socio-cultural and political) aspects of youth agency.

Education is shown to have positive as well as negative implications for youth, and is not a panacea for peace. Therefore, it must be embedded in broader processes of peacebuilding, and the need for reform requires political will. Mieke Lopes Cardozo concluded by saying there is a need to apply more holistic approaches to education for peacebuilding, that includes, yet moves beyond, more technical and economic aspects of youth agency, and is more inclusive of political and socio-cultural aspects of young people’s empowerment.

The session concluded with a number of questions from the audience, dealing with issues of extremism, the difficulty and limitations of political will, privatisation, mobile technology, perceptions of youth, and Nancy Fraser’s ideas about social justice.
Session 3: Interactive Sharing of Research Insights from Myanmar, Pakistan, South Africa and Uganda

For the interactive sharing of research insights from the four case studies, the country teams presented posters about the key characteristics and findings of their research.

Youth and Violence. Youth Agency in Context: A South African Case Study

In their poster presentation, Marcina Singh and Lorna Balle (Centre for International Teacher Education, Faculty of Education, CPUT) discussed the South African case study, which looked at the role of formal and non-formal “socially cohesion” initiatives around youth agency for peacebuilding. Specifically focusing on a micro case study of a non-formal youth intervention, the researchers discussed the shocking finding that youth are systematically exposed to high levels of physical and normative violence, as well as gender-based violence, discrimination and exploitation, and intergenerational violence, which in turn shapes how youth approach their lives.

Education and Social Cohesion in Pakistan Youth Agency - Gender - Violence

Young Pakistanis accessed in the current study in Karachi appeared to possess some remarkable assets for social cohesion, such as resilience, commitment to volunteerism and a deep sense of affection for Pakistan. Stakeholders linked youth marginalisation from the mainstream society to violence among the youth. Factors affecting disengagement included: socio-economic inequities, disappointment with the state, inequitable access to public services, and a lack of representation in decision-making. The interventions studied produced different outcomes in different contexts for different groups of young people. They helped youth to mitigate drivers of conflict to some extent, but they appeared to reproduce social hierarchy and segregation.
Gender Perspectives: Students & Teachers in Myanmar

Naw Tha Ku Paul (Point B Myanmar) and Elizabeth Maber (University of Amsterdam) from the research team presented their findings on gender perspectives of youth, teachers and teacher trainers. They found that gender was a cross-cutting theme in their research, such as for example in the way that the explicit and hidden school curriculum reinforces gender roles by presenting male hero narratives.

Education and Peacebuilding in Uganda

The Uganda research, presented by Simone Datzberger and Alan McCully (Ulster University) alongside Aloysius Malagala (Gulu University), centred around a threefold question regarding the roles of policy, teachers, and agency of youth in education and peacebuilding. In all these areas, the team found potential as well as challenges. In the area of policy for example, the team argued that although Uganda is not short in transformative policies in the education sector, its weak implementation affects sustainable peacebuilding process.
Session 4 - Plenary Debate: Practical Challenges from a Country Perspective

Summary

The session opened by discussing how government ministries embraced the concept of peacebuilding, the PBEA programme and reflections of the 4Rs.

Discussing how stakeholders understood social cohesion or peacebuilding, the panellists stated that Governments have embraced peacebuilding but each panellist stated their own challenges in the respective countries they represented. Panellists Cliff Meyers and Lidewyde Berckmoes stated the need for buy-in from central Government as imperative for their programmes to progress and develop, the remaining panellists echoed this sentiment stating political will and shared trust as vital in their work in Myanmar and Burundi respectively. Annet Kajura Mugisha stated decentralisation in Uganda did work and can work in other contexts but a major risk of decentralisation is devolving control to elites. Naureen Durrani reacted to this by arguing that all stakeholders attributed great significance to the role of education in social cohesion. However, differences existed in their preferred approach to social cohesion. While some were in favour of recognition of and respect for internal difference, the majority viewed internal difference as a threat to national unity and laid greater emphasis on assimilation as a means of fostering social cohesion.

Secondly, the panel discussed the application of the 4R framework in each of the countries where the panellists work. In South Africa, Azeem Badroodien described of the challenge of the South African Government embracing all of the 4Rs when there is still inequality. Violence and oppression, not war was the basis for the conflict in South Africa, and in 1994 led to the critical challenge of centralisation versus decentralisation, which was then discussed by the panel. Naureen Durrani explained that despite serious issues of reconciliation at different levels and between different groups, stakeholders found it difficult to see how ‘reconciliation’ was applicable to Pakistan because of the absence of any formal reconciliation processes in the country.

The session finished with questions taken from the audience that focused on implementation of the PBEA programme and challenges. Each country representative stated specific implementation challenges but all agreed that the interconnectedness of (under) funding and programme duration were key challenges they faced when implementing their programmes.
Wrap up: Highlighting Key Issues of the Day

Summary

Alan Smith concluded the day by giving key reflections that emerged from the day’s discussions.

What he stated as evident was who was “not in the room”. Security professionals, lawmakers, and peace builders need to be engaged with, which is the challenge educators face today. He continued that education and peacebuilding will have greater impact if there is stronger dialogue between these separated sectors.

Alan Smith outlined the benefits of working with UNICEF which has allowed research to bridge the gap with practise, leading on to his final reflection on legacy of the programme. Capacity has been built and knowledge has been shared which will be taken to into new contexts that will further enhance peacebuilding and education initiatives in the future. Perhaps, the work is just beginning.
Session 5: Education and Peacebuilding in the Context of SDG4

Summary

In his keynote address, Jordan Naidoo argued that there will be no sustainable development without peace, and, similarly, that there will be no peace without development.

Naidoo pointed out that at the moment, the SDGs are mainly linked to economic development. However, peacebuilding must be explicitly looked at in the SDGs.

Jordan Naidoo argued that there are connections between peacebuilding and goal 4. The issue of peace is captured in target 4.7, and the challenge for us as a community is how to relate global citizenship education with peacebuilding. The conceptualization of global citizenship education has been quite problematic, which needs to be addressed, but Jordan Naidoo argued it is unlikely the global community will come to a single understanding of citizenship.

The Education 2030 framework for action is a guide on how to achieve the educational goals in the SDGs. Jordan Naidoo urged the audience to focus more on teacher education and curriculum development. Unfortunately, at the moment, it is when conflict destabilises a region that it receives attention, which means education is now often seen as a means of addressing conflict. Instead, for sustainable peace, the root causes of violence must be addressed, for example, attention has to be paid to issues of division and language in curriculum reforms. He urged the community and relevant stakeholders to really participate in the SDGs.

Jordan Naidoo’s keynote stimulated many questions from the audience. An important question was raised with regards to extremism. Jordan Naidoo pointed out that UNESCO has set up processes in developing strategies in preventing extremism. Jordan Naidoo concluded his contribution with emphasizing the importance of not using frameworks statically. For example, he emphasized that the SDGs should be unpacked and applied in relation to specific context, and with regard to the 4Rs analytic framework, Jordan Naidoo commented that this framework is intended to be used dynamically in its application and interpretation.

Dr. Jordan Naidoo is the Director, Division for Education 2030 Support and Coordination (formerly Education for All (EFA) and International Education Coordination) at UNESCO, Paris/HQ. Prior to this he was a Senior Advisor in Education at UNICEF in New York/HQ responsible for strategy and research on equity and innovation in education. Having worked directly on programmes in Indonesia, Nepal, Ethiopia, Bangladesh, Bolivia and Haiti, South Africa, the US among others, he has extensive experience and expertise in policy analysis; program and systemic evaluation and monitoring; community mobilization, decentralization, governance and democratization in education; education and peacebuilding, education in fragile contexts, and implementing school reform. He received his M. Ed. from the University of Natal, South Africa and Doctor of Education (D. Ed.) from Harvard University. Among other publications he was the lead editor of the Springer publication, Community Schools in Africa - Reaching the Unreached.
Session 6 – Priorities for Education and Peacebuilding

Working in small groups of 6 to 8 people, attendees of the event identified priorities of moving forward in the field of education and peacebuilding at the community, civil society, national, and international levels. The session was geared towards identifying what individuals and/or organisations can do to contribute to these priorities.

The groups presented their recommendations on a series of posters that were hung around the venue, and which generated lively debates among the attendees. Despite the number of different recommendations, some clear trends came through. All the groups emphasized the importance of taking into account local thinking before defining evidence-based interventions. Participants identified the systematization of knowledge of contexts and dynamics of conflict as a priority. In order to obtain this knowledge, one group suggested there is a need to develop methodologies and approaches to understand local notions and dynamics of peace at the community level. Others suggested the priority of consultations, for example with youth. At the same time, the importance of creating awareness of rights and responsibilities and empowerment at the community level was also pointed to as a priority for peacebuilding and education.

One level up, to the national level, participants identified the priority of dealing with a lack of transparency and accountability vis-à-vis the other levels. Also, the need to better translate the values of INGOs and the UN to national policy was identified. Lastly, the need to address gender in education and teacher training was pointed to. At the level of donors, attendees prioritized the need for funding mechanisms that support the development of peacebuilding focussed policies at national level as well as incentives to support feedback loops.

Overall, the groups emphasized the priority to continuously engage and collaborate between the community, civil society, national and international level. Related to this, the need for stronger accountability of governments to citizens, or vertical social cohesion, was emphasized.
Session 7: Implications and Future Challenges for Donors, Governments, Policy makers and Practitioners (Panel discussion)

Summary

The final session was a round table discussion, chaired by Mieke Lopes Cardozo (University of Amsterdam). Panellists were Sharif Baaser (UNICEF HQ), Solvi Karlsson (UNOY), Khin Mar Aung (World Education Myanmar), Jordan Naidoo (UNESCO), and Kelsey Shanks (Ulster University).

In response to the first question how the organisations of the panellists approach peacebuilding, various strategies were emphasised, addressing the importance of advocacy at governmental level, bringing a social and community side to the peacebuilding agenda in response to a security-dominated field, community engagement through non-formal education, building capacity of teachers and youth in communities, and promoting nonviolent and disarming of (history) curricula in order for education to be able to be transformative. The need to understand and be sensitive to ethnic and linguistic contexts was emphasised: Kelsey Shanks gave the example of language of education with the Yazidis in Iraq, where a policy was implemented ensuring all those enrolled would be taught in Kurdish, without understanding that a majority of Yazidi also speak Arabic, and have a cultural attachment to Arabic. A lack of sensitivity to these issues can make things worse.

Discussing their most important and surprising learned lessons, panellists pointed to: the challenge of short (funding) timeframes that complicate strategic programme implementation; how demanding, complex and context dependent conflict analysis is, and the reflexivity needed from staff carrying out these analyses and programme implementation; the need to question assumptions of the influence communities and teachers might (not) have, and the severe discrimination, marginalisation and alienation youth may experience.

The final topic of the session was on future research agendas, on what we need and where the gaps are. The panellists pointed to the need for more political and technical training in addition to more research. More knowledge of how findings can be applied is also necessary. Sharif Baaser concluded by saying research should be closer to practitioners, as there is still a gap between research and practice. Programmes must be designed based on evidence, with the aim of strengthening connections to the real world.
Consortium Directors Dr Mieke Lopes Cardozo, Professor Mario Novelli and Professor Alan Smith.
Mario puts into practice what he’s learnt and convincingly convenes the day. After speaking on foundations and findings the future is now in our line of sight. Speaking beyond the stillness of the morning are eyes that express how the joys of the evening contribute beyond goals set. It’s about transforming our world through authentic partnerships director Naidoo stresses as he points out shortcomings, short falls and short sightedness.

There is a need for more than broad strokes and general idea’s. There is a need for more than good intentions and warm feelings. There is a need for more critical attention and attentiveness to inclusivity.

As he runs through his keynote stepping and turning towards and away from the microphone he unlocks doors and sidesteps the static reflections of our movement. He asks us to look critically and systemically at our goals.

Is it about scoring or making sure other are able to play? Is it about the sponsors on our shirts the hooligans in the stand or the Cruijf courts?

It’s the responsibility of everybody to change the playing field director Naidoo says. The national governments are the ones with the power consensus on an international level watered down initiatives are the result of the sovereign interpretations.

Because there is no shared definition of global citizenship it is so powerful. Swinging from gas to solid it can be the cloud we daydream under and the block of ice that breaks open safes after being poured in it’s liquid state.

There needs to be an engagement with the practicalities of the goals. From the drawing room to the class room it’s about the local the translation, the implementation, the differences and their acknowledgement. We need to trouble the focus on the repression of violence and move towards a rearticulation of peace as an instrument of education and education as fundamental for peace. Intertwining them like the pick pockets fingers around Lindsay’s wallet, stealing away the passive voice as our agency recognizing the circles we move in.

It’s about mobilizing resources moving moving movements beyond the abbreviations, the abstractions necessary to keep on going beyond the tears and the blurry visions of where our next steps will greet our eyes with a handshake or a hug three kisses or a nod. A recognition of presence an awareness of importance.
Mieke lists the backgrounds of the panelists and the globe opens itself up through the particular bodies sharing their knowledges with us. Each a kaleidoscopic collection of personal and institutional stories of learning.

It’s in the minds of men, women and the intersexed that peace is envisioned, mooring away from the top down peace building process, transforming the checklist bureaucracy into a paddle that feels the current and changes accordingly. Naive assumptions thrown overboard, ballast that impedes and slows down context acceptance. We’re distracted by our reflection in the water, the eyes that look back and forget the ground beyond the surface, forget the ones walking below our radars under our dialogues buried by our words. Questions are flying through the church like the pages of the open book in front of us. Plain English, or plain any other language is important to shift the paradigm. Shift and tilt the perspective produce the perspiration necessary that develops the muscles that were underused, push to the brink the comprehension of piecing together peace beyond something that is piecemeal, something that is flighty, something that is beyond our grasp. The pages are here now we need to add our shared ink.

An ink that is placed in the here and now but remains long after immediate emergencies of repairing broken books.

Mario notes the end as a transformative moment a time in space beyond the competition, an opportunity to look and jump beyond the podium beyond the institutional microphone to be heard by those we need to reach, the ones listening. A communist preacher; a contradiction. A local global; a revelation.

It’s the emergence of moving beyond the elites and rendering the social justice resurgence equal to the national interests. Researching beyond the money questioning through the confines analyzing with the power, the conflict the intervention.

Quinsy Gario ‘raps’ up the seminar in style!
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Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR), University of Amsterdam

The AISSR Programme Group Governance and Inclusive Development (http://aissr.uva.nl/programmegroups/item/governance-and-inclusive-development.html) consists of an interdisciplinary team of researchers focusing on issues relating to global and local issues of governance and development. The Research Cluster Governance of Education, Development and Social Justice focuses on multilevel politics of education and development, with a specific focus on processes of peacebuilding in relation to socio-economic, political and cultural (in)justices. The research group since 2006 has maintained a particular research focus on education, conflict and peacebuilding, as part of its co-funded ‘IS Academie’ research project with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Centre for International Education, University of Sussex

The Centre for International Education (CIE) (www.sussex.ac.uk/education/cie) was founded in 1989 on the premise that education is a basic human right that lies at the heart of development processes aimed at social justice, equity, social and civic participation, improved wellbeing, health, economic growth and poverty reduction. It is recognised as one of the premiere research centres working on education and international development in Europe. The Centre has also secured a prestigious UK ESRC/DFID grant to carry out research on the Role of Teachers in Peacebuilding in Conflict Affected Contexts, which aligns directly with the research strategy of the PBEA programme and will form part of the broader research partnership.

UNESCO Centre at Ulster University

Established in 2002 the UNESCO Centre (www.unescocentre.ulster.ac.uk) at the University of Ulster provides specialist expertise in education, conflict and international development. It builds on a strong track record of research and policy analysis related to education and conflict in Northern Ireland. Over the past ten years the UNESCO Centre has increasingly used this expertise in international development contexts, working with DFID, GIZ, Norad, Save the Children, UNESCO, UNICEF and the World Bank, providing research on education and social cohesion, the role of education in reconciliation and analysis of aid to education in fragile and conflict affected situations.
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