

(Re)Constructing Memory: Education, Identity, and Conflict

Michelle J. Bellino and
James H. Williams (Eds.)



SensePublishers

**(Re)Constructing Memory:
Education, Identity, and Conflict**

(Re)Constructing Memory: Education, Identity, and Conflict

Edited by

Michelle J. Bellino

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

and

James H. Williams

The George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA



SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM/BOSTON/TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: 978-94-6300-858-7 (paperback)

ISBN: 978-94-6300-859-4 (hardback)

ISBN: 978-94-6300-860-0 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,
P.O. Box 21858,
3001 AW Rotterdam,
The Netherlands
<https://www.sensepublishers.com/>

All chapters in this book have undergone peer review.

Cover image by Michelle J. Bellino

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved © 2017 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword to the Series: (Re)Constructing Memory: School Textbooks, Identity, and the Pedagogies and Politics of Imagining Community	vii
Acknowledgments	xi
1. Introduction <i>Michelle J. Bellino and James H. Williams</i>	1
Section 1: Nation-Building Projects in the Aftermath of Intimate Conflict	
2. What Framing Analysis Can Teach Us about History Textbooks, Peace, and Conflict: The Case of Rwanda <i>Elisabeth King</i>	23
3. Ideologies Inside Textbooks: Vietnamization and Re-Khmerization of Political Education in Cambodia during the 1980s <i>Saori Hagai, Yuto Kitamura, Khlok Vichet Ratha and William C. Brehm</i>	49
4. Construction(s) of the Nation in Egyptian Textbooks: Towards an Understanding of Societal Conflict <i>Ehaab D. Abdou</i>	75
Section 2: Colonialism, Imperialism, and Their Enduring Conflict Legacies	
5. Creating a Nation without a Past: Secondary-School Curricula and the Teaching of National History in Uganda <i>Ashley L. Greene</i>	101
6. From “Civilizing Force” to “Source of Backwardness”: Spanish Colonialism in Latin American School Textbooks <i>Matthias vom Hau</i>	127
7. The Crusades in English History Textbooks 1799–2002: Some Criteria for Textbook Improvement and Representations of Conflict <i>Fiona Kisby Littleton</i>	147
8. History Education, Domestic Narratives, and China’s International Behavior <i>Zheng Wang</i>	171

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 3: Interaction and Integration in Divided Societies

9. Addressing Conflict and Tolerance through the Curriculum 191
Tony Gallagher
10. Learning to Think Historically through a Conflict-Based Biethnic
Collaborative Learning Environment 209
Yifat Ben-David Kolikant and Sarah Pollack

**Section 4: The Democratic Role of Schools as Mediating Institutions
in Society**

11. Living with Ghosts, Living Otherwise: Pedagogies of Haunting in
Post-Genocide Cambodia 241
Cathlin Goulding
12. When War Enters the Classroom: An Ethnographic Study of Social
Relationships Among School Community Members on the
Colombian–Ecuadorian Border 269
Diana Rodríguez Gómez
13. From Truth to Textbook: The Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation
Commission, Educational Resources, and the Challenges of Teaching
about Recent Conflict 291
Julia Paulson
14. Nation, Supranational Communities, and the Globe: Unifying and
Dividing Concepts of Collective Identities in History Textbooks 313
Falk Pingel
- Index 335

FOREWORD TO THE SERIES

(RE)CONSTRUCTING MEMORY

School Textbooks, Identity, and the Pedagogies and Politics of Imagining Community

Official school textbooks provide a rich source of material for those seeking to understand the greater social effects of schooling and the larger social and political contexts of education. Textbooks provide official knowledge a society wants its children to acquire—facts, figures, dates, seminal events. Textbooks also frame the facts, figures, dates, and events in a larger, though generally implicit, narrative that describes how things were, what happened, and how they came to be the way they are now. A group’s representation of its past is often intimately connected with its identity—who “we” are (and who we are not) as well as who “they” are.

Analysis of textbooks provides a lens through which to examine what might be called a nation’s deeper or hidden social and political curriculum. Comparative and longitudinal analyses provide a better understanding of variations and continuities in these “curricula” over time and across national contexts. Moreover, analysis of the implicit “pedagogy” of teaching and learning in textbooks provides insight into the relationship envisioned between the student and history. Is history presented as an interpretation of events that are socially understood, constructed, and contested, and in which the individual has both individual and social agency, or as a set of fixed, unitary, and unassailable historical and social facts to be memorized? Do students have a role in constructing history, or is it external to them? How is history presented when that history is recent and contested?

These volumes propose a series of comparative investigations of the deeper social and political “curricula” of school textbooks, in contexts where

- The identity or legitimacy of the state has become problematic
- Membership or the relationship among members of the state has been challenged
- Conflict, or some aspect of conflict, remains unresolved

Throughout, the books seek to better understand the processes by which the implicit social and historical lessons in textbooks are taught and learned, or ignored.

Ultimately, the books are intended to promote a culture of mutual understanding and peace. To do this in a context of complex, often conflicting identities and ways of seeing the world requires a sophisticated understanding of the actual social and political uses and functions of textbooks. In particular, we highlight for further

research four interrelated issues: the identity and legitimacy of the state, membership and relationships among groups comprising and outside the state, approaches to unresolved conflict, and modes of teaching about these matters.

The state occupies an important role in the conception of these books, not to further privilege it but in acknowledgment of its central role in the provision of schooling, the organization of the curriculum, and the preparation of citizens. It is increasingly clear that the state is not the only salient actor in questions of collective, even national, identity—subnational and supranational influences play important, often primary, roles. Still, in the matter of school textbooks, the state is always at the table, even if silent and unacknowledged.

We hope to come away from these books with a better understanding of the ways school textbooks construct and are constructed by political collectives, how they inform group identity, conflict, and the collective memory. We hope to see what can be learned from a deep analysis of cases facing similar issues in quite different geographic and cultural circumstances. We hope to gain insight into nations, movements, social forces, and conflicts that have shaped the current era, the countries themselves, and the circumstances and decisions that led to particular outcomes.

The first volume, *(Re)Constructing Memory: School Textbooks and the Imagination of the Nation*, considers the relationship between school textbooks and the state. Schooling is one of the core institutions of the nation-state. The histories of mass schooling and the rise of the nation-state are closely intertwined. Textbooks offer official or semiofficial narratives of the founding and development of a state, and their stories play a formative role in helping construct the collective memory of a people. This volume is premised on the idea that changes in textbooks often reflect attempts by the state to deal with challenges to its identity or legitimacy. We look at ways textbooks are used to legitimize the state—to help consolidate its identity and maintain continuity in times of rapid change and external threat. This volume also considers the challenges of maintaining national identities in a global context and of retaining legitimacy by reimagining national identity.

(Re)Constructing Memory: Textbooks, Identity, Nation, and State, the second volume, looks more deeply at textbooks' role in portraying the composition and identity of nation and state. In contrast to many founding myths, most states are multiethnic, comprising multiple groups identified ethnically, in religious terms, as immigrants, indigenous, and the like. Volume II considers the changing portrayal of diversity and membership in multiethnic societies where previously invisible or marginalized minority groups have sought a greater national role. It considers the changing portrayals of past injustices by some groups in multiethnic states and the shifting boundaries of insider and outsider. The book looks at “who we are” not only demographically, but also in terms of the past, especially how we teach the discredited past. Finally, the book looks at changes in who we are—ways the state seeks to incorporate, or ignore, emergent groups in the national portraiture and in the stories it tells its children about themselves.

Conflict and wars play a critical role in defining most countries, through the portrayal of past victories, explanations of defeat, and identification of self and other. The third volume, *(Re)constructing Memory: Education, Identity, and Conflict*, focuses on these issues, especially in the context of unresolved conflict and issues derived from conflict. Beginning with a series of cases that examine shifts in the portrayal of self and other by historical antagonists, the volume then turns to the representation of conflict, both internal and external, and the representation of the nation's role in that conflict. Recent war is particularly difficult to teach, especially in cases of internal conflict. A series of cases considers the changing role of curriculum after discredited political regimes, civil war, and genocide. A final series of cases looks at curriculum used to promote peace, tolerance, and resolution of conflict. As a cumulative result, we develop a richer understanding of the intimate and contradictory connections between schools and war.

Throughout, the books consider the teaching and learning processes by which the explicit and implicit lessons of school textbooks are taught and acquired. Textbooks provide information and narrative, and in many ways they can be said to represent the intent of the state. Yet students do not ingest this intended curriculum whole. Instead, the intended curriculum is conveyed, and in the process interpreted, by teachers. It is then acquired by students, but in the process reinterpreted. All of these processes take place in a larger cultural and political environment that is, also, instructive. We consider the pedagogies of collective memory, of belonging and unbelonging, of historical thinking, and of the possibilities for individual and group agency as historic and civic actors. Efforts are made to avoid essentializing groups of people and to highlight individual and collective agency, while remaining aware of the powerful shaping forces of culture, tradition, and collective memory.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We have received a great deal of help in completing this book. We must thank our contributors and publisher. Especially deep gratitude to Cynthia Orticio, our copy editor, who has stayed with us throughout the three volumes of the project. We must thank the many anonymous reviewers for their feedback and comments, which were extraordinarily helpful.

We must thank a generation or more of graduate students, who worked with us on this project. Anisha Singh provided valuable assistance at a critical point in preparing this volume. Thank you! Other graduate students assisted in other volumes, alphabetically: Chizuru Asahina, Marilyn Hillarious, Karen Hopkins, Emily Koester, Natasha Kolar, Anne Laesecke, Asif Memon, Melinda Michaels, Alison Mills, Lindsey Peterson, Charles Prince, Sevanna Sammis, Anne Shimko, Krystyna Sonnenberg, Andrew Valent, Rebecca Wong, and Kathryn Ziga. Thank you all!

1. INTRODUCTION

The war broke out when Meliha was in elementary school. As schools across Bosnia and Herzegovina closed indefinitely, Meliha was unable to complete the fifth grade or play with many of her friends, whose families were on the “other side” of the conflict. Worried their daughter needed a distraction from the violence and hunger they were suffering, Meliha’s parents began a secret school in their basement, teaching math and basic skills to children who had no other chance to continue their education. When the war ended, Meliha’s aunts and uncles, who had fled to Germany during the war, returned and relocated to a region largely populated by Bosniaks, where her cousins could attend schools catering to Muslim students. As Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks resettled across Bosnia and Herzegovina, segregated schools became a driving force for migration. Meliha’s parents asked if she wanted to stay in her school, where she was one of only a few Muslim students. She opted to stay, rationalizing that her peers only teased her for wearing hijab occasionally, but the school’s good reputation would help her future prospects. Meliha was in high school when the Ministry of Education delivered an urgent memo. That day, students spent the afternoon seated over their textbooks with markers, as the teacher guided them through several passages to black out: a back-ground section to the war titled “Aggression,” another describing “The siege of Sarajevo,” and one recounting “The genocide in Srebrenica.” Now a teacher, Meliha continues to wonder about the day she was asked to alter the history of her country by omitting significant events that had shaped her childhood, her identity as a Bosnian, and her understanding of her country’s ongoing ethnonationalist divisions. She wondered: Had omitting conflict from the textbook done anything to rid their country of violence and division?¹

Research is increasingly gaining access to the intimacies of education and armed conflict. Meliha’s story illustrates the complex linkages between education and conflict, as well as the shifting goals and purposes of education during and after periods of violence. Education in Meliha’s life played a range of functions, alternating between a safe haven, a distraction, and a source of normality; to a site for development of identity and social belonging; to a credential with the potential to open and close certain futures; to a repository of official memories and legitimate knowledge. Similarly, wars play a critical role in shaping national identity and intergroup relations. Educating² young people during and about periods of conflict has a profound, multigenerational impact on their sense of political efficacy, ethical decision-making, and belonging. As an instrument of the state linked intimately

to the minds of young people, schools play a formative role—in conjunction with the informal curricula of family and community—in the ongoing construction and reconstruction of the national imaginary. To some, schools stand in for the state and its unwelcome intrusions into ideology, family, and community. At the same time, the relational interactions that take place within schools, as well as the politics of school access, language of instruction, and the opportunity structures that allow educated individuals to transition to meaningful roles in society, all speak to the ways that symbolic, structural, and physical violence intersect in educational spaces.

As the nature of conflict has shifted toward greater numbers of civilian victims of war, we are confronted with new questions about the educational trajectories of youth whose lives are interrupted by violence and also profoundly shaped by conflict. Half of the nearly 60 million children out of school across the globe live in conflict-affected settings, some inhabiting states embroiled in protracted conflicts and others forcibly displaced into conditions of asylum seeking and chronic statelessness. For their entire educational careers, these children and young people might lack legal citizenship status, confronting social exclusion and discrimination within and outside of school spaces. Still others come of age enduring the challenges of violent aftermaths of conflict alongside the promises of peace, democracy, and reconstruction, or within settings where everyday experience with social and political violence is normalized, if not institutionalized. Across these diverse contexts, we seek to examine and interrogate the underlying purposes and day-to-day functioning of schools and schooling. How do schools protect youth against the violence and division operating outside, and sometimes within, school walls? How do schools encourage young people to critically and honestly examine the causes and consequences of violence? How do schools contribute to national goals such as peacebuilding, engaged and positive citizenship, and prevention of violence? To what extent are schools and educators able to achieve the many expectations placed on them in the midst and aftermath of armed conflict? What are the necessary conditions for schools and educators to be able to fulfill these imagined roles?

However these questions are answered, much uncertainty remains in the thinking and practice of education as it relates to peace and conflict. What structures of school systems mitigate and redress conflict? What pedagogies foster attitudes respectful of democratic pluralism and engaged participation? What representations of conflict challenge presumed boundaries between *us* and *them*?

This collection seeks to explore how states and other social and political entities experiencing armed conflict and its aftermath conceive of and utilize education as a space for forging collective identity and national citizenship. In some contexts, the erasure of conflict and the homogenization of difference are central to shaping national identities and attitudes. In other contexts, collective memory of conflict is the central organizing frame through which citizenship and national identity are constructed. The essays in this volume illuminate varied and complex inter-relationships between education, conflict, and national identity, while accounting

for ways in which teachers, youth, and community members replicate, resist, and transform conflict through everyday interactions in educational spaces.

This volume is the third in a series entitled *(Re)Constructing Memory: School Textbooks, Identity, and the Pedagogies and Politics of Imagining Community*. The series set out to understand the greater social effects of schooling and the larger social and political contexts of education. Analysis of curricular material, we assert, provides a lens through which to examine a nation's formal and hidden social and political curriculum. Examination of curriculum reveals implicit tropes about which historical events are deemed significant by nature of their inclusion in the dominant narrative of a nation's past, while constructing visions of model citizenship. The first volume, examining curriculum in a collection of national case studies, focused on the ways in which schools responded to challenges presented to the legitimacy of the state. Such challenges are almost invariably external to the school system. They might be presented by the need to deal with an "inconvenient past," which challenges the positive narrative the state naturally wishes to convey, or the need to shore up citizens' waning commitment to the national project. Despite its public presentation as fixed and timeless, the nation often finds its legitimacy in need of support, cultivated through engagement with educational curriculum. The second volume considered challenges to membership in the state and the relationship among members, again largely through analysis of textbooks and other instructional materials. The volume considered the portrayal of sub-dominant groups in curriculum, how texts present and work to shape the ideal citizen, and by inference, the less than ideal.

This third volume centers on conflict, taking a broader perspective that educational systems, including but not limited to schools and formal curriculum, are primary sites through which the state, young people, and communities confront conflict and its legacies, even, in some cases, when these confrontations manifest as silence.

EDUCATION, PEACE, AND CONFLICT

Through their increased attention to the topic over the past 15 years, scholars and practitioners have come to new understandings about the relationship between education and conflict. Simplistic renderings of education's effortless benevolence have been willfully refuted and reframed through research by Dana Burde (2014), Elisabeth King (2014), James Williams (2004), and Lynn Davies (2004), all of whom point us to the myriad ways that education can instigate and perpetuate conflict. By now, we know that education functions in multiple, complex, and at times contrary ways. Education is a context for violence, its replication, and its resolution. Educational interactions can both build peace and foment violence, and there are many gradations between the "positive" and "negative" faces of education (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000). As such, education presents a cause, mechanism, and (partial) solution. In conflict situations, schools and school children are all too often intentional targets of violence. Still, parents value education highly and seek

ways to provide it for their children, even under difficult conditions. Communities experiencing conflict demonstrate this commitment to education through the forging of schools, even if illicit, in private spaces, and in the absence of teachers, infrastructure, and material resources, such as Meliha's "basement" school. Children and youth value opportunities to learn, particularly when opportunities for social and economic mobility are linked to formal education. To many, education offers hope for the future, though it also represents and too easily replicates society's divisions, particularly failures of nation-state building projects to include and enfranchise all peoples. To the uninformed policymaker, education may represent an unqualified good, drawing on the espoused intentions of educators. To those on the receiving end, education is more likely to resemble a scarce and rationed resource, available to some and not others through more or less legitimate mechanisms of distribution. For some identity groups, schools have always been sites of violence and discrimination. In contexts of scarcity and distrust, where all resources and actors have political implications, external support for schooling during and after conflict can exacerbate intergroup tensions and divisions, contributing to more conflict. Moreover, education generally has an ideological component, whether to bind otherwise unrelated individuals into a shared sense of nationality, to foster a sense of collective grievance, or, less commonly, to promote a sense of shared humanity across borders. Yet these identities, too, are conveyed differently to different groups, and at times come with implicit messages that belonging is only achieved through assimilation and a public renunciation of important dimensions of one's identity.

For many states impacted by conflict, the primary educational concern becomes ensuring access to safe schools rather than implementing large-scale policy or curricular reform. Yet efforts to privilege access over instructional quality and relevance have been critiqued for closing access gaps without attention to the uneven teaching and learning that takes place in schools, thereby creating new gaps in quality. In other cases, institutional inequity is sidestepped while policymakers implement curricular and pedagogical reforms aimed at supporting inclusion and political reforms such as democratization. These efforts to address school and classroom-level realities solely through instruction, without tackling structural issues such as differential access, often perpetuate existing inequalities.

Schools affect, and are affected by, the conflict in what they teach, the ways education is delivered, and the ways schools are embedded in and function in relation to opportunity structures in the broader society. These understandings, while absent of the rich contextual details that animate the cases in this collection, provide an important starting point for further interrogation of the interrelatedness of education, conflict, and society.

EDUCATION AND THE NATION

Despite education's potential for contributing to conflict, schools continue to be regarded as important spaces for acknowledging conflict and remaking relationships

between individuals and groups, within communities, and between citizens and the state. Across post-conflict settings, the subject of history is especially fraught and vulnerable to political contests over who has the authority to narrate the past, and whether historical injustice should be taught in schools at all. To understand the gravity of these debates, we need to consider the construction of national identity and its ironic malleability. Is it not odd how often the boundaries of such a fixed, essential, even primordial entity shift? The nation has been theorized as “a territorially bounded community moving together through time” (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001, p. 51). In this sense, education about the past, including periods of conflict, does more than establish a sense of the nation “as a collective entity.... [It] creates an essence which itself is timeless” (p. 139). History education, then, is essential to the nation-building project. Carretero (2011) has added to this discussion the corresponding prevalence of national myths that emerge as “master narratives,” alongside symbols of the nation-state embedded in everyday school routines, all designed to promote loyalty and allegiance to the nation.

From the perspective of the state, then, there is good reason to silence or smooth out periods of internal conflict and instead look to historical periods that lend themselves to more positive constructions of nationhood and national unity. Yet there is growing recognition that studying the past might prove integral to developing citizens who embrace their roles in shaping more peaceful futures. The challenge for schools is deciding on “whether and how” (Paulson, 2015) to engage with histories of conflict in ways that leave young people informed about the choices and events that have shaped their societies, as well as empowered to intervene to prevent future violence. Closely related are beliefs that history, social studies, and citizenship education become microcosms of the conflicts they aim to depict, reflecting persistent memory contests circulating in wider society, particularly in the face of ongoing power disputes that reflect conflict-related identities. At stake is more than the transmission of a particular historical narrative, but the legitimacy of the state itself, so that “the party in power ... will create a history that structures civic identity in its own image” (Freedman, Weinstein, Murphy, & Longman, 2008, p. 684). Fluctuations in power help us better understand how dramatic shifts in curriculum become entrenched as new and undisputable truths.

Schools teach us who we are and who we are supposed to be, the scope of acceptable and exemplary citizenship, and the benefits bestowed on those who belong. We also learn who we are not, who the others are, and the repercussions felt when those who do not belong enter the civic space and make demands on the state. The national imaginary is in a state of constant flux, expanding and contracting, continually made and remade. During periods of conflict, Abu El-Haj (2015) reminds us, “the edges of belonging and not belonging [are] sharpened.... However, although these edges are hardened in the face of war, they rely on boundaries that already exist” (p. 105). Social distinctions and exclusions are generally present long before violent outbreaks, often with the distinct complicity of schools and the everyday nationalism that circulates within these spaces.

The conceptual distinction between Billig's (1995) "banal nationalism" and Ben-Porath's (2006) "belligerent nationalism" is useful here. Everyday "banal" efforts to forge a national imaginary become naturalized, routine, and invisible as they permeate daily life, juxtaposed with the exclusionary politics of "belligerent nationalism," which presumably provides protection during war and threats to the nation's security. Importantly, harmful messages and practices in schools do not surface only as explicit expressions of bigotry, inferiority, and "belligerent nationalism." As a number of researchers have demonstrated, harmful practices might comprise "banal nationalism," deriving from positive intentions to foster peace, social cohesion, and national unity. Attempts to construct national identity often homogenize difference or presume that new discourses of multiculturalism reposition historically marginalized groups on equal footing with those who have long enjoyed the benefits of national membership or privilege (Bellino, 2014). In other cases, they convey social belonging as "conditional" (Rios-Rojas, 2014) or "impossible" (Abu El-Haj, 2015) for particular groups.

A persistent question in the field remains whether reforms in the education sector are mechanisms for peacebuilding and social reconciliation, or whether they simply reflect a changed society more ready and willing to confront its violent past. Authors of this collection grapple with this tension, ultimately left unresolved, illuminating the potential for both. Surely if we can recognize education's contributions to conflict, we can also recognize its potential for unmaking and remaking these relationships. Yet solutions are not easy reversals. By now it seems a truism that education will follow political and social changes in the larger society. But we must also ask under what conditions might it precede and lead them as well? Posing this question reasserts longstanding debates about the reproductive tendencies and transformative potential of educational institutions.

Education's capacity for replication, resistance, and transformation depends on whether education is conceived as an oppressive or liberating societal force. In other words, is the intended purpose—and the perception of those experiencing the education system—that school is a site of critical *development* of autonomous civic agents, or a site of *domination*, where youth are inculcated as compliant subjects of the state (Levinson, 2011)? Do students develop a sense of stake in their society, or are decisions made above and without them? Is schooling available to and representative of all groups in civil society, or are some favored with higher quality institutions, resources, and educators? Adding to the complexity, reproduction, resistance, and transformation can take place simultaneously at different levels, reinforcing and undercutting their potential for change. A student may experience substantial discrimination as a member of a disfavored group on the one hand, while finding possibilities for individual mobility on the other. A teacher may experience pressure to teach what she might consider an oppressive curriculum, but find opportunities to create dialogue and foster critical thinking among her students. These complexities underlie many of the chapters that follow, made visible in policy-level debates about curriculum, student and community responses to educational messages, and the

challenges of implementing policy reform in classrooms led by teachers who may not wholeheartedly buy into the goals of those who make the big decisions.

ORGANIZATION OF COLLECTION

We have organized this collection around four somewhat overlapping themes, each highlighting a distinct intersection of education and conflict: (1) nation-building projects in the aftermath of intimate conflict; (2) colonialism, imperialism, and their enduring conflict legacies; (3) interaction and integration in divided societies; and (4) the democratic role of schools as mediating institutions in society. Each of the four groupings speaks to the ways that education is envisioned and utilized as a collective space for constructing and reconstructing national identity and civic values during and after periods of conflict.

Nation-Building Projects in the Aftermath of Intimate Conflict

Among the most challenging tasks facing the state is rebuilding a sense of camaraderie and belonging following internal armed conflict. In such contexts, those directly involved in conflict, even victims and their perpetrators, live near each other and may have historically intermingled, intermarried, and shared the civic space. In her account of civil war in Peru, Kimberly Theidon (2013) referred to the “volatile social world” (p. xiii) of living amongst “intimate enemies.” Schools would seem to have an important role to play in such circumstances in working toward peace and social repair. Still, schools and school actors are inherently entangled in these charged and morally complex webs of power. Additionally, teachers are generally poorly equipped to manage the highly charged interactions necessary for such work. As a result, common consequences include public silence about the conflictual past or a bright look toward the future that ignores the conflict, its root causes, and its ongoing legacies.

Elisabeth King’s chapter builds on her previous insights that schools can play multiple roles during conflict, *reflecting* existing social and political conditions, *amplifying* discourses and tensions, and at times *motivating* different intergroup relationships (King, 2014). Recognizing the dearth of tools and frameworks that allow us to move beyond the question of “whether” we should teach the past and into the “how” (Paulson, 2015), King employs framing analysis in her approach to understanding and assessing history curriculum as it relates to conflict and peace. Differentiating between diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frames (drawing on Bedford & Snow, 2000), she explores the framing and reframing of particular episodes in Rwandan history across curricular texts produced from the late 1930s to the present. Rendering these implicit narrative frames visible, King examines the continuity and shifts among textual representations of ethnicity and conflict. Like vom Hau (this volume), her work demonstrates that these frames reflect the interests of the ethnic group in control of state power at the time. Her analysis points to

ways that states organize and (re)present knowledge for their own purposes, often with harmful implications for young learners developing as individual citizens and coming into a sense of national identity. King's work aims to bridge narrative representations of national identity and action, distinguishing between frames that *mobilize consensus* and frames that *mobilize action*.

Saori Hagai, Yuto Kitamura, Khlok Vichet Ratha, and William Brehm focus on education reforms in Cambodia in the immediate aftermath of the Pol Pot regime, when tensions were high and state legitimacy was questioned nationally and internationally. The authors argue that the restructuring of the education system and curriculum in subjects such as moral and political education allowed Cambodians to begin to come to terms with the Pol Pot era as a formative part of their national identity. The new state utilized the school system as an antidote to the Khmer Rouge's purposeful use of formal and nonformal education to spread propaganda among youth. Balancing distinct forces of Vietnamization, which emphasized an international socialism, and re-Khmerization, which emphasized cultural pride, the authors argue that these early efforts helped achieve national unity and possibly contributed to later, more intentional engagement with genocide education.

Ehaab Abdou seeks to explain recent political events in Egypt—democratic demonstrations spurred by the Arab Spring in 2011, the fall of Mubarak, the election of the Muslim Brotherhood, the fall of Morsi, and current polarization. Throughout abrupt swings in government and public sentiment, support for the military remains strong. Why? Abdou traces this support to a deliberate attempt on the part of the current regime to align itself with a “schematic narrative template” long implicit in Egyptian life. Drawing on the work of Wertsch (1998), Abdou analyzes school textbooks for evidence of this storyline, which at its simplest “represents a *quest for liberation from foreign control and conspiracies, with the aid of an Egyptian army/a military leader*.” This notion, elaborated in the chapter, has been “deeply entrenched for decades in the psyche of Egyptian citizens,” enforced and reinforced through educational institutions, alongside popular culture and political forums. Abdou's study explores how these organizational frames essentialize Egyptian identity in ways that smooth out the diversity of the people and complexities of their history. Such histories foreclose debate and close the public space for greater and more diverse forms of citizens' participation in civic governance.

One implication that emerges from this section is the importance of differentiating between nation-building projects that build in-group solidarity by reinforcing, even generating, intergroup tensions and more inclusive efforts to assert a (new) national identity that seeks to redress earlier exclusionary frameworks. Both efforts highlight the influential role of educational constructions of the nation and the ways that curricular materials may be reconfigured for different political purposes. Revising curriculum to (re)construct national identity can reflect a number of distinct intentions in pursuit of nation-building, some that come with the risk—or even the intent—of “othering” groups within and outside of national borders.

Colonialism, Imperialism, and Their Enduring Conflict Legacies

Colonial and precolonial imperialist relationships manifest globally in the institutional structuring of school systems, the underlying values and forms of mass education, and the construction of the post-colonial nation. Long after these encounters, the legacies of these inherently violent interactions continue to mark national identity, organize relationships between and among colonized and colonizer states, and often institutionalize the marginalization of others within national borders. Social groupings intentionally shaped through colonial encounters have historically granted some peoples greater access to education than others. Such access is typically accompanied by assumptions about some groups being more “naturally” inclined to occupy positions of power in the formal political structure. The chapters in this section carefully consider the ways in which states have responded to colonial encounters and their approaches to constructing national identity after independence.

Ashley Greene explores these legacies in Uganda, where efforts to create a unified national identity through the telling of a colonial past have been recurrently challenged by post-independence instability, periods of violent state repression, and conflicting local identities. Despite attempts to build Ugandan national consciousness through the revision of colonial narratives, curricular reforms have encountered significant political resistance, resulting in a silencing of national history in favor of pan-African and global narratives. Greene demonstrates the limits placed on history instruction in a context where teachers are granted official autonomy over curriculum but do not feel sufficiently secure to critique power structures. Denied access to their national history in their own schooling, Greene’s teachers were instead exposed to Eurocentric content rooted in a narrative of Western progress. Teachers who once experienced education as out of sync with their everyday experiences of marginalization might be compelled to acknowledge silenced histories of oppression. Yet even today, they are not consistently empowered (or even sufficiently aware in some cases) to challenge the narratives and silences they perpetuate in their classrooms. Amidst educators’ persistent fears of “spies in the classroom,” Greene identifies the ways that individual teachers creatively resist the official narrative and silences embedded in the curriculum.

Matthias vom Hau’s chapter focuses on similar state efforts to revise educational messages. Initially intended to shape colonial subjects, the educational project later shifted toward developing citizens of an independent nation. Through a comparative historical analysis, vom Hau examines curricular representations of Spanish colonialism in Mexico, Argentina, and Peru, finding that these countries shaped post-colonial national identity projects in strikingly similar ways. He locates convergence in a narrative shift in the portrayal of colonialism from a “civilizing force” to a “source of backwardness” necessary for understanding post-colonial political and socioeconomic development trajectories. Yet the timing and extent of these shifts varied across settings, illustrating that political and institutional reforms alone do not shift identity narratives, nor are they simply a byproduct of naturally

occurring social memory processes. Rather, these curricular reforms entailed intentional engagements between state regimes and the education sector, contingent on favorable political circumstances and teacher support. Accounting for teacher agency, vom Hau explores political ideology, socioeconomic status, and community context as indicators of support and resistance for state reforms at the school level. Teachers' perceptions of state legitimacy, as well as the ways in which teachers position themselves vis-à-vis the state, as subversive agents or representatives of the state order, emerge as important factors to consider in the enactment of curricular reform aimed at reconstructing the nation.

Fiona Kisby Littleton draws on an extensive range of English textbooks, spanning two centuries, to examine representations of the Crusades as a lens into enduring global relations between Christianity and Islam. The author documents the ways that European Christian actors have been endowed with historical agency and positive motivations for the violence of the Crusades much more frequently than Muslims, noting that this discrepancy has been sustained in texts over several centuries. When Muslim actors are portrayed with agency, it is often of a criminal nature, prompting and rationalizing the use of religiously sanctioned violence. Over time, Kisby Littleton finds that more balanced textbook accounts are featured as a dimension of epistemological complexity, aligning with the evolution and growing trend toward disciplinary approaches to history instruction. In examining these accounts over time and their interaction with Orientalist, exoticizing, inferior, and at times criminal framings, the author argues that historical representations in education texts have contributed to problematic and persistent narratives that position Islam as an enduring "other" within and without the Western world. As such, Islam remains "a problem to be solved," and the stage is implicitly set for an ongoing process of "othering" of Muslim peoples.

These chapters demonstrate the ways that the legacies of imperialism and colonialism have posed distinct challenges to reconstruction of social arrangements and stratification within colonized states and colonized discourses. While shaping national identity as a consequence of foreign domination, states simultaneously aim to portray active efforts from within their own borders to establish independence and authority. The identity of these states as sovereign entities, and the colonial classifications that labeled select peoples "indigenous," have their origins in experiences of violence, repressive subordination, and, in many cases, popular revolution. Legacies of imperialism are further complicated by the nature of the racial, ethnic, and religious hybridity that remain salient forms of identification, often with distinct social statuses. For example, the experience of colonialism in Latin America and subsequent modes of meaning-making have led to enduring constructions of racial difference and *mestizaje* in the Americas, constructs that lend themselves to recognizing the shared social composition of societies across Latin America, as well as the ways these racialized identities are continually juxtaposed with whiteness within and outside the region. Depictions of the Crusades are similarly entrenched in contemporary discourses of Islamophobia, the geopolitical imaginary of the Arab

and Muslim world, and the inadequacies of constructing Muslim and non-Muslim as oppositional identities. We might also use this set of analyses as an opportunity to examine the ways that colonial relationships continue to operate today in the education sector, though in distinct, albeit still hegemonic, forms such as West-East and North-South policy borrowing flows, conditional educational investments, and the inheritance of flawed education structures that were designed to sort, classify, and exclude, rather than liberate and educate all peoples (Samoff, 2007). The systems themselves, in these cases, comprise legacies of imperialism.

The legacy of imperialism plays out quite differently in Zheng Wang's telling of China's efforts to revise its national memory from a Marxist-Leninist interpretation of history to a nationalist narrative based on "a century of national humiliation." Like others, Wang argues that education plays a supporting role in larger national projects. He traces the shift in focus from a historical understanding of class warfare in the 1980s and 1990s to a narrative of historical humiliation and links the emergence of this narrative to a justification for more assertive, even aggressive, foreign policy, in which China itself might appear, to outsiders, as imperial in its demands and strategies employed to achieve global power. Viewed from the Chinese perspective of historical humiliation, however, Wang argues that such assertiveness is seen as a natural and healthy response by a self-respecting nation.

Interaction and Integration in Divided Societies

Across conflict-affected and post-conflict contexts, racial, ethnic, class, religious, and other forms of segregation are recognized as inherent contradictions and anathemas to post-conflict goals of multiculturalism, social cohesion, and peacebuilding. In many cases, we can assume that segregation contributes to the triggering or escalation of intergroup violence and impedes efforts toward reconciliation. It is easier to dehumanize the other from a distance, when one lacks personal experience or face-to-face encounters from which to empathize and counter negative stereotypes. Whether an artifact of *de hure* or *de facto* arrangements, segregated school systems convey an inability to join together the worldviews of different identity groups. Moreover, tailoring different schools for different groups of people serves as a formal reminder of social hierarchies and the limits on social belonging for some. The two chapters in this section take up issues of social division, segregated learning contexts, and the challenges of social integration.

Tony Gallagher's chapter highlights the persistent tensions that work against school reform for integration in divided societies where social groups implicated in identity-based conflict are geographically segregated and funneled into separate school systems underpinned by different beliefs about the past and present. In this context, teachers' religious, political, and professional identities collectively influence their roles in perpetuating these divisive dynamics, whether or not they are consciously aware of them. Examining more than a decade of curricular reforms in Northern Ireland, Gallagher finds that revisions to history and citizenship curriculum

are necessarily (re)interpreted by school-based actors, where they intersect with wider social forces and constraints such as competitive public commemoration, divisive narratives within communities, and separatist politics more broadly. Given the powerful forces outside of schools, Gallagher argues that, despite concerted ministry efforts at reforming curriculum, there remains insufficient engagement with the violent past after middle school years. Meanwhile, young people's political attitudes are actively shaped by the divisive narratives they are exposed to outside of school. With schools doing little to counter or complicate these views, Gallagher finds that other actors too easily "fill the historical space."

What if, rather than a textual encounter, live interactions with the "other" could humanize and make it impossible to ignore perspectives that contradict our own? Yifat Ben-David Kolikant and Sarah Pollack's chapter centers on a curricular intervention designed to facilitate intergroup dialogue in an integrated classroom in Israel, with Israeli Jew and Israeli Arab/Palestinian students. Based on design principles informed by contact theory, the authors developed a collaborative web-based writing assignment requiring mixed groups of students to interact with one another while interpreting conflicting historical accounts of the 1917 Balfour Declaration/Promise. In a setting where Jews' and Arabs' historical interpretations and social identities are presumed to be mutually exclusive, the authors explore the relationship between dialogue, recognition of other perspectives, and historical empathy. Giving careful consideration to the relational elements of the dialogical interactions and students' engagement with disciplinary practices, the authors point to the possibilities of web-based, digital platforms to foster meaningful interactions with others who might be physically near but remain socially distant and isolated. This work also serves as a reminder of the importance of students' sense of security in expressing divergent viewpoints, with implications for classroom cultures and norms of discussion within school communities. Finally, it suggests the care with which education interventions must be crafted to begin to build empathy across members of communities in conflict.

In the aftermath of conflict, teaching about the violent past, as most authors in this collection hope educators will do, is made particularly challenging by the enduring nature of physical segregation and separatist politics that shape broader societal relations. In integrated classrooms, divisive perspectives on controversial subjects need to be sensitively managed and negotiated, whereas in segregated classrooms, the perspective of the other is more likely to be dismissed as invalid or ignored entirely (Bellino, 2016). In all cases, teachers recognize the need to be cautious about broaching topics that might be highly personal and emotive for students and their families. In many cases, these topics are personal and emotive for teachers as well. As numerous studies have found, teachers are often tasked with implementing a curriculum that implicates them and calls into question their own experiences and decisions made in the context of conflict (Freedman et al., 2008; Murphy & Gallagher, 2009). Moreover, teachers' concerns over classroom dynamics and their students' well-being during politically charged conversations reflect their attention to the relationships

they are building between schools and communities, at times with significant power differentials between themselves and their students' families.

Schools as Mediating Spaces

Arguably, schools are among the most pervasive and intimate daily points of contact between young people and the state. Schools comprise what Alexis de Tocqueville conceived as “mediating institutions,” essential to democracy in their potential for civic discourse. They “create social spaces and social relationships that connect citizens of all ages to each other and to the other major sectors of society” (Kassimir & Flanagan, 2010, p. 93). Through formal and hidden curricula, schools teach students about their political membership, roles and efficacy in the larger collective, as well as the rights and responsibilities of such membership. Students bring to school a rich informal curriculum acquired through interaction with family and community, which also contains a sense of membership along with terms and conditions. To the extent that these groups and their ideas are in conflict, the school can represent a site of cognitive and social dissonance for the student or teacher. Accordingly, schools can buffer students from the effects of conflict, poverty, and injustice that they might be experiencing in their everyday lives. But they can also serve as drivers of inequality, intergroup tension, and violence. Schools can empower or disempower young people in becoming active citizens capable of preventing violence and contributing to a more just society. The three chapters in this section examine everyday interactions across formal and informal modes of education, mediating teachers' and young people's identifications with the state.

Cathlin Goulding uses an autoethnographic lens to contrast a genocide education curriculum in Cambodia as taught in formal classroom settings, a genocide museum open to public visitors and frequented by international memory tourists, and a collaborative zine-making project with informal education goals. In each of these spaces, Goulding demonstrates how Cambodians are asked to recognize that the past is not *past*. Rather, the Cambodian people are “living with ghosts.” Living concurrently with the horrors of the past, Cambodians demonstrate resilience in their capacity to continue in the aftermath of mass suffering and their refusal to let the past be unhinged from post-genocide life. Legacies embrace the fabric of everyday life in the form of hauntings. Although these three educative spaces occupy different social spheres with distinct pedagogical goals, and involve distinct national and global actors, their perspectives contribute to the complexity and power of a narrative of hauntings that alters a sense of “post-war” temporality.

Diana Rodríguez Gómez explores how daily exposure to violence at the Colombia-Ecuador border shapes identities and social interactions among students and teachers within school spaces. She asks what kinds of social and identity-making spaces schools provide when students are growing up amidst protracted armed conflict as an everyday fact of life. In this configuration, schools complicate and interact with conflict settings, generating unpredictable and potentially volatile relationships that

penetrate education spaces. Schools do not necessarily protect youth from violence, nor do they reproduce external conflict dynamics wholesale. In examining these interactions through the lens of Bourdieu's (1989) social space, social capital, and frameworks that position violence as underlying societal arrangements, rather than *un*making them (e.g., Scheper-Hughes, 1992), she illustrates how identities formalized through affiliations with armed groups and mediated by differential statuses such as soldier, guerrilla, and refugee are not necessarily the way individuals come to see themselves. Her chapter provides a rich description of the ways young people caught up in protracted conflict negotiate their identities and roles in the mediating space of the school, where members of multiple groups and political alliances interact.

In the final chapter, Julia Paulson considers the relationship between education and post-conflict transitional justice processes in Peru. Revealing a lost opportunity for education reform, Paulson examines the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's intentional efforts to collaborate with the education sector, framing the commission report as the source of a new historical narrative, one grounded in a consensus process aimed at documenting historical truth. While the commission's educative potential and willingness to engage with the Ministry of Education created authentic openings for curricular revision, the possibilities of reform became entangled in conflict dynamics unresolved in the political sphere. Following public defaming of curricular materials designed to represent the violent past consistent with the commission's findings, the ministry subsequently took steps to remove discussions of state actors who committed human rights violations, portraying the conflict as a historical inevitability and the fault of rural peasants. Paulson's study reveals the ways that narratives of conflict are negotiated and interpreted simultaneously at local, national, and global levels, so that shortcomings in the education system allow powerful interests to shift the blame from political actors to schools themselves, while delegitimizing transitional justice and peace processes more broadly.

In these various ways, schools represent a space where unresolved tensions and conflict in the larger public sphere play out. These chapters also illuminate the civic potential of schools, which are extensions of the state, but also spaces where students can cultivate and exercise political agency in opposition to the state. Often excluded from policymaking decisions, teachers are presumed to carry out top-down reforms, regardless of whether they agree with them or feel capable of enacting them. In much of the literature on education and conflict, "the state" and "international organizations" are cast as the dominant agents wielding great power. Indeed they are, and they do. The state has its view, sometimes unitary, but as with implementation of policy, there is variable, often considerable, space for negotiation among actors within schools and classrooms. These chapters showcase the agency in everyday decisions made by teachers, students, and community members to take up, adapt, resist, and challenge messages that come from above and outside the state. There are also occasions in which students, teachers, and parents subvert possibilities for civil dialogue, entrenching silence or promoting biased accounts. Understanding these

processes necessitates engaging with the power dynamics of the conflict, such as the students in the Ecuadorian Putumayo who threaten school actors with their political networks, and the rapid and covert silencing of Peru's Ministry of Education. The success of schools as sites for peacebuilding and democratic citizenship, in these cases, depends to a great extent on the space, tools, and attitudes that these agents have at their disposal, including their relative power and capacity to imagine themselves as capable agents of positive change.

REFLECTIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Curriculum in Context

In this volume, we have compiled studies in an attempt to broaden and complicate the ways in which education is understood as related to armed conflict, its causes, and the legacies it leaves behind. Education, or more precisely formal schooling, serves a number of purposes. Its primary aim is to transmit skills and knowledge to future generations. It certifies successful completion of bodies of knowledge with credentials, which are linked more or less directly to the labor market. Because demand for such skills and credentials almost invariably exceeds their availability, school systems must also find ways to sort and allocate scarce places in schools, particularly at higher levels of education. Most contemporary school systems are funded and operated, or at a minimum regulated, by the state, even in the context of growing trends toward privatization. Following Benedict Anderson (1982), many have argued (Abu El-Haj, 2015; Carretero, 2011; Heater, 2004; Torres, 1998; Williams, 2014; Williams & Bokhorst-Heng, 2016) that the state uses schools, in part, to construct and maintain the "imagined community" of the nation as well as, more pointedly, to help sustain and maintain the legitimacy of the state and the existing social and political order. These tendencies can be seen especially clearly in history and social studies textbooks, where curricular resources permit close textual analysis.

The idea for this book began with the intention of studying the portrayal of wars and conflicts in school textbooks, anticipating that representations of past victories, explanations of defeat, injustice, and admissions of wrongdoing would offer important insights into the role of conflict in constructing images of self and other. We continue to believe that studies of curricular resources offer valuable insights into the relationship between education and conflict, particularly through the lens of national identity and the ongoing need for legitimacy. In many parts of the world, including stable societies with robust education systems, new and under-trained teachers rely largely on textbooks and structure teaching and learning through methods not so far from rote pedagogy. Education systems with weak capacity, such as those experiencing or emerging from conflict, might distribute textbooks long before they offer comprehensive professional training opportunities, especially in more complex undertakings such as teaching historical inquiry, deconstructing the causes of conflict, and working to address and resolve everyday conflicts among

students in the classroom. Although we by no means endorse approaches that entrench textbooks and teachers as the sole authorities and conveyors of legitimate knowledge, we recognize the importance of textbooks and other formal curricula in classrooms around the world.

We also advocate for a concerted effort to link studies of curriculum and the important insights they yield to instructional practice, the micro and macro structures of schools, and the everyday experiences and perceptions of those who teach and learn there. For one thing, as we know from personal experience, the contents of textbooks are not transferred directly from the pages into the minds and memories of learners. Studying textbooks in isolation provides a moderately good understanding of the intentions of textbook writers, and by inference an understanding of the constraints they face, but only a limited understanding of what teachers and students think, believe, and do with that content. Indeed, we know relatively little about the ways textbooks are utilized by those who feel more and less visible in the narratives and constructions of nationhood they convey. We have not yet fully explored the ways in which state-generated curricula might be routinely challenged or subverted by teachers and students, “known” but not “believed” (Wertsch, 2000). And we know remarkably little about how these curricula interact with everyday experiences of inclusion and exclusion in the imaginary of the nation-state, or citizens’ impressions of whether conflicts were justly fought or justly resolved.

Teaching Conflict

That conflict increasingly takes place among warring parties *within* rather than *between* states has changed the task of teaching about conflict. A consensus narration of such conflicts is almost inherently impossible, especially when, as in many cases, conflict is protracted, continuing into the present and future, or unresolved, and where memories of conflict remain “active” even after fighting has stopped (Yogev, 2014). Many of the authors in this volume discuss education in the context of these more complicated kinds of conflict—internal, ongoing, actively remembered, and publicly contested or censored. Often, this kind of conflict is, in Theidon’s (2013) wording, a marker of “intimate violence,” where members of groups in conflict live nearby and attend school together. Presenting controversial content is made more difficult when teachers already struggle to facilitate inclusive classrooms. In an effort to circumvent these tensions, many teachers evade discussions of conflict, either by glossing over historical injustices and cautiously obscuring their connections to the contemporary state of affairs, or by erasing them from the taught curriculum altogether (e.g., Murphy & Gallagher, 2009).

Throughout these chapters, authors grapple with the social, economic, and political contexts through which educational curriculum, instruction, and organization have shifted in tandem with conflict and peace processes. While Paulson centers her analysis in Peru’s transitional justice process, other authors reference these moments as potentially decisive turning points in the capacity for states to come

to terms publicly with conflict. Initiatives described in these cases moved forward when messages promoted in textbooks, educational media, and through school interactions reinforced each other and mirrored messages from other modes of public engagement or informal education. Single or solely educational interventions were less successful. Education in the context of transitional justice is a fruitful area for further research, one with implications for how education reform can capitalize on moments of political transition. More locally, classroom teachers can be ready—if properly prepared—to take advantage of “teachable moments,” even and perhaps especially when these moments are politically and emotionally charged.

Authors in this collection largely agree that schools must teach about conflict so that students can understand the conditions that led to violence and division, share in a collective responsibility to resolve past injustices, and prevent their recurrence. These chapters, and the empirical data on which they draw, elicit questions about the quantity, frequency, and nature of engagement with violent pasts in formal education settings. For example, how much is too much exposure, and how little is too little? Hagai, Kitamura, Ratha, and Brehm document horrific images and narratives of Pol Pot’s regime aimed at third graders. At the other extreme, experiences of colonial violence are swept out of sight in the name of national development, war crimes are removed from the Peruvian curriculum, and young people in Northern Ireland grow up knowing little about people unlike themselves. Here we are reminded of the importance of teaching conflict in ways that allow for moral complexity, as well as room for students to derive a sense of moral clarity. Stark representations of good and evil may not be conducive to critical understandings of conflict. This work is easier said than done, especially in the midst of distorted and politicized representations of conflict, where teachers urgently want students to leave school with a clear sense of right and wrong (Bellino, 2014).

We have suggested that schools contribute to peace and conflict through what they teach, how schooling is delivered, and how schools function socially. Of course, expressions of belonging voiced through discourses of intolerant, “belligerent nationalism” (Ben-Porath, 2006) have contributed to a great deal of historical conflict and unequivocally displayed education’s “negative face” (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000). It is clear, however, that the relationship between education and conflict is worked out in much more complex and nuanced ways than overt othering. As Rosaldo (1994) noted, “In its official pronouncements, the state emphasizes its capacity to enfranchise and plays down its twin capacity to disenfranchise” (p. 403). Understanding the hidden curriculum of schools necessitates that researchers and practitioners listen for and document the ways that exclusion masks as inclusion, while intolerance masks as freedom.

Acknowledgment and Accountability

We write this in a period of unprecedented global conflict and forced migration, of escalating nationalism and xenophobia. Paradoxically, globalization has made the

nation-state both more and less salient in the educational lives and trajectories of young people. As borders between states become more fluid and digital technologies link diverse peoples through transnational networks, radical discourses about those who belong and those who are guests, foreigners, and others among us become more “belligerently” defended. The easy assumption of the nation-state as a natural and primary organizing unit and reference point for collective life needs interrogation, and doing so means moving beyond explicit and official assertions of nationhood into the everyday spaces where social belonging is negotiated, contested, and denied. Regrettably, there are far too many conflicts, historical and ongoing, that have impacted education systems and limited young people’s opportunities for futures unmarred by violence than can be documented in this book. Likewise, there are appallingly many instances where educational structures, curriculum, pedagogy, disciplinary policies, and everyday practices within schools render education and educational actors complicit in social and political conflict.

Indeed, across studies of conflict and education, there is a striking absence of accountability for state involvement in mass violence. W. E. B. DuBois (1935/1992) famously argued against the educational silencing of U.S. slavery and post-Civil War reconstruction. He wrote, “Nations reel and stagger on their way; they make hideous mistakes; they commit frightful wrongs; they do great and beautiful things. And shall we not best guide humanity by telling the truth about all this?” (p. 714). History may be written by the victors, as the saying goes, but examining national identity constructions in curriculum and through everyday interactions in schools is a reminder of how persistently history is shaped around stories of victimization *by others* and so rarely shaped around understandings of collective wrongdoings *toward others*. We believe that increased acknowledgment of conflicts fought over unjust conditions, the complicity of states and state institutions such as schools in these conflicts, and the persistence of social hierarchies that divide and exclude could powerfully contribute to education’s role in peacebuilding.

NOTES

- ¹ This excerpt is based on research carried out by Bellino in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2013. Meliha is a pseudonym.
- ² While recognizing important distinctions between formal education, i.e., schooling, and other forms of education, we discuss the different ways that education presents, while at the same time using *schooling* and *education* interchangeably, except when noted.

REFERENCES

- Abu El-Haj, T. (2015). *Unsettled belonging: Educating Palestinian American youth after 9/11*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, B. (1982). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.
- Bellino, M. J. (2014). Whose past, whose present? Historical memory among the “postwar” generation in Guatemala. In J. H. Williams (Ed.), *(Re)constructing memory: School textbooks and the imagination of the nation* (pp. 131–152). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

- Bellino, M. J. (2016). So that we do not fall again: History education and citizenship in “postwar” Guatemala. *Comparative Education Review*, 60(1), 58–79.
- Ben-Porath, S. R. (2006). *Citizenship under fire: Democratic education in times of conflict*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London, UK: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1), 14–25.
- Burde, D. (2014). *Schools for conflict or for peace in Afghanistan*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Bush, K. D., & Saltarelli, D. (2000). *The two faces of education in ethnic conflict: Towards a peacebuilding education for children*. Florence, Italy: Innocenti Research Centre, United Nations Children’s Fund.
- Carretero, M. (2011). *Constructing patriotism: Teaching history and memories in global worlds*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Davies, L. (2004). *Education and conflict: Complexity and chaos*. London, UK: Routledge.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1935/1992). *Black reconstruction in America 1860–1880*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Freedman, S. W., Weinstein, H., Murphy, K., & Longman, T. (2008). Teaching history after identity-based conflicts: The Rwanda experience. *Comparative Education Review*, 52(4), 663–690.
- Heater, D. (2004). *A history of education for citizenship*. London, UK: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Kassimir, R., & Flanagan, C. (2010). Youth civic engagement in the developing world: Challenges and opportunities. In L. R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C. A. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth* (pp. 91–113). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- King, E. (2014). *From classrooms to conflict in Rwanda*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, B. A. U. (2011). Toward an anthropology of (democratic) citizenship education. In B. A. U. Levinson & M. Pollock (Eds.), *A companion to the anthropology of education* (pp. 279–298). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Murphy, K., & Gallagher, T. (2009). Reconstruction after violence: How teachers and schools can deal with the legacy of the past. *Perspectives in Education*, 27(2), 158–168.
- Paulson, J. (2015). “Whether and how?” History education about recent and ongoing conflict: A review of research. *Journal on Education in Emergencies*, 1(1), 14–47.
- Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and nation*. London, UK: Sage.
- Ríos-Rojas, A. (2014). Managing and disciplining diversity: The politics of conditional belonging in a Catalanian institute. *Anthropology and Educational Quarterly*, 45(1), 2–22.
- Rosaldo, R. (1994). Cultural citizenship and educational democracy. *Cultural Anthropology*, 9, 402–411.
- Samoff, J. (2007). Institutionalizing international influence. *Safundi: The Journal of South African and American Studies*, 4(1), 1–34.
- Scheper-Hughes, N. (1992). *Death without weeping: The violence of everyday life in Brazil*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Theidon, K. (2013). *Intimate enemies: Violence and reconciliation in Peru*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Torres, C. A. (1998). Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world. *Comparative Education Review*, 42(4), 421–447.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (2000). Is it possible to teach beliefs, as well as knowledge about history? In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 38–50). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Williams, J. H. (2004). Civil conflict, education, and the work of schools: Twelve propositions. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 21(4), 471–481.
- Williams, J. H. (Ed.). (2014). *(Re)constructing memory: School textbooks and the imagination of the nation*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Williams, J. H., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. (Eds.). (2016). *(Re)constructing memory: Textbooks, identity, nation, and state*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Yogev, E. (2014). Studying the past in the present tense: The dilemma of history textbooks in conflict-ridden areas. In J. H. Williams (Ed.), *(Re)constructing memory: School textbooks and the imagination of the nation* (pp. 171–190). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

M. J. BELLINO & J. H. WILLIAMS

Michelle J. Bellino
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

James H. Williams
The George Washington University
Washington, DC, USA

SECTION 1

NATION-BUILDING PROJECTS IN THE AFTERMATH OF INTIMATE CONFLICT

ELISABETH KING

2. WHAT FRAMING ANALYSIS CAN TEACH US ABOUT HISTORY TEXTBOOKS, PEACE, AND CONFLICT

The Case of Rwanda

What is taught in schools, of which history curriculum is an important part, is often a *reflector* of existing social and political conditions. When a historical narrative is published in a textbook, it illustrates the “commonplaces of historical thinking of a certain place and time” and tells us how those in power understand their positions (Dance, 1960, p. 56). The truism that “the victor writes history” reflects this common understanding.

However, schools are not merely passive reflectors; they also actively shape politics and intergroup relations. Schooling serves as an *amplifier* of social categories and messages, where, for instance, uneven access to education may enhance and multiply preexisting social and economic conditions, and can serve as a *motivator* in socializing students to act in certain ways, using the tools and experiences they learned in schools to actively influence society (King, 2014). As the scholar of nationalism Ernst Gellner claimed, speaking to the socializing role of schools in the construction of the nation-state, “the monopoly of legitimate education is now more important, more central, than is the monopoly of legitimate violence” (1983, p. 33).

Hence, in conflict-affected contexts, the ways in which schools reflect, amplify, and motivate can have important effects on peace and conflict. I have argued elsewhere that in Rwanda, schools have long been a key instrument of the state apparatus, contributing to the construction, awareness, collectivization, and inequality of ethnic groups in ways that have helped underlie conflict (King, 2014). History education has been a crucial part of these processes, alongside access to schools, how schools are set up, and pedagogy. History education plays an important role in identity formation and socialization by influencing students’ perceptions, attitudes, and understandings of themselves and others (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Davies, 2006; UNESCO, 2011). In situations where groups are in conflict, such as Rwanda, history can be particularly contested, and the concern with history education is that rather than increasing groups’ acceptance and countering divisiveness, it has the potential to do the opposite (Barton & McCully, 2005; McLean-Hilker, 2011).

To date, when history education in conflict-affected contexts is discussed, a key debate has been whether or not to teach sensitive history topics in the aftermath of

conflict (Cole, 2007; Cole & Barsalou, 2006; Paulson, 2015). Beyond that, there are general recommendations in both policy documents and scholarship suggesting, for example, that history education should be tolerant and egalitarian to promote a culture of peace rather than violence (e.g., Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Davies, 2006; UNESCO, 2011). Nonetheless, most fall short of providing specific action plans for history education. This is also true of several prominent manuals for education in conflict-ridden societies, such as the *INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery* (Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies [INEE], 2012), *INEE Guidance Notes on Teaching and Learning* (INEE, 2010), and *INEE Guidance Note on Conflict Sensitive Education* (INEE, 2013). Indeed, we have relatively few tools and frameworks to help us analyze the specific content of history curriculum as it relates to conflict and peace.

Drawing on the case of Rwanda, this chapter argues that framing (or frame) analysis is a useful tool for shedding light on the ways in which history education is a form of strategic communication and can reflect, amplify, and motivate in contexts of intergroup conflict. The first section reviews framing theory and the insights it may offer into history education in conflict-affected contexts. It focuses on framing as the active and purposeful construction of reality through three main types of frames: diagnostic (identifying problems), prognostic (identifying solutions), and motivational (mobilizing action) (Benford & Snow, 2000). The second part provides background on Rwanda as a case study. The third section of the chapter explains the research methodology: a longitudinal comparative content analysis of Rwandan history curriculum and textbooks produced from the late 1930s to the present. The fourth section analyzes how some of the most contentious events in Rwandan history have been framed and reframed over time, identifying key diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frames. The conclusion explores the value of framing analysis for the study and teaching of history in conflict-affected contexts.

FRAMING HISTORY IN CONFLICT-AFFECTED CONTEXTS

“Framing” involves conscious strategic efforts by groups of people to shape shared understandings about the world. Drawing largely from collective action theory, it is about conscious communication with the goal of reaching particular objectives. Coined by Goffman, a *frame* is a “schemata of interpretation” that enables individuals to “locate, perceive, identify and label occurrences within their life space and the world at large” (Snow, Rochford, Worden, & Benford, 1986, p. 464). Frames involve simplifying and condensing the world (Benford & Snow, 2000) to produce “cognitive cues” (Swidler, 1986, p. 262) that people evaluate and act upon.

Framing theory helps us analyze “strategic communication” (Desrosiers, 2012). Benford and Snow (2000) identified three main types of frames, each playing a different role in collective action: diagnosis, prognosis, and motivation. Diagnostic frames identify issues and problems and may attribute blame or responsibility.

Diagnostic frames include “injustice frames” that identify unfairness and prejudices and “adversarial frames” that craft an “other.” Specific examples of frames with diagnostic roles are victim and culprit frames. Prognostic frames articulate a proposed solution to a problem and delineate a strategy, addressing what is to be done as well as build consensus (Benford & Snow, 2000, pp. 615–617). Motivational frames provide a call to action in the form of rationale for engaging in collective action. Desrosiers (2012) usefully grouped together diagnostic and prognostic frames as serving to *mobilize consensus* in contrast to motivational frames that more directly *mobilize for action*.

Take an example from the anti-gay marriage movement (OpenStax College, n.d.). The movement diagnostically framed marriage as only between a man and a woman. It clearly and simply stated gay marriage as an issue or problem. As a prognostic frame, this movement may restrict marriage to “one man/one woman” and/or permit civil unions among gay couples rather than marriage. These prognostic frames lay out solutions. As a motivational frame, the movement calls people to act. It may advocate expressing anti-gay marriage opinions to congressmen and women or voting against candidates who favor gay marriage.

Political entrepreneurs compete to frame events knowing that how events are understood will be important for building consensus, mobilizing action, and furthering interests (Barnett, 1999; Ross, 2002). A range of actors may become political entrepreneurs—politicians, journalists, community leaders—and, I add, textbook and curricular authors and approvers. They each seek the opportunity to define issues. Framing contests occur between movements, the state, and counter-movements (McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1996). Power is crucially important; the frames of winning movements are translated into public policy and become representative of general culture (Zald, 1996). These become, in James Scott’s terms, “the public transcript” (1990, p. 18).

Nonetheless, frames cannot simply be imposed on recipients. Barnett argued that, too often, scholars fail to recall that those who receive frames have agency and are not merely “cultural dupes” (1999, p. 7; see also Benford & Snow, 2000). Frame alignment refers to compatibility or congruence between frames passed down by framing entrepreneurs’ and recipients’ existing frames. When frames align, there is resonance. Alignment and resonance depend on the credibility of the frame, including its cognitive consistency, empirical credibility, the credibility and power of frame articulators, and frame salience to the targets of mobilization (Benford & Snow, 2000; Payne, 2001). Resonant frames need to provide plausible information, but need not account for everything.

Frames can and do change. Goffman (1974) referred to a process called “keying” wherein meaningful activities, events, and biographies are redefined in terms of a new framework so that participants come to understand them as something different. However, previous frames can constrain the shape and resonance of future ones. As Majstorovic usefully put it in relation to framing identity and intergroup relations,

Identity is not produced upon a blank slate, and ethnic groups do not suffer from historical Alzheimer's disease. There is historical clay that needs to be reshaped, and the shape of the clay in a previous epoch is a constraining factor to the political elites in a subsequent historical juncture. (1997, p. 173)

Frame changes may be domain specific, altering, for instance, the status of different groups. Frame changes may alternatively be more global, changing an entire worldview, such as religious conversion.

While I propose that frame analysis is a useful addition to the way we think about history education, peace, and conflict, there are a number of limitations to what it can explain in human behavior. First, and consistent with the ideas of alignment and resonance, not all frames have their intended effect. This is easy to overlook, as most studies focus upon successful instances of frame resonance. Second, and conversely, a single outcome may be explained by several different frames. This poses important challenges for trying to predict frame resonance (Payne, 2001). Third, a single frame can mean different things to different people (Desrosiers, 2015). Fourth, framing—sometimes complementary, but oftentimes contradictory—occurs in multiple locations, and it is difficult to know *ex ante* which will carry more weight. Finally, the political and institutional structures of the setting in which the framing takes place impact acceptance of the frame. Tarrow (1998) argued that in order to result in collective action, the patterns of political opportunities and constraints matter as much as the series of frames and their resonance. For example, frames are often paired with coercion to produce the outcomes desired by elites (Payne, 2001).

Framing analysis is now widely recognized in the social sciences. The recent *Oxford Handbook of Political Science* listed framing as a potential “next big thing” (Goodin, 2009, as cited in Desrosiers, 2012). Framing theory is particularly useful in conflict studies, where rationalist theories that focus on incentives, opportunities, and strategies have typically opposed interpretivist, psychocultural approaches that explore “socially constructed internal representations of the self, others, and one’s social world that are widely shared in a society” (Ross, 1993). By focusing on strategic communication, framing theory usefully bridges these approaches (Desrosiers, 2015).

Yet, surprisingly, the framing approach has been rarely used in educational studies broadly, or in the analysis of textbooks in particular (exceptions include Cachelin, Norvell, & Darling, 2010; Engel & Ortloff, 2009). There are clear parallels between the concept of a historical narrative as told in a history textbook, or simplified in a curricular document, and the concepts explained above as frame analysis. According to Apple’s (1979) foundational work, curriculum inculcates “‘desired’ knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (p. 1). The active decision-making involved in choosing what to include and exclude and how to present information emphasizes “the crucial issue of the authority to define and select legitimate knowledge” (p. 1). This is illustrated in that history textbooks can alternatively frame an event or person in diverse, and even contradictory, ways; a martyr to one can be a terrorist to another. Historical

narratives make “emotionally significant connections” over time so that the past may be evoked in order to respond to the needs of the present and act in the future (Ross, 2002, p. 306; see also Barnett, 1999; Volkan, 1997).

Framing theory often goes further than narrative or discourse analysis in order to explore *why* text is framed in particular ways, mapping the potential functions of a given frame or the mechanisms in collective action represented by different frames. Narrative analysis of textbooks typically focuses on thematic analysis (what is said or told, key themes) and structural analysis (the way a story is told) (Riessman, 1993). Similarly, discourse analysis is most like structural analysis in concentrating on how a text is constructed in order to tell a story (De Beaugrande, 2005). These types of studies, while valuable, do not typically draw on a more holistic version of framing theory that focuses on strategic communication. I argue that it is fitting to analyze school texts in conflict-affected contexts by investigating the relationship between different types of frames. Further, it is possible to theorize the links between frames that appear in texts (such as consensus mobilization frames) and real-world collective action.

In terms of analyzing the content of history education for peace and/or conflict, the International Institute for Education Planning’s (IIEP) *Guidebook for Planning Education in Emergencies and Reconstruction* is unique in making explicit recommendations for those who review and revise history curriculum in conflict-ridden societies. The authors make the case that such revision should pay attention to questions such as: “Is the history of each component group of society represented? Is there stereotyping involved in this representation? How is the ‘other’ treated?” and “Is the text organized around the systematic recounting of previous conflicts (as opposed, for example, to a focus on national or social achievements)?” (UNESCO – IIEP, 2010). I argue that framing analysis can help us answer these questions in a way that goes beyond identifying themes and structures, contributing to our understanding of how the content of history curriculum might be translated into mobilization within broader peace and conflict processes.

THE RWANDAN CONTEXT

Rwanda is an important case through which to investigate history textbooks and to explore the potential for framing analysis. During the 1994 Rwandan genocide, Hutu extremists, with the participation of a great number of ordinary Rwandans, murdered nearly 75% of Rwanda’s resident Tutsi population and likely hundreds of thousands of Hutu moderates in just 100 days. Many Hutus did not directly participate in violence, but estimates suggest that 14% to 17% of the male adult Hutu population participated (Straus, 2006). The genocide ended through a military victory of the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), a group of mostly Tutsi exiles who had been in Uganda since 1959 when the first round of ethnic killing occurred prior to Rwanda’s independence from Belgium in 1962. The leader of the RPF, Paul Kagame, assumed office in 2000 and remains president today.

Historically, during the colonial period, the Belgian administration favored Tutsis for government and educational opportunities. Between independence in 1962 and the genocide in 1994, the Rwandan government was dominated by Hutus, and Hutus were generally favored in politics, education, and society. Grégoire Kayibanda, a Hutu from south-central Rwanda, was president during what is known as the First Republic (1962–1973). Juvénal Habyarimana, the second president, a Hutu from northwestern Rwanda, ushered in the Second Republic (1973–1994) with a coup. It was the shooting down of his plane that signaled the beginning of the genocide in April 1994.

Over the course of this history, education has been highly valued and influential in Rwanda. A sixth-grade curricular document produced in the 1980s teaches students several Kinyarwanda proverbs that speak to the historic importance of education, dating back to ancient Rwanda. These include the view that “education is more important than birth” and a focus on youth: “We straighten a tree when it is still small” (Republic of Rwanda, 1985, pp. 169–170). While oral history is important in Rwanda, there were no published substitutes to the history that students were taught in schools during the colonial period (Longman, 2010) and only very few thereafter. What is taught in schools, including the historical narrative, may consequently have particular salience.

METHODS

To investigate the framing of history over time in Rwanda, I collected textbooks and curricular guidance for teachers related to history education from the colonial period to the present. To date, this is the most complete collection of primary history textbooks and curriculum reviewed in any study. As the colonial authority in Rwanda as of 1919, a League of Nations mandate gave Belgium control over all educational institutions in the country. It was thus the Belgian colonial administration, mostly through missionaries, that set up Rwanda’s first formal schools. The earliest text (Sandrapt, 1939) was produced and used during the colonial period at the *Groupe Scolaire*, one of the few secondary schools in the country and arguably the most elite and influential. The text, in French, was produced for and used, according to my interviews with colonial officials, in the “administrative stream,” particularly for Tutsi students destined to become chiefs. During the colonial period, Rwandan history was not taught at the primary school level (King, 2014).

No history material was formally issued by the Rwandan government for more than two decades after independence. In 1971, a book overviewing Rwandan history, *Introduction à l’Histoire du Rwanda* (Heremans, 1971), was privately published and recommended to all teachers of history at primary and secondary levels in state and church-run schools. In interviews, I was told that teachers wrote segments on the board for students to copy. I also collected, and herein focus upon, the first Rwandan history curriculum produced by government officials, targeted at primary schools and published in Kinyarwanda in the mid-1980s for grades 4 through 8

(e.g., Republic of Rwanda, 1983, 1985). These documents were skillfully translated into French by a Rwandan-Canadian translator. The first Rwandan government history textbooks for students, two texts in French, were published for secondary school students a few years later (Republic of Rwanda, 1987a, 1987b). I worked with these texts in French and translated relevant excerpts into English for presentation here.

While there was first a moratorium on history education in the aftermath of the genocide, there have now been a number of civics, social studies, and history texts that clearly present historical narratives. At the primary level, this includes the first post-genocide text, a civics text funded by UNICEF and published in English and French (Baranyizigiye et al., 2004); social studies pupil's and teacher's books for grades 4 through 6 (Bamusananire, Byiringiro, Munyakazi, & Ntagaramba, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c); another set of social studies texts for students (Ajuru, Munywa, Okiror, & Lubega, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c) that mirror the earlier texts by including all of the same sections in the same order but with additional exercises and scenarios; and social studies texts for grades 4, 5 (Hakorimana, Kitooke, & Oiko, 2010a, 2010b), and 6 (Kitooke & Oiko, 2010). At the secondary level, the government of Rwanda's National Curriculum Development Centre issued a History Program for Ordinary Level (Republic of Rwanda, 2008a), Political Education for Secondary Schools (Republic of Rwanda, 2008b), and History Program for Advanced-Level Secondary School (Republic of Rwanda, 2010a). It also issued a Teacher's Guide to the History of Rwanda (Republic of Rwanda, 2010b). Junior secondary school history books for students and teachers have also been published (Bamusananire & Ntege, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c).¹ In the present period, all textbooks must be certified by the Rwandan Education Board, specifically by the Curriculum Materials Production and Distribution Department that replaced the National Curriculum Development Centre (Rwanda Education Board, n.d.; Rutayisire, 2011). While there are many more history texts for both primary and secondary level in the current period than in the past, they portray a consistent narrative (see King, 2014, chapter 4).

I investigated the framing of history in Rwandan school texts over three main eras of Rwanda's modern history: colonial, the two Republics, and post-genocide. By focusing on the three periods, my purpose was to identify continuities and changes in framing. In doing so, I concentrated on issues related to the UNESCO-IIEP questions: Is there stereotyping involved in the representation of groups? How is the 'other' treated? In particular, I focused on narratives related to ethnic groups and their relationship. First, I concentrated on the *Hutu Manifesto*, a key document calling for Hutu solidarity and the disenfranchisement of Tutsi leadership, as well as the 1959 social revolution, the movement that ultimately shifted power from Belgian and Tutsi leaders during the colonial period to Hutu leadership at and after independence. Second, I investigated definitions and origins of Rwanda's three ethnic groups: Hutus, Tutsis, and Twas. This section includes discussion of the Hamitic hypothesis: that a subgroup of Caucasian origin exists (in Rwanda's case Tutsi) and is superior to other black Africans. These topics were established in

scholarship, and in previous interviews with Rwandans, as particularly important. I read all of the texts from each of the three main eras of Rwanda's history to identify representative sections that addressed these issues. I then analyzed these sections to identify diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frames. For the two Republics and post-genocide periods, when multiple sources were available, I focused on the most detailed narrative, as it typically encapsulated the others. Different sources from the same period were very similar, sometimes nearly identical, and did not contain contradictions. I did not assess the veracity of the different narratives across time, although some were more consistent than others with the now more developed academic literature on Rwanda. I recognized that in selecting excerpts to make my case, I too was engaging in framing. To minimize my bias, I included relatively lengthy excerpts from various texts.

HISTORY EDUCATION AND FRAMING IN RWANDA

The Hutu Manifesto and the Social Revolution of 1959

Curriculum during the two Republics (1962–1994). The first Rwandan-authored history teaching texts emerged only in the 1980s during the second of two successive Hutu governments. These texts described in detail conflicts between Hutus and Tutsis surrounding independence. At least two diagnostic frames were clear: Hutus were the victim of colonial era injustice, and Tutsis and the colonialists were the culprits and the “other” against whom Hutus needed to stand.

Several prognostic frames follow. First, the *Hutu Manifesto* was presented as a solution to these problems. The content and consequences of the *Hutu Manifesto* were thoroughly explained in both the primary and secondary texts. The *Hutu Manifesto* became the platform for the first government of independent Rwanda. It asserted pride and the entitlement of Hutus and was foundational in crafting government documents and policy throughout the period (King, 2014). The textbooks and curricula critiqued the different documents that the (Tutsi) leaders of Rwanda drafted in the lead up to independence for “not mentioning anything about the ethnic problem that divided Hutus and Tutsis” (Republic of Rwanda, 1985, p. 157). The manifesto highlighted that during the colonial period, Tutsis were favored by the government in terms of land and education, while Hutus suffered “injustice and oppression.” The Hutu Manifesto was said to have “asked for equality and respect for important human rights” (Republic of Rwanda, 1985, p. 157).

The revolution was also presented as a prognostic frame, a solution to injustice. The text explained how, despite the stipulations of the manifesto, “the government did not take them into consideration. There *had* to be the revolution of 1959” [my emphasis]. The text called the consequent violence “war” and added that “the population started killing, pillaging, burning and chasing a few of the Tutsi leaders” (Republic of Rwanda, 1983, p. 163). There was no broader discussion of violence

against Tutsis or the large number of Tutsis who went into exile, which comprise the framing of this event in the post-genocide material.

Another prognostic frame was to “bring together the majority of the population,” widely interpreted by Rwandans as meaning Hutus, within “democracy.” During the two Republics, democracy was generally understood as a means to fulfill the interests of the demographic majority (King, 2014). Prognostic frames articulate solutions and delineate strategies to address injustice and/or adversaries, in this case, to justify Hutu governance. The following excerpts are from the fifth-grade text translated from Kinyarwanda (Republic of Rwanda, 1983, pp. 157–160):

a. What this document refused

The *Hutu Manifesto* refused the injustice and oppression that existed in Rwanda.

1. In the government:

- Tutsis held many positions in the work of the state in the councils that represented the population and even in the government.
- There was injustice in the justice system, and moreover there were not written laws.

2. At the level of the economy and the living conditions of the population:

- Tutsis had for themselves the only properties and pastures....
- The lower class, which was of majority Hutu, was oppressed by uburetwa.

3. Education: It was Tutsi children who went to secondary schools; the Hutu who studied in such schools were very few.

b. What this writing requested: ...

1. In the government:

- Put in place democratic power that allows people to advance according to their capacities rather than their ethnicity or family...
- Equality must prevail in regards to state work and in the government; Hutus too should have jobs in the government. This writing even asked that the population be able to elect their own sub-chiefs, chiefs, and judges.

2. At the level of the economy and the living conditions of the population:

- Abolition of the corvées (of the chief) so that the population has the time to work for itself....
- Respect of rights to say what one thinks (freedom of speech and thought).

3. In regards to education: ...

- Hutus too need to be accepted to secondary and higher schools.

...The important reasons that caused the 1959 revolution are the following:

a. The fact that privileges were reserved exclusively for only some Tutsis....

b. Oppression of the lower class (the poor). Examples: Vassalage service, corvées, injustice in justice system.

c. Unjust holding of power: As we have seen, some educated Hutus remarked that there was injustice because power was in the hands of a few people who came from the same families. They wanted Hutus to play a role in governing the country. This role would be based on bringing together the majority of the population. These thoughts that we call democracy were demonstrated in writing in the 1957 *Hutu Manifesto*. But these protests were fought by the Tutsis, who refused to ‘remove the milk from their mouths’ [give up power and privilege]. This meant that the use of force was what remained and revolution would take place.

The consequences of the 1959 revolution were listed to include “nomination of Hutu chiefs and subchiefs to replace Tutsis that had fled or were prisoners”; “electing leaders of communes (most were from Parmehutuparty)”; “putting in place a provisional government (October 26 1960) made up of whites and Rwandans led by Grégoire Kayibanda”; and “creation of the Republic on January 28, 1961” (Republic of Rwanda, 1983, pp. 163–164).

Textbooks in the post-genocide period (1994–present). In contrast to the previous section, in the post-genocide period, Tutsis are framed as the victims of injustice with Hutus as the “other” who perpetrated such injustices. While there are some nuances and acknowledgment of Hutus’ suffering during the colonial period, Tutsis are more prominently framed as having been victims since 1959. This is most evident in the recounting of the genocide against the Tutsis. (For a detailed analysis, see King, 2010, 2014). In contrast to texts from the two Republics that emphasized human rights violations against Hutus during the colonial period, the post-genocide period material focuses on Tutsis as experiencing violations of human rights during the two Republics.

In post-genocide history education, the *Hutu Manifesto* is framed as a problem, “little more than propaganda” (Bamusananire & Ntege, 2010b, p. 99). Its demands are described only briefly in contrast to a detailed description of the content, causes, and consequences of the Manifesto discussed in earlier history education. A sixth-grade text says that Kayibanda “wrote what was called a *Hutu Manifesto* of 1957 and this promoted divisions among Rwandans by emphasizing hatred for the [Tutsi] monarchy” (Kitooke & Oiko, 2010, p. 77). Whereas the consequences of the 1959 revolution are described in a largely positive light during the Republics, in the post-genocide period, the focus is on how the events led to decades of state-supervised violence and impunity, and even genocide. In a concise rendering, the grade 6 textbook says that “in November 1959, the political struggle for independence turned into fighting. In the ‘Rwanda Revolution’ of 1959, many people of the Tutsi descent were killed while many others were exiled in neighbouring countries” (Ajuru et al., 2010c, p. 67). The framing of the *Hutu Manifesto* as divisive and the 1959 revolution as leading to violence are additional diagnostic frames that endeavor to clearly identify problems in Rwandan history and past leadership.