

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU NATAL

**THE IMPACT OF THE SOCIO-POLITICAL CONTEXT ON PEACE EDUCATION:
EXPERIENCES FROM THREE SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN ZIMBABWE**

BY

SIKHULULEKILE MASHINGAIDZE

209526105

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SOCIAL SCIENCE IN
CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION AND PEACE STUDIES

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

SUPERVISOR: DR. JORAM NDLOVU

STAFF NUMBER: 

DECEMBER 2015

DECLARATION

I, Sikhululekile Mashingaidze, student number 209526105 hereby declare that this thesis is my own original work, has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university, and that the sources I have used have been fully acknowledged by complete references. This thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the Master of Science Degree in Conflict Transformation and Peace Studies in the Faculty of Humanities, School of Social Sciences at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.

Signature _____ Date: December 8, 2015.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am greatly indebted to my mentor and supervisor, Dr. Joram Ndlovu for his spirited commitment without which the completion of this project would have been an overwhelming task.

Professor Geoff Harris enabled my participation in an enriching learning experience shared with other students from various parts of Africa. Each of us brought unique experiences to a Masters Programme whose significance proved more than just an academic pursuit but spoke to the much needed transformation of our communities towards a culture of peace. Special mention also goes to Dr. Sylvia Kaye whose coursework module in Peace Education provided a launch pad for my study.

I am most thankful to Professor Percysledge Chigora from the Midlands State University (MSU) for enabling my research. I am also grateful to Mr. Douglas Munemo from MSU, Mr. Rodgers Manungo from Solusi Adventist University and the lecturers from the various departments of the National University of Science and Technology for their most insightful sharing of their experiences.

My deeply felt gratitude goes out to all the former educationists as well as former and current students from Africa University, the National University of Science and Technology and the Midlands State University. Although most of them expressed concern that my study was sensitive, they still wanted to contribute to shaping the future of peace education in Zimbabwe.

This study was immeasurably enriched by Dr. Phillip Bhebhe and Mr. William Mavhengere who provided the much needed linkage in the lived experiences of our country's past and its impact on the present. They are fountains of knowledge on the history of Zimbabwe and their greatest desire is that peace education be used as an effective tool in ensuring that the ills of the past do not repeat themselves. It is my hope that God enables them to witness this in their lifetime.

A very special thank you goes to "*a man of the people*", Sir. Robin T. Mashingaidze who, thanks to his people skills, facilitated the take-off of my study.

DEDICATION

Firstly; this work is a heartfelt dedication to my parents; Mr. R.S. and Mrs. T. Mkandla, without whose selfless sacrifices I would not have come this far. Only God can adequately reward them for their lifelong, indiscriminate and untiring commitment to the betterment of the lives of others.

Ngiyalithanda, ngiyaziqhenya ngani maqhawe angempela, iNkosi ilandisele umusa!

In equally great measure it is dedicated to my greatest and most constructive critic; Terence Mashingaidze. An indulgent friend and husband and my ever-present inspiration who gives free reign to my dreams and propels me to greater heights each day. Stable and steady in your academic pursuits, you remain driven by a personal commitment to quality scholarship.

To my beloved brothers Thabani and Zibusiso Mkandla, always there on the other end of the line to check on how I am doing and “how the books are going...” Ziggy, I remember always your devotion to my academic pursuits, in particular when I left to work in Kenya and forgot my important research data. Too poorly scribbled to be scanned, by your very own hand you typed pages and pages to ensure the data reached me in time enough to prepare and submit my assignment. Fly much higher *boKhabo* in your own academic pursuits and all your other life endeavors.

ABSTRACT

In this dissertation, I focus on the impact of the socio-political context on the experiences of the teaching and learning of peace at Africa University (AU), the National University of Science and Technology (NUST) and the Midlands State University (MSU). The study is entrenched within the Systems and Marxist theories of education as well as the transformational conflict theory. My central argument is that peace education is currently operating within constrained environment within which it is viewed with suspicion as a western inspired regime change agenda. This is evident in the onslaught that it faces from state aligned media. Secondly, the potential effectiveness of peace education is also hindered by partisan political tampering that has kept its content and pedagogical approaches on a leash to ensure that it steers clear of controversial yet pertinent issues. Due to this evident lack of political will students argue that current peace education initiatives are not only irrelevant but designed to mollify them so they do not question the injustices of their lived realities. In my study I underscore that the sanctioning of peace education in Zimbabwean universities remains cosmetic in the absence of political will to address the structural socio-political imbalances that currently militate against the values of plurality, tolerance, truth telling, forgiveness and reconciliation. This dissertation mainly draws on former and current students, lecturers and retired educationists' subjective interpretations of their teaching, learning and existential experiences.

ABBREVIATIONS

AIPPA –Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act
AU-Africa University
CCJP-Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace
CSOs-Civil Society Organizations
DANIDA-Danish International Development Agency
LRF-Legal Resources Foundation
MDC-Movement for Democratic Change
MSU-Midlands State University
NGO’s –Non Governmental Organizations
NSS-National Strategic Studies
NUST-National University of Science and Technology
ONHRI-Organ on National Healing Integration and Reconciliation
PF-ZAPU- Patriotic Front- Zimbabwe African People’s Union
PLC-Peace Leadership and Conflict transformation (NUST peace studies programme)
POSA-Public Order and Security Act
SAU-Solusi Adventist University
UN-United Nations
UNESCO-United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
ZANLA-Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army
ZANU (PF)-Zimbabwe African National Union (Patriotic Front)
ZIPRA- Zimbabwe People’s Revolutionary Army

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Description	Page
Declaration	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Dedication	iv
Abstract	v
Abbreviations	vi
Table of contents	vii

Chapter 1 Peace Education in Zimbabwe

1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem	3
Education for Ideological Re-orientation	6
Biased Media Coverage	8
Zimbabwe's Attempts at Addressing the Problem of Violence (1980 to date)	10
The Culture of Violence in Zimbabwe	11
The Organ on National Healing, Reconciliation and Integration (ONHRI)	12
The Introduction of Peace Education	14
1.2 Research Questions	15
1.3 Research Problems and Objectives	15
1.4 Theoretical Framework	17
1.5 Literature Review	18
1.6 Methodology	19
1.7 Ethical Considerations	21
1.8 Limitations	22
1.9 Structure of Dissertation	23

Chapter 2 Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.0 Introduction	25
2.1 The Link between Violence, Peace and Security	26
2.2 The Ways in which Peace is established	28
2.3 Peace Education: History, Definition and Rationale	30
2.4 Types, Goals and Approaches to Peace Education	33
2.4.1 Types of Peace Education	33
2.4.2 Goals of Peace Education	36

2.4.3 Approaches to Peace Education	37
2.5 The Gender Lens as an Approach to Peace Education	39
2.6 Ambiguities of Peace Education	43
2.7 The Complexity of the Dual Nature and Role of Education.	46
2.8 The Complexity of Justice in Peace Education	50
2.9 Conclusion	51
Chapter 3 The Multiple Dimensions of Peace Education in Zimbabwe	
3.0 Introduction	55
3.1 Post Graduate Peace and Governance Studies at Africa University	56
3.2 Compulsory Peace Education at the National University of Science and Technology	58
3.2.1 Peace Education for all Approach	60
3.2.2 Peace Education should be Optional	62
3.3 Midlands State University's Peace Studies Programme	64
3.4 Conclusion	66
Chapter4 The Socio-political Context of Peace Education in Zimbabwe	
4.0 Introduction	68
4.1 Peace Education and the Media	69
4.1.1 Peace Education as a threat to the National Imaginary	72
4.2 Peace Education's Hidden Curriculum	75
4.3 Family and Community History	79
4.4 Conclusion	85
Chapter 5 Making a Difference through Peace Education	
5.0 Does Studying Peace make a difference?	87
5.1 Creating an enabling Socio-political Environment for Peace Education	89
5.2 Conclusion	92
Chapter6 Conclusion and Recommendations	
6.0 Moving Zimbabwe forward through Peace Education	93
6.1 Conclusion and Postscript	94
References	97
Appendices: - Interviewees list, Questionnaires and Ethical Clearance	
Letter	102

Chapter 1

Peace Education in Zimbabwe

1.0 Introduction

The Zimbabwean socio-political context is shaped by numerous phases of mass violence that include the pre-colonial inter-community raids and counter raids between its Ndebele and Shona ethnic groups, the liberation struggle era violence, the post-independence state instigated Gukurahundi violence against the Ndebele ethnic minority, the post 2000 land reform conflict and the politically motivated violence that has accompanied every post-independence election process. Sachikonye (2011: xvii) for example makes reference to institutionalized violence in Zimbabwe in which “the military, police, security agencies, ruling and opposition parties alike have engaged... It is also shown that civil society organizations (CSOs) have not been immune from the cancer of violence both as victims of it as well as participants in it...” Godwin (2010:133-134) further critiques this insidious culture of violence in his comparative analysis of state high-handedness during the 1980s Gukurahundi massacres and the few months preceding the June 2008 presidential run-off elections which he defines as “abuse on an industrial scale, with the torturers following a script handed to them from above...ordained from the top...hierarchical, planned and plotted...Two operations separated by nearly twenty five years, but apparently, nothing has changed.”

Over the years the government has responded to post-violence situations through top down approaches such as the 1980 reconciliation pronouncement by the incoming Prime Minister Robert Mugabe; the 1988 blanket amnesty which was extended to all combatants in the Gukurahundi inferno, and among others, the October 2000 Clemency Order Number 1 which pardoned every person liable to prosecution for politically motivated crimes perpetrated between

January and July of the same year. These measures, which were entirely the prerogative of the political elite, discounted the agency and perspectives of ‘ordinary’ citizens. Mashingaidze (2010:21) critiques this culture of blanket amnesties and unity accords that imposed superficial “state sanctioned and narrowly conceived national reconciliation policies.” Alexander *et al* (2000:229) echo similar sentiments when they argue that the 1987 Unity Accord demanded “Unity First, Solutions Later.” This resonates with Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2003:117) who also laments at how the 1987 Unity Accord “Succeeded only in meeting the minimalist conditions for peace, human security and human rights... rather than to entrench the desperately needed culture of democracy and peace.”

The aforementioned responses to violence have served to massage the egos of the political elite and mollify the ordinary citizens with a facade of actions that in reality paper over a deep etched culture of violence. It is only peace education that seemingly takes a bottom-up approach targeted at Zimbabwe’s younger citizens. This implies a vision of transformation of mindsets from a culture of violence to that of peace. Africa University was the first to offer peace education in 2003 and since then other Universities have and continue to introduce it. This study therefore interrogates the experiences, impact and possible future trajectories of peace education in Zimbabwe.

Peace Education curricula founded on the desire to transform the society from a culture of violence to that of peace has the potential to mitigate the effects of violence on affected citizens. Maxwell (2004:123) notes that:

...it is necessary to train people in the practical skills ...particularly skills of conflict management and conflict transformation. It is also necessary to encourage people to explore the roots of violence, and to enable them to help build a society based on a different foundation.

Peace education is an aspect of peacebuilding that can cover a multiplicity of initiatives targeted at the transformation of human mindsets and behaviors through learning that promotes human cohesion, understanding and tolerance. Peace education plays a crucial role in molding human opinions, attitudes and behavior by proposing an alternative vision for Zimbabwe. One of the long term goals is the opening of avenues for the appreciation of the diversity that characterizes Zimbabwe's citizens, hence working towards the promotion of tolerance. It will also avail an open platform for courteous and constructive engagement with the nation's numerous phases of the afore-mentioned history of violence, giving the nation's young a space to share on their perceptions concerning this violence and proffer sustainably peaceful solutions so that this does not recur in future.

However, peace education in its implementation finds itself beset by numerous problems, some of which are a hostile socio-political context that often views it with suspicion and may manipulate its content and approaches. It also finds itself within an already packed education system hence relegated to a lesser priority and competing for financial and time resources.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The introduction of peace education in Zimbabwe is in line with international conventions as Harris (2002) observes that the United Nations General Assembly declared the year 2000 as the International Year of the Culture of Peace with a focus on children. This study therefore is interested in how the university experiences of peace education interact with social institutions of politics, the family and the mass media in the quest to transform the young citizens who have been enmeshed in a violent and polarized socio-political context. This study seeks to unpack how the socio-political context impacts university peace education and its potential to contribute to a

more peaceful society in Zimbabwe. The introduction of peace education in Zimbabwe's tertiary education sector is a post-2000 phenomenon. The three universities, Africa University, The National University of Science and Technology and the Midlands State University, which are the focus of this study, initiated their respective peace programmes in order to entrench a culture of amity in a country whose socio-political context is characterized by a deeply etched, cyclical culture of politically motivated harm and impunity. This culture is characterized by unresolved past violence experiences, repression on communities' efforts to express and memorialize past injustices and structural violence in the midst of a governance system that has institutionalized violence to appropriate and maintain power. Bar Tarl (2002:5), upon whose thesis this study is premised, exhorts us to confront the complexities of peace education and asserts that:

...the socio-political context in which peace education takes place supersedes the rest. It is the context that determines to an important extent (a) the challenges faced by peace education, (b) its goals, and (c) its ways of treating the different sub-groups of participants.

Given the value of the context in shaping the effectiveness of peace education, this study seeks to analyze how students can effectively remain encouraged to adopt peace as a way of life when they are daily assailed with messages of violence?

Notably, the year 2000 marked an international quest for peace, whose first area for action was the promotion of a culture of peace through education. Paradoxically, this very year and decade declared for the promotion of a culture of peace is the very year and decade of Zimbabwe's political degeneration, marked by an increase in state sanctioned violence and economic decline. The year 2000 and beyond marks a very significant era in Zimbabwe for the following reasons; although as already noted the culture of violence dates back to the pre-independence period, the year 2000 saw the heightening of state sponsored gross human rights

violations following the then incumbent government's major defeat in a national referendum to change the country's constitution. This, coupled with repressive legislation such as the Public Order and Security Act (POSA) and the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (AIPPA) among others, served to restrict citizens' basic freedoms. As analyzed by Mlambo and Raftopoulos (2010) this was a period marked a period of economic decline that saw deepening poverty levels with at least 80% of the country's population rendered jobless. It is indeed a complex time in which to be unrolling peace education in Zimbabwe and yet still, a most crucial and relevant time.

Contrary to the situation in Zimbabwe, Kenya, a nation much more ethnically diverse and sometimes marked by religious tension and violence, is one example of a country which, through peace education is making effort to confront the aftermath of the 2007 post-election violence. Together with UNICEF, the Ministry of Education has peace programmes running through the primary education system. While these programmes may not address violence in the short term, they are positive long term steps in the right direction as they have provided the necessary foundation for the re-socialization process of communities, enabling them to interrogate violence and negotiate how peace can be achieved. Peace education, as Johnson and Johnson (2005:275) reveal is a necessary step that:

...gives students the competencies and values they will need to build and maintain peace in their families, friendship groups, work places, neighbours, countries and world as well as within themselves...The building and maintenance of peace on all levels depends on students having certain competencies and values that are primarily taught, practiced and perfected in the schools.

Education however, is not without its complexities as this study will explore in the literature review. In the following discussion I look at how formal education and the mainstream media

have, and continue to be manipulated to indoctrinate the citizenry, especially the younger generation.

Education for ideological re-orientation

In any given context young people are an embodiment of possibility, of change and of transformation. This explains why any initiative that seeks to bring about change in any society often begins with the young, as has been the deliberate starting point of most peace education initiatives around the world. It is commendable therefore that peace education in Zimbabwe has deliberately been targeted at the youth, a majority of whom have been the prime target of political players as instruments of repression and the unleashing of violence. In the following analysis I detail how young people as a group have been victim to deliberate government measures to maintain the status quo through education.

The government's efforts to ideologically re-orient Zimbabwe's youth is evident in the introduction of a broad spectrum of programmes implemented post 2000 that fall within the realm of what Ranger (2004) terms "patriotic history". The first port of call of these initiatives was the National Youth Service which saw the establishment of training centres in various parts of the country. The graduates from this programme became ZANU (PF)'s electoral campaign tools who, in alliance with war veterans ran torture camps around the country, committing violence with impunity. In a bid to convince Zimbabwe's youth into this programme there were attempts to make it a pre-requisite for entry into training colleges ,especially teacher and nurse training, by giving enrolment priority to the programme's graduates. This indoctrination would further extend into young people already enrolled in training colleges through the introduction of compulsory National Strategic Studies (NSS). NSS' sole purpose was the teaching of a history

that elevated ZANU (PF) as the country's sole redeemer, with the main text being President Mugabe's monograph of speeches known as *Inside the Third Chimurenga*. Ranger (2004:215) gives an analysis of this "patriotic history", lamenting at how this history:

...is propagated at many levels-on television and in the state controlled press; in youth militia camps; in new school history courses and textbooks; in books written by cabinet ministers; in speeches by Robert Mugabe and in philosophical eulogies and glosses of those speeches by Zimbabwe's media controller ,Tafataona Mahoso... a coherent but complex doctrine.

Clearly, the current structure of the general educational curriculum emerges as a core impediment to effective peace education as it is exclusionary and is often tampered by partisan political calculations. The secondary school history syllabus for example is characterized by echoing silences on PF ZAPU and its armed wing ZIPRA's contributions to the liberation struggle, this, a violence in itself. It exalts ZANU (PF) and its armed wing ZANLA and gives a partial reading of the past that implies that it was ZANU (PF) and ZANLA that single handedly executed the struggle for independence. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2009) examines how this partisan narrative is exclusionary of PF-ZAPU, ZIPRA, and Joshua Nkomo and an untruthful reflection of history. This contradicts the real and lived experiences of ZIPRA ex-combatants and some of the students of peace education who are born and socialized in these homes. In line with this, Zembylas and Bekerman (2008:409) note with concern that "...it is the perpetuation of "exclusionary myths, demonizing propaganda and dehumanizing ideologies...that legitimize polarized narratives."

In addition to this, the ZANU (PF) side of government has been wary of mainstreaming discourses of human rights, justice, democracy, good governance and rule of law into the school curriculum. Ranger (2004:225) further reveals how UNESCO and DANIDA had cooperated with the Ministry in the production of a series of textbooks on *Education for Human Rights and*

Democracy in Zimbabwe. He bemoans the cost in terms of time and money invested in hundreds of thousands of these books, printed in the year 2000 yet still gathering dust in warehouses to this day. On the contrary, there has been, as already highlighted above, the introduction of patriotic history as a counter to Western ideals that essentially recognize the universality of human rights. Ranger (2004:215) notes that:

... there has emerged in Zimbabwe a sustained attempt by the Mugabe regime to propagate what is called 'patriotic history'... intended to proclaim the continuity of the Zimbabwean revolutionary tradition...an attempt to reach out to 'youth' over the heads of their parents and teachers, all of whom are said to have forgotten or betrayed revolutionary values.

The education curriculum remains the same more than a decade after the observations in Ranger's foregoing analysis. This is in spite of the introduction of peace education. This indoctrination however does not end with the youth. As narrated in the following section, the state media is ZANU (PF)'s tool for ensuring that patriotic history has a wider reach as part of the process of keeping the rest of the populace in check.

Biased Media Coverage

While the formal education system seemingly targeted the younger populace, the state media, both print and electronic, has effectively served the interests of ZANU (PF) in reaching out to the generality of the populace of all age groups. Through its partial renditions and deliberate silences, it has also been manipulated to buttress a narrow and selective rendition of the past, promoting divisionism in society and breeding bitterness on the part of the excluded. Cook-Huffman (2002: 45) aptly observes that:

In many countries and communities there exists a very real climate of exclusion and intolerance where one group claims the right to deny another group's existence and rights. How do we deal with this reality so that all voices and perspectives, those who are excluded and those calling for exclusion, can be heard...

This exclusion has been extended through Zimbabwe Television programmes such as Nhaka Yedu (Our Heritage), National Ethos, and Zvavanhu (People's Heritage) among numerous other indoctrinating programmes aimed at re-socializing and re-educating the nation into an anti-imperial mode. Apart from being a platform for the exaltation of ZANU (PF) rule, these programmes are a platform for hate speech, attacking any alternative political opinion or organizing. Any perceived dissenting voices, particularly those of the opposition Movement for Democratic Change and of civil society organizations have been labeled as sellout, imperialist stooges of the West propagating a regime change agenda. In addition, to that the state media has been the medium for the airing of not only partisan news but also jingles structured to exalt the person of Robert Mugabe, ZANU (PF) and the Third Chimurenga. At the same time it has engaged in character assassination of Morgan Tsvangirai, the leading opposition politician, and the MDC. These programmes have become modern day Zimbabwe's unfailing platform for attacking any alternative political voice or ideology and elevating that of ZANU (PF). Sachikonye (2011:45) makes further observations on this, noting that "The state media is controlled by and provides most space to one particular party, and ensures that national history and values are interpreted from a particular party perspective."

In essence the state media is one of ZANU (PF)'s greatest campaign tools. However, in spite of all this deliberate violence, there have been efforts aimed at addressing the problem of violence in Zimbabwe, albeit that some of them may be a facade. In the following segment I look at the steps that post-independent Zimbabwe has taken in dealing with the problem of violence and its attempts at promoting peace. I argue however that most of these efforts have not been effective as they have been half-hearted, partisan, top down and exclusionary initiatives that sought to protect interests of the political elite at the expense of citizen's legitimate concerns. I

also look at the introduction of peace education as a milestone in the government's attempts to begin working towards the promotion of a culture of peace.

Zimbabwe's Attempts at Addressing the Problem of Violence (1980 to date)

Mashingaidze (2010:21-23) notes that upon the attainment of independence the Zimbabwean government inherited a culture of blanket amnesties, a precedent set by the Rhodesian state. This saw the declaration of what he terms a "narrowly conceived national reconciliation policy that entailed imposition of state sanctioned forgiveness." This state sanctioned approach to the communities' lived experiences of violence would also be the norm upon the signing of the 1987 Unity Accord, which led to the merger of ZANU (PF) and PF ZAPU into ZANU (PF). As Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2003:117) points out here:

...the absence of overt violence...does not mean there is peace and security in a society...the unity accord was not a product of broad based democratic consensus that included the people's voices. It was part and parcel of the authoritarian and top-down strategies of ZANU PF meant to strengthen regime security rather than to entrench the desperately needed culture of democracy and peace. The agreement was confined to the top leadership of PF ZAPU and ZANU PF. What was at stake was not the security of the people but power sharing among political elites.

The CCJP (1997:3) report confirms this exclusion of the victims, whose plight remains unacknowledged as:

Officially the State continues to deny any serious culpability for events during those years, and refuses to allow open dialogue on the issue. In effect, there is a significant chunk of Zimbabwean history which is largely unknown, except to those who experienced it at first hand. All Zimbabweans, both present and future, should be allowed access to this history.

Beyond these massacres latter phases of violence have seen pardoning, through blanket reconciliations, clemency orders and national amnesties of perpetrators of politically motivated

violence. The healing needs of the affected communities have remained peripheral. Until the post 2008 election period, there are no deliberately consultative approaches aimed at opening public spaces for engagement on the varied harms communities have experienced and the approaches they would like to see employed to address them. The subsequent section briefly explores the rise of the civil society movement as a response to the exclusion of community voices and the problem of violence. It then concludes by a look at the setting up of an organ on national healing and the introduction of peace education in Zimbabwe and whether these are the potential windows of hope for setting the country on the path towards sustainable peace.

The Culture of Violence in Zimbabwe

It would seem that the post-independence euphoria lulled the Zimbabwean populace's civic conscience up until the rude awakening brought about by the impact of the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP). Not even the state instituted violence of the Gukurahundi atrocities had awakened the generality of the populace to the reality of a shared vulnerability and victimhood to the then emerging authoritarian state.

However, coupled with ESAP's detrimental economic impact, the increase in state instituted violence in the post 2000 period was consequentially accompanied by a shift in civil society and non-governmental organizations' previously predominantly development and humanitarian focus. Although there had already been landmark interventions from organizations such as Amani Trust, the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace and the Legal Resources Foundation, the year 2000 marked a surge of the civil society movement as a more united, vigorous and directly confrontational buffer against the violation of citizen rights to voice and security. The year 2000 was a mark of its climax through the successful mobilization of the 'No Vote' campaign against the then government's proposed constitution.

The continued increase in the number of Civil Society Organizations and the emergence of the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) as the first ever formidable opposition force for ZANU (PF) to reckon with within the political arena implied that ZANU (PF) could no longer enjoy its previously unchecked monopoly and political power excesses of nearly two decades. Thus Civil Society organizations such as The Crisis Coalition, Zimbabwe Human Rights Association, the Zimbabwe Non-Governmental Organizations Forum, Transparency International Zimbabwe and the Zimbabwe Lawyers for Human Rights, among a plethora of others, emerged as an immediate demand for the institutionalization and socialization of democracy and a tradition of respect for human rights. It was inevitably a point of acknowledgement of state violence as a problem in Zimbabwe and a call for action.

In addition to this, the emergence of community level peace education initiatives through organizations such as the Zimbabwe Peace Project, Grace to Heal, Centre for Conflict Management and Transformation, the Zimbabwe Young Women's Network for Peace Building and Heal Zimbabwe Trust among others all testified to the urgency for action in addressing the problem of violence in Zimbabwe. Further to the above, the next discussion dwells on two key advances towards addressing the problem of violence in Zimbabwe; the setting up of the Organ on National Healing Reconciliation and Integration and the introduction of peace education.

The Organ on National Healing, Reconciliation and Integration (ONHRI)

Nearly twenty two years after the signing of the Unity Accord, following the 2008 post-election violence, Zimbabwe embarked on yet another top down, short term measure towards peace in the form of the Global Political Agreement (GPA), which birthed the inclusive government. In spite of its notable shortcomings that saw ZANU(PF) continue to wield the greater power, unlike the Unity Accord of 1987 in which PF ZAPU was literally swallowed into extinction, the inclusive

government succeeded in enforcing a near pragmatic measure of power sharing, with the other political parties retaining a semblance of their autonomy. It is worth celebrating that the other political parties retained their names, a symbolic feat that the 1987 Unity Accord had not achieved. Of interest to this discussion is the fact that the GPA initiated the first ever government efforts to officially acknowledge violence as a problem that needed to be dealt with in the Zimbabwean body politic through the establishment of the Organ on National Healing, Reconciliation and Integration (ONHRI). In line with GPA Article 7 the ONHRI was instituted, with three Ministers representative of each political party in the inclusive government. However, this was not without its own handicaps. Eppel (2013:2) raised the following legitimate concerns about ONHRI then, whose:

...three Ministers... do not attend Cabinet, as they head an 'organ' not a ministry: they inherited no enabling legislation, no bureaucratic framework or staff, and no budget to speak of. The staff of the 'President's Office' -members of the Central Intelligence Organization, well known for its perpetration of violence and repression over the decades -have been seconded to carry out much of the bureaucratic work of the organ.

Apart from this, the organ remains undermined by the prevailing volatility of the country's political environment characterized by resistance at security sector reforms, a partisan state media, repression of media freedoms, intolerance, polarization, denial and lack of political will in the midst of 'official' use of violence as a governance mechanism. In spite of its shortcomings, the setting up of the ONHRI is a commendable step in the right direction as it marks the official acknowledgement of violence that has placed violence on the agenda and thereby forcing the political leadership to begin to condemn it publicly from time to time, even if reluctantly. Beyond that it has thrown the whole debate on peace and violence onto the public arena, bringing to realization that more than the political elites' role, it is communities' inclusion and agency in the peace building dynamic that can influence sustainable solutions. This call for

inclusive, long term approaches brings me to my next discussion, that of the introduction of peace education and its potential to address the problem of violence in Zimbabwe.

The Introduction of Peace Education

The introduction of peace education into Zimbabwean universities' curriculum came much earlier than the birth of the inclusive government and the setting up of the ONHRI. However compared to other parts of Africa and the world, peace education in Zimbabwe is still at a very preliminary stage. Africa University, through its Institute of Peace, Leadership and Governance is the country's first to offer peace studies. The National University of Science and Technology (NUST), Solusi Adventist University (SAU), Bindura University and the Midlands State University have also followed suit. Peace education in Zimbabwe is a relatively new phenomenon and a welcome development in a nation that has been shaped by and continues to be governed by an endemic culture of violence. I view peace education as that transformation focused alternative which according to Zembylas and Bekerman (2008:409):

...will constitute...an affective space that opposes nationalist sentiments and polarized narratives and opens possibilities for reimagining the sense of community and identity...avoiding (sic) becoming enclosed in past identities that have been historically associated with nationalism and struggle to invent a democratic citizenship that critically reconsiders past feelings of belonging.

Thirty three years on, post-colonial Zimbabwe's collective memory is shaped by unresolved conflict and violence experiences. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2009:230) comprehensively notes that:

...violence is an integral part of Zimbabwean politics. What has been changing is the naming of the form of violence or the codes used. What is more worrying is that those who committed human rights abuses and atrocities have not only not been brought to

book, but continue to occupy positions of authority that enable them to unleash further violence at any time.

In view of the impact of this socialization, and the prevailing political context, could peace education be that window of hope for the re-socialization of the nation? Could it be an urgent and timely response to the problem of violence in Zimbabwe?

1.2 Research Questions

The four main questions I seek to address in this study are:

- What are the dimensions of peace education in Zimbabwe?
- How does the Zimbabwean socio-political and economic context impact on university peace education initiatives and their efficacy?
- Does studying of peace make a difference?
- In what ways can the current peace programmes be modified in order for them to be highly effective?

Simply put these questions look at how education as a system interacts with social institutions of the media, the family and politics and the varied ways in which these are supportive or retrogressive to the quest for sustainable peace. Probing these questions is necessary given that the introduction of peace education seemingly is an ongoing exercise in Zimbabwe's institutions of higher learning. It is crucial to interrogate the motivations and experiences to date of the ongoing peace education initiatives as part of this study's anticipated contribution to discourses and policies on peace education.

1.3 Research Problems and Objectives

This study makes an in-depth analysis of the Zimbabwean socio-political and economic context and how it shapes current peace education initiatives. I will also examine the motivating factors

at both institutional and student level for the teaching and studying of peace and the pedagogical implications on its efficacy? Overallly I will be interrogating the ways in which peace education as a system interacts with social institutions of the media, the family and politics and how these are either supportive or retrogressive to the quest for sustainable peace. Probing these questions is necessary given that the introduction of peace education seemingly is an ongoing exercise in Zimbabwe's institutions of higher learning. It is anticipated that this study's empirical interrogations will contribute to discourses and policies on peace education since this is an area that still requires rigorous review.

Other broader issues that have a direct influence on the implementation and sustainability of peace education include ethnicity, post-1980 peace and reconciliation initiatives, the politicization of the education system, a hierarchical education system, the hidden curriculum, socio-political polarization, the media and its representations of violence and the ever soaring unemployment levels. These are pertinent structural issues that shape the very 'peace classroom atmosphere' and appropriation of the values it seeks to advance.

The literature review will investigate issues of ethnicity and the politicization of the education system. Muzondidya and Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2007:257) point out that "...ethnicity...has continued to shape and influence the economic, social and political life of Zimbabwe since 1980." In the same vein, the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace(CCJP) and the Legal Resources Foundation(LRF) (1997:5) note that "One of the most tragic effects of events in the 1980s is that it served to harden "ethnic" differences in Zimbabwe ..." The perceptions that shape the day to day relations among the Ndebele and Shona ethnic groups at an individual level and as collective groups confirm this and are a reality which, I argue, play a major role in the primary socialization. In addition to this I will examine how the current

education structure is exclusionary and often tampered by partisan political calculations which in turn have a consequential impact on peace education and its efficacy.

1.4 Theoretical Framework

This study is premised upon three theories which are the Systems and Marxist theories on education and the transformational conflict theory.

Bar Tarl (2002) argues that peace education is by nature elusive. This elusive nature of education acknowledges that education serves a dual and contradictory role in society. Education interacts with the socio-political and economic environment as a tool for political socialization, political legitimation, social control and the stimulation of social change. The systems theory on education for example perceives of society as a system of interrelated social institutions of politics, economy, education and the family among others. The sociologist Parsons in Haralambos and Holborn (2000) for example points to the functionalist role of education in which schools are a system that socializes the young into the basic values of a society thereby entrenching value consensus. Within this perspective this study is particularly interested in the socialization and political functions of peace education.

The Marxist theory on education directs this study to how education is an instrument that is open to manipulation by those in power to advance their interests. Marxist scholars like Althusser (1970) argue that “education... is the primary *ideological state apparatus* that militates against proper comprehension of the oppressive nature of capitalist society.” The application of the Marxist perspective on education is apt in this study as education is enmeshed within a political environment that may deliberately influence peace education’s philosophy, goals and objectives. Although peace education scholars like Bar Tarl(2002) underscore the value of open minded peace education programmes that promote alternative views, scholars like

Murray(1983:11) also present pragmatic observations concerning the politics-education interaction when he states that “...no governmental system intentionally encourages its own overthrow or replacement by a competing system.” It may follow therefore that peace education may be “programmed” to legitimate the status quo.

In addition to educational theories I will draw from conflict theory. Isenhardt and Spangle (2000:1) in their focus on conflict theories observe that “Conflict is an inescapable part of our daily lives...is intrinsic to organizations, families and modern city life” This study will be informed by the transformational theory which advances that conflict is a “constructive social process” that leads to new social order. The transformational theory is not only focused on solutions but seeks a transformation of relationships. The selected theories share certain key principles that will shed more light in ascertaining the potential of peace education in Zimbabwe.

1.5 Literature Review

My literature review notes that although peace education scholarship is mainly populated by Western experiences, peace education initiatives are anonymously being implemented all around the world. To attain a balanced analysis the review also drew experiences from African focused scholarship as well.

The review, which began by drawing from Galtung’s (2000) call for a holistic appreciation of peace that goes beyond that of the mere absence of direct harm and physical violence is further informed by scholars like Burns and Aspeslagh (1983), Reardon (1988), Kent (1993), Dovey (1996), Carl and Swartz (1996) Perez de Cuellar and Young (1999), Melko (1999), Harris and Lewis (1999), Harris (1999) Salomon (1999), Bar Tarl (2002), Maxwell *et al* (2004) ,Smit (2005), Houghton and John (2007) and Barash and Webel (2014) among others. These scholars shed more light on the link between violence, peace and security; the ways in which peace is established; peace education definition history and rationale as well as its types

goals and approaches, among other pertinent issues. Importantly the literature review makes a gender analysis and a review of the complexity of justice in peace education.

1.6 Methodology

This study seeks to understand people based on their perspectives and therefore pursues an insider view of the peace teaching-learning experience hence it is an empirically grounded qualitative study that utilizes both primary and secondary data. Berg (2001:6-7) notes that:

Qualitative research properly seeks answers to questions by examining various social settings and the individuals who inhabit these settings. Qualitative researchers, then, are most interested in how humans arrange themselves and their settings and how inhabitants of these settings make sense of their surroundings through symbols, rituals, social structures, social roles, and so forth.

This is also substantiated by Cresswell *et al* (2010) who point out that qualitative research is human experience focused, emphasizes participant voice and seeks a contextual understanding of processes. In the same vein this study is interested in the lecturers' and students' conceptualizations of peace in light of both the macro environment and relative effectiveness of each institution's approach.

Africa University, located in Mutare in Manicaland Province is strategically selected for being the first institution to offer peace education programmes and only at postgraduate level while NUST, located in Bulawayo Metropolitan province is the first state institution to offer peace studies, offered as a compulsory service course to all its first year students irrespective of their major disciplines. NUST is particularly a case study of interest in this research firstly because of its Science and Technology orientation and secondly because unlike in the other two universities where students make voluntary choices to engage in peace education, NUST offers it as an obligatory course for every first year student. I argue that the NUST approach points to a deliberate *resocialisation and mindset transformation* commitment. The Midlands State

University is one of the latest institutions to offer peace education, in 2014, offering a full-fledged undergraduate 4 year degree course.

The case study approach adopted for this research is useful as noted by Robson (1993:148) that case studies enable specific yet holistic insight into the numerous interacting variables shaping each programme experience. Primary data was drawn from course outlines and other university policy documents rationalizing teaching of peace education in each institution. In addition to this, interviews and focus group discussions with various relevant stakeholders in the education enterprise such as lecturers, current and former tertiary level students of peace education, and some retired educationists were carried out in order to gain insight on their experiences and perceptions of studying peace within the Zimbabwean socio-political context. Data for this study was collected through institutional documents and records, in-depth personal interviews and focus group discussions. As Morgan (1996) has argued, focus group discussions enable validation of certain viewpoints as participants have the opportunity to query and explain themselves to one another. For my research tools I utilized semi-structured open-ended questionnaires which also served as interview schedules for focus group discussions and in-depth personal interviews. Formal meetings for personal in-depth interviews were arranged with relevant department personnel in each institution in order to explain the nature of the study while gaining insight on institutional ethos. The respondents were generally averse to being audio-recorded. A total of 100 respondents were targeted for this study for a fairly representative and administratively manageable sample size. Since the National University of Science and Technology offers peace studies to every first year student, a larger, 40 students and 6 staff respondent's pool will be drawn from it in order to attain a fairly representative student and lecturer sample since peace is taken by every first year student. 22 students and 2 staff will be drawn from Africa and Midlands State Universities each

and the other 6 respondents will be randomly but strategically drawn from other University Departments, Civil Society and Education sectors to enable an outsider perspective.

For the student population this study adopted a non-probability sampling approach that utilized a combination of quota and snowball sampling. The quota sampling procedure was selected for ensuring quantity representativeness in terms of the sex, language group, age and specialization where achievable. Snowball sampling was particularly used in identifying former students where it was possible to access them. Robson (1993:142) advises that snowball sampling is "...a useful approach when there is difficulty in identifying members of the population."

For AU respondents were identified through a network of former students, some of whom I emailed the questionnaire or interviewed over the phone. Most of them are former students spread far and wide as lecturers in other universities and development practitioners within civil society. For NUST and MSU I travelled to the campuses in Bulawayo and Zvishavane respectively in order to randomly identify participants guided by the aim for gender balance and representativeness in all other key aspects. Emailed questionnaires and telephone interviews were also used for some of the respondents who were too busy to schedule interviews.

1.7 Ethical Considerations

As part of fulfilling the ethical considerations I began by requesting permission, through the relevant Registrar, Department Chairpersons and Lecturers' offices from each institution. Email communication, one on one as well as telephone interviews were held as part of this process and the institutions granted research clearance and availed written documentation to that effect. This engagement also enabled me access to internal programme documents that shed more light on the peace education programmes within each institution. In the process I also availed my

research tools that mainly entailed my questionnaire with an attached informed consent form as well as details of my identity; my institutional affiliation and that of my Supervisor and contacts.

Prior to conducting the interview each respondent was informed of the nature of the research, assured of confidentiality and given room to opt for anonymity, use pseudonyms and to withdraw from the research anytime as best suited them.

Lastly, the data is to be kept securely through an arrangement with my supervisor and will, at the appropriate time, be disposed of through shredding and incineration.

1.8 Limitations

One of the major limitations of this study is the political sensitivity of the subjects of peace and violence, especially as matters of discussion within the public realm. The political polarization and intolerance for political plurality pastes a suspicion tag upon every researcher who may be perceived as anything from a pro-ruling party intelligence undercover or informer to an opposition sympathizer advancing a regime change agenda.

Given this politically volatile environment meant respondents, lecturers and students alike could not freely engage in such a sensitive subject, something which may have led to censor significant opinion as far as this study is concerned. Some students and lecturers alike totally withheld their identities, some took questionnaires, never to return them and some simply declined to participate.

Another limitation was the challenge securing appointments with some of the programme authorities who were busy or out of the country the length of the research period and without their green light it was difficult to formally engage with some of the personnel in their department.

Lastly, the perception that has been advanced by state aligned media that peace education is a western inspired field of study bent on a regime change agenda instills a sense of insecurity on both researcher and respondent. This demands that efforts are made to secure those involved which may compromise the publishing of findings and the research's ability to influence policy and future scholarship. Credibility may be questionable due to excessive use of pseudonyms and censorship of pertinent observation.

1.9 Structure of Dissertation

Chapter 1 is the Introduction and gives a general overview of the area of study by focusing on Zimbabwe's historical background and contextual analysis of the post year 2000 political dispensation and how it has shaped the socio-political realities of conflict, violence and peace. This chapter also looked at the theoretical framework and methodology.

Chapter 2 analyses cognate literature and interrogates the theoretical framework on peace education in Zimbabwe. A wide array of peace and conflict studies, sociology, sociology of education and history scholarship informs this chapter. It will explore key peace studies concepts of conflict, violence, peace, security and justice. Importantly, it will make a detailed study of peace education in the following categorizations; the ways in which peace is established; defining peace and peace education; its goals and ambiguities and conclude by encapsulating the key aspects raised by the scholarship selected for this study.

Chapter 3 examines the multiple dimensions of peace education in Zimbabwe within which I interrogate the multifaceted motivations for the study of peace education and the unique implementation approaches and how these impact on its effectiveness.

Chapter 4 analyses the socio-political context of peace education in Zimbabwe. This chapter looks at how peace education is shaped by social institutions such as the family, politics

and the media. It will examine the consequential impact of home socialization, the media and political articulations on peace education and its efficacy.

Chapter 5 takes a back and forward looking analysis to ascertain the benefits of peace education at different levels in order to ascertain the possibilities of making a difference through peace education. It will also explore the need to revisit the peace curriculum in order to make it more comprehensive and all encompassing.

Lastly, Chapter 6 concludes and summarizes the dissertation's findings and locates its contribution to ongoing scholarship on peace education in Zimbabwe. It also proposes recommendations towards future peace education programmes.

For a broader appreciation of peace education, in the next chapter I draw insights from a wide array of peace and conflict studies scholarship.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.0 Introduction

Although peace education is a western inspired concept and western scholarship populates the selected literature, scholars like Burns and Aspeslagh (1983:314) note that “most of the work on peace education is carried out **anonymously** and in very difficult social, economic and political circumstances, only rarely using the label ‘peace education.’” For a broader appreciation of peace education this literature review draws insights from a wide array of peace and conflict studies scholarship from the early eighties to 2014. These include Burns and Aspeslagh (1983), Reardon (1988), Kent (1993), Dovey (1996), Carl and Swartz (1996) Perez de Cuellar and Young (1999), Melko (1999), Harris and Lewis (1999), Harris (1999) Salomon (1999), Bar Tarl (2002), Maxwell *et al* (2004) , Smit (2005), Houghton and John (2007) and Barash and Webel (2014) among others.

One of the notable developments in peace scholarship is the call for a holistic meaning and understanding of peace that goes beyond that of early writings which limited peace to the absence of direct physical violence. Advanced by Galtung in Salomon (2000), this development has led to a marked demarcation between negative and positive peace and a shift from the prioritization of state security to that of human security all driven by the quest for social justice.

The selected literature shows how the challenges with the definition of the concept of peace have further complicated what constitutes peace as a field of study. Burns and Aspeslagh (1983), Reardon (1988), Harris (1999), Salomon (1999) and Bar Tarl (2002) bring out the various contestations concerning the nature and typologies of peace education. For instance

Salomon (1999) points to this dispute when he argues that “...too many things are now called peace education.” Although there are milestones to be celebrated, peace as a field of study is still fraught with complexities as this literature review will further reveal.

2.1 The Link between Violence, Peace and Security

Kent (1993), Perez de Cuellar and Young (1999), Melko (1999), Harris and Lewis (1999), Nathan (2000), Salomon (2000) and Harris (2008) all draw from Galtung’s postulations on structural violence in their focus on the meaning of peace that goes beyond that of early writings, which limited peace to the absence of direct physical violence. The scholars note that over the years the meanings of violence, peace and security have broadened, leading to the categorizations of structural violence, negative and positive peace as well human versus state security. It is necessary to begin here by defining violence.

Although the traditional meaning of violence is premised on the physical manifestations of direct bodily harm and infliction of pain, advances in peace theory over the years have led to the emergence of structural and cultural violence. Although these concepts are open to contestation, Galtung’s observations of often indirect and insidious forms of violence that are embedded within the social system have served to deepen the understanding of conflict, violence and peace. Johan Galtung (in Harris 2008:79) in his analysis of Rhodesia became concerned with the challenges of limiting the definition of peace to the absence of direct violence given that “In a certain sense, there was harmony, cooperation, integration. But was this peace? With the blatant exploitation, with blacks being denied most opportunities for development given to whites, with flagrant inequality...” These observations are what led Galtung to the concept of structural violence which extends beyond direct harm to entail any

unintended yet preventable situations that impede human access and potential. Barash and Webel (2014:7) expanding on Galtung's postulations define structural violence as an extreme form of social oppression, premised on a dominion that denies people their economic, social and political rights.

The expansion in the meaning of violence has inevitably expanded the meaning of peace into negative and positive. Negative peace entails an absence of direct violence in spite of a state of social and political repression. The state of calm in the midst of depraved social circumstances is often sustained by authoritarian means. Positive peace on the other hand pursues an end to both direct and structural violence marked by the absence of personal violence and presence of social justice. Positive peace therefore is a state of balance between absence of direct violence and presence of social justice, where people are free from the threat of the various manifestations of violence, a state of security. Harris (2008:78) further observes that the traditional definition of security is no longer significant for developing countries. It focused on territorial security and military might at the expense of human security needs yet:

The greatest threat to the people...at present...are socio economic problems such as poverty, unemployment, lack of education, lack of housing, the high crime rate and violence. One of the policy priorities of the government, therefore, is socio economic development and upliftment.

This is also echoed by Barnaby (1989:26) who states that human conduct and access to basic resources are intricately related and when scarcity of resources impedes life itself, a state of social injustice obtains in which the contest for these resources eventually leads to hostility that fuels violence. Violence therefore is more than direct physical harm while peace is more than the absence of direct physical violence. The reality of structural violence and human security confirm the complexity of the task of pursuing a behavioral definition of peace. The following

section ventures into the various ways in which peace can be established, with a deliberate focus on peace building, the realm within which peace education falls.

2.2 The Ways in Which Peace is Established

Peace theory states three ways in which peace may be established. These three approaches to establishing peace are complementary and acknowledge Galtung's dichotomies of structural violence as well as negative and positive peace. This is because at various levels of their implementation the approaches may be working towards the promotion of peace in the immediate, short, and medium to long term. Harris and Lewis (1999:34) give a summary of these three ways stating that:

- peacemaking occurs at the diplomatic and political levels;
- peacekeeping involves military intervention by third parties in an attempt to contain or prevent direct violence ;
- Peacebuilding involves the physical, social and structural initiatives which can help provide reconstruction and rehabilitation.

Peacemaking and peacekeeping initiatives are often reactionary, short to medium term transitory measures that often foster negative peace while peacebuilding entails a set of pro-active, long term steps aimed at inculcating positive peace values. As Harris (1999:300) observes, peacekeeping uses force by building barriers between disputants to deter violence, as exemplified by cases of the physical presence of UN peacekeeping missions in some war zones.

While peacekeeping and peacemaking are equally crucial and necessary measures, they have their own limitations. Firstly; they not only tend to be reactionary but also serve as a temporary non-self-sustaining measure as they respond only to the symptoms of a deep rooted problem. They serve only to suppress or halt violence while postponing the problem which is bound to re-emerge in future. Peacekeeping and peacemaking therefore are mechanisms of

achieving negative peace as they only address the symptoms and not underlying causes of conflict. The effectiveness of such processes is what Botcharova (2001:279-281) challenges when she laments that:

Even when accords have been undertaken, the sad statistics are confirmed, that more than 50 percent of ... initiatives and negotiations on peace fail...People forced by their leaders to fight with each other only yesterday cannot readily shake hands today just because their leaders finally draw lines on maps and put their signatures on important papers...Only a paper peace can be reached on paper.

The temporary relief brought about by peacekeeping and peacemaking approaches is revelation that steps that disregard victims' agency in establishing peace do not appeal to the deep sense of harm and need for healing within individuals and their societies as they often disregard contextual experience by bringing in irrelevant, sometimes elitist approaches. Adam and Adam (2000:33) in their analysis of the politics of memory in divided societies echo similar sentiments on how legislated reconciliation is insensitive to the fact that the mandate of forgiveness lies with the victim. There is need for the complementary structural approach that peacebuilding avails in addressing the problem of violence and promotion of sustainable peace. Peacebuilding seeks to build human and institutional structures of peace premised on justice, equity and cooperation by targeting the underlying causes of violence. Peace building therefore is foundational in its approach, seeking to establish long term sustainable structures for positive peace as Johnson and Johnson (2005: 277-278) reveal that it:

...creates the economic ,political, and educational institutions needed to ensure long term peace based on social justice...removes the structural bases of oppression and destruction conflict and establishes new (or modified) structures that create the processes necessary for social justice and peaceful relations among former disputants.

Peacebuilding realizes that peace as a human relationship process cannot be maintained by imposing a blockade, physical or ideological between the conflicting parties. Neither can it be

achieved by focusing on the interests of the political elite. In the next section I analyze the history of peace education, its definitions and rationale.

2.3 Peace Education: History, Definition and Rationale

The history of peace education as presented by Harris (2002:5-6) points to the fact that the quest for peace runs through most if not all the scriptures of the religions of this world. This implies that peace education is as old as the world's religions and possibly as old as humanity itself. Secondly, the passage of about 3 centuries between the first European Comenius' (1642, 1969) efforts to promote peace through the written word and the introduction of the first academic peace studies programme in 1948 at Manchester College, Indiana all add to what Harris' (1999:299-300) terms peace education's glorious history that has seen a shift from concern with the terror of warfare and the mass destruction potential of mechanized weaponry to addressing all aspects of violence and the ensuing trauma. Simply put, there has, over the years been a deliberate approach to building peace that acknowledges Galtung's postulations on negative and positive peace as well as structural violence. The need to come up with wholesome initiatives that address both direct and structural violence at various levels of human existence have inevitably led to the multi-faceted dimensions of both peace and peace education.

Gervais (2004:208) draws comparisons between what he terms peaceful versus conflict ridden countries. He explains that peaceful countries like Norway and Canada have peace education programmes aimed at communication skills acquisition instead of a historical approach that seeks to promote a deeper understanding of the roots of peace and conflict. On the other hand, he cites Israel, Palestine and Ireland as examples of conflict troubled countries where peace education "...is a highly politicized and emotionally charged issue with one side as more

‘right’ than the other.” Gervais’ concern is that both approaches are limited as the first overlooks existence of conflict while the latter approach may be unable to see beyond the conflict.

Peace education’s complexities with definition in turn have implications on goals and even the curriculum. Contradictions are evident amongst scholars in terms of what should constitute the content of peace studies. While some scholars acknowledge that a peace curriculum can be as diverse as the problems within the context in which it unfolds, Salomon (2002:5) proposes a distinction between peace education and other fields expressing grave concerns that:

Too many things are now called peace education, ranging from violence reduction in schools to learning about war and peace...it is obvious that peace education shares quite a bit with such...But as long as we do not distinguish between the core of peace education, its unique goals and ...problems...we will not be able to formulate clear criteria for the evaluation of peace education or to raise necessary questions about it.

Although Salomon raises pertinent considerations for principles and evaluation, there emerge contradictions here. For example, some scholars like Harris (1999:303) define conflict resolution programmes as one of the five types of peace education yet Salomon seems to categorize these differently and separately, arguing that peace education is different in that it is focused on the long term transformation of human mindsets and classifies peace education into three categories compared to Harris’ five. According to Salomon the major categorizations are those of peace education in regions of intractable conflicts; peace education in areas of inter-ethnic tension and peace education in regions of experienced tranquility. I argue that, given their focus, conflict resolution programmes are a facet of peace education and may also contribute to long term mindset transformation. Notably there are overlaps depicted by the packaging of some peace education programmes as Peace and Conflict Transformation studies or Conflict Resolution and Transformation Studies.

In spite of this ongoing debate on content however conflict remains an inevitable characteristic of human existence as a key rationale for targeted education mechanisms that seek to promote alternatives to violent responses to conflict. Barash and Webel (2014:20-21) further explain the necessity of peace education when they explain how:

People concerned about violence are turning to education as a means to heighten awareness about the causes of violence and to promote nonviolent alternatives to violent means of conflict resolution. Peace education is the theory and practice of education about peace and nonviolence and a commitment to building a more cooperative society by utilizing the concepts and practices of peace studies, conflict resolution, and nonviolence.

Clearly there is a need for steps aimed at equipping a society's individuals with skills and attributes to ensure that incompatibility in interests does not necessarily lead to violence. Bar Tal (2002) aptly puts this debate to rest when he comprehensively captures the definition, goals and justification of peace education in this observation:

Within a wide range of different peace education programs, a common general objective can be found. They all aim to foster changes which will make the world a better, more humane place. The goal is to diminish, or even to eradicate, a variety of human ills ranging from injustice, inequality, prejudice, intolerance, abuse of human rights, environmental destruction, violent conflict, war and other evils, in order to create a world of justice, equality, tolerance, human rights, environmental quality, peace and other positive features.

In the same vein, Haavelsrud (1983:121) recognizes that "peace education tries to transform individuals so they develop a particular type of personality that desires to promote peace at all levels-personal, societal, and global." Bar Tal (2002:2-3) perceives peace education as a mirror of society unto itself, a socialization, re-socialization and campaign for change initiative. Ideally, as a mirror peace education enables societal introspection on the prevailing context and what needs to be transformed for the society's good. He observes that peace education is condition dependent and its focus will be influenced by the structure of a given society's relationships, its economy, inequality, polarization, civic culture and political stability. Cawagas and Swee-Hin

(1989:13) highlight for example that peace education in the Philippines has a two-fold responsibility:

First, it seeks to help all members of society to fully understand the root causes of conflicts and violence in their communities, regions and nation, as well as within themselves and between nations in the world. At the same time, peace education encourages all students and citizens to engage in personal action and social action which can transform their society and the world toward more just, compassionate, sharing and nonviolent structures, institutions, systems, communities, families and individuals.

In spite of its complexities, contradictions and difficulties, peace education is necessary in the world today as there seemingly is no other field of study that has the indiscriminate reverence for human life and the desire to make the world more habitable.

2.4 Types, Goals and Approaches to Peace Education

This section focuses on the different types of peace education and its various implementation approaches.

2.4.1 Types of Peace Education

There are as numerous categorizations or types of peace education as there are contexts and approaches to its implementation. As already noted in the foregoing, peace and violence have broadened into positive and negative peace as well as physical and structural violence, respectively. The type of peace programme may therefore depend on whether it is targeted at educating for positive or for negative peace. Maxwell (2004:207) observes with concern that “According to the international peace education programme meta-analysis...the peace education focus appears nonetheless to be primarily concerned with negative peace.”

In addition to this, types of peace education are influenced by the objectives in a given context. Some of the objectives may be targeted in isolation while some may be sequentially

targeted and overlapping to complement each other towards the greater goal of building a sustainable culture of peace, hence they may be short, medium or long term. Peace education as a long term process targets transformation in values and attitudes while as a short term measure it may just be focused on imparting information, hence the distinction by some scholars on ‘educating *for* peace’ versus ‘education *about* peace.’

Furthermore, social, economic and political status of participants in terms of race, class, ethnicity, gender and inequality all come into play. In relation to this Salomon (2002:5), drawing examples from Northern Ireland, Israel, Bosnia, Spain and Kosovo, categorizes peace education in areas of ongoing violent conflicts; peace education in areas characterized by inter-ethnic, racial or tribal tension and peace education in areas of experienced calm. He argues that in such areas education may be more about peace than for peace. Falling within these categorizations Cawagas and Swee-Hin (1989:11) also explore peace education in the Philippines which they define as “a land of suffering and hope”, where communities desperately try to survive within a deepening vicious cycle of poverty, hunger, insecurity and crime. Reflecting on related issues, Maxwell *et al* (2004:103) draw from the South African experience as they explore peace education in a context of “pervasive social violence” within which both the children and peace educators are shaped by experiences of violence. Houghton and John (2007:2) delineate South Africa’s deeply entrenched legacy of violence lamenting that:

... (d) ecades of minority rule, brutally enforced, have left a country whose people, structures and institutions bear the scars of violence, of inequality, of opportunity denied...violence in the political arena (has become) a socially sanctioned method for dealing with conflict and for achieving change...in this context, reversing such a culture of violence and educating for peaceful change is an enormous challenge.

This reality of the challenges means the various aspects of a community must work together hence more players need to be engaged if peace education is going to bear fruit. Apart from

schools and civil society, religious groups have not been left out in the quest for peace. In fact, as earlier noted by Burns and Aspeslagh (1983:313) various religions of the world have been at the forefront of educating for peace way before there was the modern brand of peace education. This is supported by Harris (2002:5) who acknowledges that each of the world's religions have specific scriptures aimed at the promotion of peace.

In line with this, Gervais (2004:205) advocates for a Baha'i faith based peace education approach which he believes deserves recognition for its wide-ranging and futuristic contributions to peace efforts in a world where he is convinced that formal education systems have proved ineffective. He too notes that roots of peace are inherent in all the world's organized religions which have at their core, guiding principles and statutes on human conduct. Koylu (2004:59) in analyzing the contribution of Islamic teaching to peace education observes a dual role of religion where it has always been an influential force for both war and peace. Similar sentiments are also raised by Davies (2005:43) who argues that the United States invasion of Iraq was partly driven by a fundamentalist Christian stereotype of Islamic countries as evil. Gervais (2004:209) however pre-empted this scholarship that questions violence carried out in the name of religion arguing that this is usually the result of a smaller percentage, about 2% of the religious population that misconstrues religious teachings to justify their violent actions.

Finally this section has revealed that the types of peace education have increased with the broadening of the definitions of peace and violence as well as the unique structures, demands and expectations of each socio-political context. Clearly, peace education is a field deep and diverse and therefore with far reaching goals as the following section seeks to disclose.

2.4.2 Goals of Peace Education

While types of peace education abound, it has a constant goal of equipping and transforming societal knowledge, skills and attitudes from a culture of violence to that of peace at all levels of human interaction. I will focus here on three sets of peace education programmes as I draw some of peace education's goals.

Through conflict resolution, violence prevention and non-violence education programmes it seeks amongst its numerous goals to equip students with skills to resolve interpersonal conflicts by proffering alternative, nonviolent and constructive responses to conflict. Instead of eluding the inevitable reality of conflict in their lives, peace education enables them to acknowledge, engage, dialogue and work out approaches of resolving, managing and even transforming the conflict. Carl and Swartz (1996:2) lament at the alarming levels of violence in South Africa and how violence is often considered the response of choice. Violence has thus become a method of the country's political, social and even economic life. Peace education therefore is that avenue that can begin to inculcate peaceful problem solving practices.

Global Peace education, referred to in some contexts as education for international understanding seeks to, among other goals; promote a global citizenship conscience that leads to appreciation and tolerance of human diversity, valuing the humanity of others in spite of the cultural, ethnic and racial divides. The hope is that this kind of education leads to universally shared knowledge that may provide long term solutions to societal ills such as xenophobia, as was witnessed in South Africa in 2008 and recently in 2015. Salomon (2002:9) concurs that peace education is an opportunity to transform the other's perspective, to acknowledge the

other's narrative and to *"relate less hatefully and more trustingly...towards that collective other."*

Peace education's goal is to deepen an understanding and application of structural violence, human rights, good governance and environmental awareness, all of which fall into the category of development education. The interdependent relationship between peace and development presents a dilemma in that wars and violence impede all aspects of a nation's development be it the political, social or economic. At the same time structural violence marked by deepening poverty and insecurity are in themselves factors that fuel instability and escalation of conflict into violence yet at the same time stability, even in the form of negative peace is a pre-requisite for development. Development education is one comprehensive facet of peace education which according to Harris (1999:305) "teaches critical consciousness that challenges injustice and undemocratic policy making."

Evidently, the goals of peace education are as wide ranging as the contexts within which the programmes are unrolled and so are the approaches as revealed in the following section.

2.4.3 Approaches to Peace Education

Peace education is a field that emphasizes both content and technique in its implementation and therefore the learner, teacher, curriculum; classroom; school and community factors all have an influence on the potential impact of any given programme. Harris (1999) observes that peace theory can be applied to various levels of educational initiatives in relation to the needs and interests in a given context and time. Initiatives can target community structures such as homes, churches, community clubs, cultural groups and informal and formal education structures such as pre-school, primary and secondary schools, colleges and as is the case in Zimbabwe,

universities. Peace education can also be structured to target government structures and even political parties. As already noted, Zimbabwe has officially pitched peace education efforts at University level.

There is debate on the ideal implementation sites and levels of peace education as explored by Coady (1985), Harris (1999), Lantieri (1995) and Cairns (1996) and Reardon (2001). They present cases of peace education from pre-school through to university level. It is necessary to interrogate the implications of peace education at these various levels in order to establish the effectiveness of peace education firstly; through the medium of the school system and secondly at university level as currently is the case in Zimbabwe. Reardon (2001:183) emphasizes the importance of the school as a key site for promoting peace, arguing that:

Schools in virtually all cultures have served as community centres, and at their best are integrated into community life, often taking on tasks other than educating children, such as helping to deal with emergencies and community problems. Teachers and Parents are usually members of the same community and their common relationship of care and responsibility for the young is the basis of a productive partnership that could be put in the service of a culture of peace. This partnership could be the vehicle through which ministries of education, school authorities and communities are educated about the needs and possibilities for education for a culture of peace.

Reardon's views in the foregoing observation perceive of schools as centres of community that can enable collaboration towards the promotion of peace. Reardon however does not overlook their potential as venues of violence. Contrary to Reardon's opinion, Cairns (1996:164) argues that the home or the family is the ideal level for pitching peace education initiatives as "school-based peace education is... bound to be ineffective because it targets the wrong people in the wrong setting." The centrality of the family as a primary socializing agent confirms that the impact of education within the formal school system is already subject to the prevailing social, political and economic circumstances. Harber (1985) for example looks at the ideological

functions of education in Zimbabwe in which he interrogates concepts of power, inequality, community and ideology. In a related analysis Ranger (2004:215) observes how the post 2000 Zimbabwean education system has served to advance the interests of the powerful elite.

As noted by the Catholic Education Office (1986:148) peace education may be implemented as a formal activity through schools or as informal activities such as advocacy and campaign activities in the communities. It may take on a bottom up community approach or may be a top down government imposition. Peace programmes may focus on a wide range of concepts, from promoting a deeper understanding of the facets and roots of peace, conflict and violence, to alternatives to violence.

While acknowledging these variations Salomon raises concern that while a variety of initiatives are being unrolled, there is not sufficient research and evaluation accompanying them. He believes that while objectives of peace education will differ from place to place; from nurturing non-violent temperament, human rights promotion to the quest for environmental peace there is need to identify Peace Education's *core attributes*. He believes this will not only ensure consolidation of a body of scholarship but that initiatives also become a basis of learning for one another within a given context and across the world.

2.5 The Gender Lens as an Approach to Peace Education

Although conflict affects men and women differently, the wide array of peace scholarship that informs this literature review is gender silent. The scholarship takes a generic approach to the analysis of conflict, violence, peace and peace education in a way that seems to overlook how social inequalities between sexes subject them differently to experiences of violence. To address this gap I draw from the important feminist insights raised by Brock-Utne (2007) who proposes

the need to approach the broader field of peace studies with a gender lens. Reardon (2001) also calls for an approach to peace studies that confronts gender bias. In addition to this, Rude (1999), Ewing (2003) and Sathiparsad (2005) all explore the dynamics of violence with a gender lens, particularly focusing on African contexts. Rude presents a Zambian perspective while Sathiparsad and Ewing locate their studies within South Africa.

Gender is a dynamic social construct that shapes definitions and expectations for femininity and masculinity and inevitably embodies a potential for conflict between girls, boys, men and women and their experiences, roles, needs, interests and preferences. A gender lens is necessary in the approach to peacebuilding for various reasons, as this discussion goes on to outline. Firstly, Peacebuilding has mainly focused on intra community differences that could have political and ethnic dimensions yet outside of politics individuals are shaped into a culture of violence by the everyday experiences of violence within the home, family and community. This is rooted within the patriarchal structures of families and communities that, in spite of the milestones achieved in seeking equal opportunities for women and girls, continue to condone violence against women. Harris (2002:8) notes that Brock-Utne, writing in 1985:

...pointed out the devastation that militarism, war, and male violence wreaks (sic) upon females and argued that feminism is the starting point for effective disarmament. She pointed out that societies not at war were not necessarily peaceful because they still had considerable domestic violence.

A gendered approach enables the questioning of philosophies of peace that sometimes overlook how even in states like Zimbabwe, which I believe may be defined as fairly peaceful, women and girls continue to suffer from the structural violence of poverty and poor service delivery coupled with high levels of violence that characterizes the private sphere. Brock- Utne (2007:3) makes a feminist call for education for and about peace and further observes that due

to the disparities fomented by globalization the greatest victims in both the industrialized and developing countries are women and children. She also affirms the reality that peace and freedom at a macro level are no assurance for the same at family level as women and girls may still be victim to violent customs. In Zimbabwe for example cases of child sexual abuse, rape, wife inheritance, child marriages and domestic violence abound in line with her observation that “Likewise there may be war in a country and no wife battering or wife battering and no war.”

The South African scenario is another case in point where, even in the absence of overt military combat before and years after the end of apartheid, rape continues to be used a weapon to violate women and girls. Ewing (2003:54) makes a revealing analysis of rape, gender and the justice system and notes with concern how boys and girls, already victims of child rape routinely suffer secondary trauma due to a criminal justice system that has in built gender discrimination from reporting to securing a conviction, if any. Sathiparsad (2005:79), in her analysis intriguingly titled “*it is better to beat her*” also observes the numerous dimensions of gender based violence amongst South African youth, with extensive abuse of girls and women within families, schools and communities. She notes that gender based violence “...is legitimized by the norms of a society concerning male/female roles and, thereby, the attitudes that males and females take into any interaction.” Notions of male power and control, sex and infidelity as assertions of manhood, men as subjects and women as objects are firmly entrenched in this. Rude (1999) further substantiates this in her analysis of gender based homicide where power and control are fundamental factors. In the same vein with Ewing she laments at how:

Comments by the judiciary...reflect certain attitudes about gender roles and appropriate behavior. The women are judged to have ‘provoked’ their perpetrators, whose violent reactions are all too often seen as inevitable, understandable, and therefore somewhat pardonable. Comments which legitimize men’s violent behavior could be said to sanction violence against women...

Clearly there are structural imbalances that continue to alienate women from the justice system that need to be addressed. Given the foregoing factors, I argue for a gendered approach to peacebuilding and specifically to the planning and implementation of peace education initiatives so that the anticipated goals are shaped by a foreseen differential impact on girls and boys, men and women. The fact that gender is a social construct means that it is dynamic and therefore changes from one culture and context to another. A gender lens therefore would enable planning, implementation and evaluation of contextually relevant gender sensitive pedagogical approaches that ensure that the peace classroom lays the foundation for an end to the violence of gender discrimination.

A gender lens acknowledges that men and women have a dual role as victims and perpetrators of violence and challenges the traditional notions of women as passive players in the violence dynamic. Women are not necessarily a synonym for peace. It is imperative therefore to appreciate the shifting dynamics of masculinity and femininity in the face of conflict and violence and take these into account in designing peace initiatives.

Another key aspect of the gender lens approach that Brock-Utne (2007) draws attention to is the possibility that material selected for peace education may contribute to making women invisible both in terms authorship and content. There is need therefore to deliberately design and select gender sensitive educational material that denotes women's agency in the promotion of peace and their equal participation in all phases of peacebuilding.

Evidently, in view of the differential impact of conflict, violence and peace on men and women, it is pertinent to take into account these gender disparities in the planning of peace education initiatives. I move on now to discuss the ambiguities that characterize peace education.

2.6 Ambiguities of Peace Education

A review of literature published over a period of nearly three decades reveals that the field of peace studies is still fraught with controversies around definition, content and even focus. Coady (1985:24) notes that the study of peace at any level is coupled with controversy while Harris (1999:301), Brock Utne (2000:132), Bar Tarl (2002:1) and Salomon (2000) all agree to the contested meanings of peace and the consequence that peace education is open to as numerous interpretations as the variety of problems it seeks to address. Salomon (2000:4) raises concern that "...no progress can take place in the absence of clear conceptions of what peace education is and what goals it is to serve...Peace education has many divergent meanings for different individuals in different places." This poses a challenge for evaluating effectiveness.

Further to this debates is ongoing as to whether it is education for peace, peace education or peace studies as the Catholic Education Office (1986:138) reveals that "Whilst the terms 'peace studies', 'peace education' and 'educating for peace' are frequently used interchangeably, there is an increasing tendency to draw distinctions. 'Peace education' tends to be now seen as broader than 'peace studies'..." However, for purposes of this study I adopt use of the term peace education more for its ease of use than for drawing a distinction with peace studies or education for peace. My conclusion is that all three may be interchangeably used. However, as this discussion unfolds, it is clear that there are ongoing controversies and contradictions.

Writing in the early eighties, Burns and Aspeslagh (1983:312) note that peace education at this point was not only facing problems in terms of its legitimacy as a field of study but was still fairly unfamiliar if not unknown in some parts of the world. However, they are quick to

caution that the fact that peace education is a concept developed in the Western world and projected onto the wider world should not overlook the fact that this is not a totally novel notion. They note the influence of the Catholic Education system in countries like Australia, Belgium and the United Kingdom where some components of what now falls under peace education were already included in justice, religious, moral and world studies. They also express a conviction that in some third world countries, in spite of the terminology used, there has always and continues to be lot of work undertaken for peace as they note that:

Anyone attempting to obtain an overview of the ideas and content of peace education and to discover what its substance is at the present time, would find a large number of different projects and experiments ...If we tried to identify or define peace education ...we should fail. For what is done in the name of peace education, in whatever language, depends on the place, the time and the problems that constitute the here- and-now reality and threaten people's survival.

Writing nineteen years later Bar Tarl (2002:1) in his incisive observations on 'the elusive nature of peace education' echoes similar sentiments when he remarks that peace education has a complex state due to the social, political and economic implications of its intentions. Burns and Aspeslagh (ibid:312) reveal the diversity of peace education priorities between Western, European, Asian and African countries when they allude to the UNESCO World Congress on Disarmament Education where Europeans were more concerned about innovations for eradication of nuclear weapons while Africans were more concerned with arms trade and poverty. It is also worth noting that for Europe and Japan concern with nuclear weapons also took different trajectories due to differences in their experiential history with such weapons.

The foregoing discussion clearly outlines that peace education is a field as diverse as the problems encountered from one context to the other. Bar Tarl is one scholar who, while clarifying the meaningful role of peace education also elucidates in depth on its complexities. In

his analysis of the elusive nature of peace education he challenges us to ask provocative yet very necessary questions for the further refinement of this field of study. He observes that peace education, while a noble venture, may not be welcome in some societies as its ability to mirror social ills may pose a threat to the interests of those in power and its focus therefore may be subject to political interference. Partisan interests and political tampering remain a major challenge.

This foregoing sentiment by Bar Tarl echoes the conflict perspective's sentiments on education and how it can be a tool for sustaining an unjust system. Bar Tarl (2002:4) further observes that it is not always that in a given society there will be uniform consensus on the objectives of peace education as:

...it is more common that certain sections of society do not support the objectives of peace education. The objectives may be perceived as posing a threat to a particular group, several groups or even society as a whole. Some groups may be afraid of losing power, status, privilege, or wealth. Other groups may perceive the objectives of peace education as negating their ideological beliefs...threaten traditional cultural values, or even the order of the social system.

As noted, commitment to peace education therefore differs from context to context, with some communities circumventing controversial issues or prohibiting it altogether. The challenge remains on how to draw societal endorsement of peace education programmes when community interests are so diverse and some a threat to social cohesion and harmony.

Another dimension to the complexity of peace is the perception that peace education in conflict circumstances is ineffective as transforming the mindsets of children daily assailed with violence may be an impossible one. A counter argument to that however still maintains that if children are equipped with alternatives to violence, transformation is possible. These are real concerns that also lead one to question if the study of peace is always necessarily about peace, or

a convenient façade that implies that a nation is, in line with global expectations, doing something about peace yet in reality it may be a process of indoctrination that ensures that the real issues on peace are kept off the societal agenda. This brings my discussion to yet two major complexities in the pursuit of peace, firstly, the difficulties that already accompany education as a medium of peace and secondly the imperative of justice.

2.7 The Complexity of the Dual Nature and Role of Education.

As has already been highlighted in chapter 1, education is not value free and can simultaneously play a dual and even contradictory role. This section is premised on two sociological perspectives on education raised by Haralambos and Holborn (2000:777); the functionalist and the conflict perspectives. The functionalist perspective advances the positive role that education plays in the socialization of a society and the promotion of social solidarity. At the same time Bowles and Gintis in Haralambos and Holborn (2000:787-789) observe that education can also serve to indoctrinate and divide the society, ensuring that the powerful can continue to oppress the disadvantaged. I venture into these perspectives below.

Education is a useful tool for the socialization and transformation of any society. Emile Durkheim, in Haralambos and Holborn (2000:777) brings to light the positive role that education plays in fostering social solidarity through propagation of the society's norms and values. Durkheim describes the school as 'a society in miniature', emphasizing that "Society can survive only if there exists among its members a sufficient degree of homogeneity; education perpetuates and reinforces this...by fixing in the child from the beginning the essential similarities which collective life demands."

Two key issues emerge from Durkheim's observations, firstly; that education is the avenue through which social integration can be fostered, through the advancement of shared social values, solidarity and tolerance, a very crucial role especially in the context of diversity. Zimbabwe for example is characterized by ethnic, racial, political and religious, among other varied forms of diversity, along whose lines the nation has increasingly become polarized. Secondly; Durkheim realizes the long term transformational role that education enables through the 'socialization' of a nation's younger generation, not only transmitting already existent norms and values but to the extent necessary, altering norms and values in a changing age through a purposeful "re-socialization" process. This resocialisation process realizes that the possibilities of initiating a new world order lie with those who are by birth and nature new.

However, contrary to the functionalist perspective that predominantly views education as a positive and crucial tool for the preservation of value consensus and social solidarity, the conflict perspective raises valid and legitimate concerns about the negative role education can be manipulated to fulfill. Bowles and Gintis in Haralambos and Holborn (2000:787-789) note that the very fact of diversity in society implies equally diverse interests, with different groups benefitting differently from a given education system due to fundamentally different opportunities. They believe education can serve to make its recipients docile, unquestioning, subservient and accepting of hierarchy, legitimating inequality as "Education creates the myth that those at the top deserve their power and privilege, that they have achieved their status on merit...the educational system reduces the discontent that a hierarchy of wealth, power and prestige tends to produce." This sentiment is also shared by Davies (2005:43) who believes that education is discriminatory and reproduces the different pathways into further education and

jobs. She also questions notions of ethnically and religiously isolated schools, drawing examples from Sri Lanka, Northern Ireland, Kosovo and Bosnia:

...where segregated schools have sometimes overtly taught mistrust or vilification of other groups. In such divided nations, it is not difficult to examine their textbooks and see how enemies are portrayed, heroes identified and histories written, and to imagine the consequent effect on learners. Yet in 'stable' societies, rich or poor, textbooks may also glorify war through greater attention and analytic detail compared to that given to peace.

Davies' sentiments are very revealing when used as a lens of analysis for the Zimbabwean context, particularly in view of how the education system has been used to glorify and legitimize violence in the context of the liberation struggle, shape the concept of the country's heroes and 're-configure' the country's history. This has already been elucidated in chapter 1 through Ranger's analysis of patriotic history. Peace scholars Cawagas and Swee Hin (1985) and Harber (1996) all acknowledge the possibilities of education's negative contributions to degenerative progressions of certain conflicts realizing that education is not always a liberating experience calling for a deeper interrogation of the values and assumptions that accompany all knowledge impartation. The Catholic Education Office 1986:143) further observes a related argument that:

...teachers involved in peace education...all people hold their versions of the truth, and teachers as products of particular societies and cultures, bring their own perceptions, understandings and values to the topics and issues they teach...it is impossible to be completely value free, some measure of bias is inevitable.

Clearly, while peace education is indeed a noble academic endeavor and undoubtedly a mechanism for societal transformation, it is however not immune to the ambiguities that education as its medium is susceptible to.

The hidden curriculum is also another intricate aspect of education and a challenge for peace education in particular. Haavelsrud (1983), Fien and Hutton (1987), Dovey (1996), Harris

(1999) and Bowles and Gintis in Haralambos and Holborn (2000) all note that, beyond the overtly specified educational objectives, the teaching and learning methods, the classroom and the school structure are imperative considerations. Bowles and Gintis in Haralambos and Holborn (2000:787) caution that schools are systems structured on a hierarchical principle of power and control where teachers command and pupils submit. They raise concern about the 'jug and mug principle' approach in which teachers have the monopoly of giving knowledge and pupils are passive, empty recipients. Harris (1999:311) and Haavelsrud (1983:124) echo similar sentiments on the need for a cooperative learning approach where pupils are actively engaged in seeking solutions to problems within a classroom that is an exemplary democratic learning community. Similar sentiments are raised by Bar Tarl (2002:6-9) who notes that while peace education is teacher dependent it must still be open minded and relevant with pupils given room for innovative propositions on matters concerning their society. Harris argues that the peaceful classroom's hidden curriculum should promote peace by adopting unique approaches to discipline for example where positive affirmations are adopted in place of retribution or punitive measures. In addition to this, the success of peace education also requires transformation of the school's administration culture from the traditional dictatorial to a representative one where pupils and students are also recognized as equal players whose rights are respected. Dovey (1996:134) relevantly concurs that:

The school ethos is an important consideration. Peace must be manifest in school procedures, and principals and teachers should work to promote this by assessing whether peace education is compatible with a school environment that shows signs of injustice and allows little opportunity for student participation and exercise of responsibility.

This foregoing discussion brings me to the realization that it is not enough for educational institutions to offer peace education. There is need for pre, on-going and post implementation reflection on the school structure and culture in order to ensure that a given peace education

programme is aligned with the goals of peace education. There should also be linkages in political will, students' and the broader community's structure and as Davies (2005:43) warns that "The concern should be less the internal 'good practice' in peace education programmes and more the surrounding 'bad practice' of whole education systems." In relation to this I go on to explore justice as another complex aspect in the implementation of peace education. While I realize there is more to the attainment of justice beyond the peace classroom, I believe the peace education classroom can play a foundational role by enabling learners to begin interrogating their justice concerns within their educational setting and in the wider community.

2.8 The Complexity of Justice in Peace Education

Justice is considered a pre-condition for sustainable peace. Pearl (2004:242) asserts that there can be "no peace without justice and no justice without peace" presenting a cyclic dilemma resulting from the interdependence of the facets of peace and justice. Pearl observes:

Justice, the ability of individuals to practice self-determination, to access essential resources, and to have confidence in their personal safety... can only flourish when the sense of victimhood that justifies social isolation gives way to acknowledgement of past universal suffering and the importance of letting go becomes as important as the need to remember.

In line with this, Botcharova (2001:271) and Godwin (2010:346) both note that it is impossible to forget the harm inflicted on one, one's family or ethnic group. Godwin particularly observes that while the perpetrator forgets, the victim does not. Aryeh Neier in Adam and Adam (2000:32), defined as one of the most passionate advocates of punishment argues that:

When the community of nations shies away from responsibility for bringing to justice the authors of crimes against humanity, it subverts the rule of law. If the victimized see no one being held accountable, they may seek revenge on their own and continue the cycle of violence.

This relates to some of the key pedagogical implications for peace education that Bar Tal (ibid) raises on the need for open mindedness and relevance. These are to me a foundation for justice and echo the same concerns that Salomon's (1999:13) "exposure paradox" interrogates when he asks "Should the real reasons for the conflict-past atrocities, present discrimination, exploitation, or segregation-be brought to the fore, exposed and discussed?...or...evade these obviously explosive issues?..." If peace education confronts the problems of a given society in a detached, generic and somewhat censored way that overlooks experiential realities of students, they are likely to receive it with skepticism or dismiss its value all together. They may struggle to reconcile these day to day realities and contradictions of their experiences within the peace education classroom discourse. These are realities that the daily socialization processes of their communities subject them to and shape their perception of conflict, violence and peace and ultimately their choice of responses when confronted with conflict. This presents a major complexity as questions abound as to whether peace education can still be considered as being relevant, promoting justice and even working to foster peace if it avoids pertinent yet explosive societal concerns. What if exposure aggravates the conflict and promotes more violence yet on the other hand papering over the realities entrenches bitterness and increases the desire for revenge. Clearly the cyclic inter-relatedness of peace and justice presents an ongoing dilemma for peace education especially in regions of intractable conflicts.

2.9 Conclusion

The foregoing literature review has comprehensively explored concepts of conflict, violence, peace and peace education. The literature review began with an analysis of conflict as a foundation for further discussions of key related concepts of violence, peace and security; the ways in which peace is established; peace education history, definition, types, approaches and

ambiguities. Focusing on literature drawn from a period of nearly three decades the literature review has observed linkages between conflict, violence and peace, enabling an analysis of continuities and changes in this field within a transforming local and global socio-political context.

Some of the key observations that this literature review has explored include a realization that conflict is not innately negative and is an inevitable aspect of day to day human existence. Nathan (2000) makes a pertinent observation that our understanding of conflict determines our response to it and therefore there is need to explore alternative responses to it that are going to cut the cost in both human and financial terms. Harris (2008) argues that violence is a costly, less effective solution for the “lazy and impatient” who do not want to commit the necessary thought and time to listening to concerned parties’ demands. He calls for a change in mindset that moves from violence and proactively proposes and commits to implement nonviolence.

Insights from Galtung propose a broadened understanding of peace and violence that goes beyond the traditional definitions. A comprehensive appreciation is essential as it provides a framework for establishing the extent to which the selected universities’ models fulfill their objectives within the totality of the prevailing context in which they unfold. Is it education for positive or negative peace and what recommendations are necessary for it to be wholesome and effective?

Importantly, the review shows that the concept of peace has, over the years extended beyond mere absence of war and physical harm to entail the value of the totality of human security, hence Galtung’s categorizations of positive and negative peace as well as structural violence. These intricate categorizations call for the need to contextualize a given peace

education model within the lived realities of a given community hence peace scholars like Bar Tarl (2002) call for peace education models that are hinged on wider social campaigns. Key to this aspect is deliberately linking peace education initiatives at various levels, from the pre-school and beyond the university to entail the broader community involvement and sustenance.

The literature review has revealed that violence and peace concepts have broadened into categories of direct and structural violence as well as negative and positive peace. Galtung exhorts peace scholarship and practice to acknowledge the reality of violence built into the social structure and how this poses the greatest threat to the sustainability of peace building initiatives such as peace education. Further to that the review confirms that education as a medium for the transmission of peace values is not without its constraints as it is a tool prone to manipulation and hence can be abused to violate its recipients. This has been confirmed by the indoctrination that has been strongly characteristic of the national youth programmes and state media campaigns in Zimbabwe. Scholars like Davies (2005) and Bar Tarl observe that education can serve a dual role of liberating, indoctrinating and even discriminating.

This literature review also looked at the various approaches to peace education and pertinent to this is an approach that acknowledges implications of the gender disparities on women and men's differential experiences of violence. There is realization that peacebuilding has mainly focused on macro scale political and ethnic dimensions of conflicts overlooking how individuals are subjected to violence daily at the micro level. Brock-Utne (2007) calls for approaches that acknowledge the link between un-organized direct violence at family level to structural violence at national level. A gender lens would enable interrogation of the patriarchal system and its accompanying cultures and traditions that condone violence against women and girls. It would also enable a balanced approach that realizes the ever shifting dynamics from one

context to another challenging long held perception of men as perpetrators and women as victims as they can all fall into either category. According to Brock-Utne, peace education has a duty to ensure not only women's visibility but their agency and participation in the promotion of sustainable peace initiatives.

It is clear from the review that while peace education is a noble endeavor it is a complex pursuit that requires political will and ongoing reflection in order for it to transform societies from a culture of violence to that of peace.

Chapter 3

The Multiple Dimensions of Peace Education in Zimbabwe

3.0 Introduction

This chapter examines the motivations and approaches to tertiary level peace education in Zimbabwe and I begin here with a discussion on the structure of the peace programmes at these various institutions, beginning with Africa University. Before I conclude on the chapter I will then engage in a curriculum review where I will engage in a comparative analysis of some key aspects of these programmes.

Some peace scholars argue that the motivation behind the introduction of peace education determines the content and commitment of those involved and hence its efficacy in transforming a given community towards a culture of peace. Here I trace how the factors behind the introduction of peace education in the selected institutions have impacted the studies in terms of content, lecturers' delivery approaches and the students' reception. Bar Tarl (2002:1) states that peace "...is one of the most desirable values in almost every society..." and Zimbabwe has not been left behind in this United Nations inspired quest to entrench a culture of peace by targeting the younger generation. At NUST and AU, peace education is taught by individuals who have specialized in Peace Studies either at Masters or Doctoral levels. At MSU the lecturers approach peace education from a multiplicity of their original specializations such as History, Politics and Public Management, International Relations and Development Studies among other disciplines. This noted, peace studies is a cross cutting discipline and I analyze its multiple dimensions as revealed through interviews with respondents from Africa University (AU), the

National University of Science and Technology (NUST) and the Midlands State University (MSU).

3.1 Post Graduate Peace and Governance Studies at Africa University

As already noted in the introductory chapter, Africa University as the first institution in Zimbabwe to offer tertiary level peace and governance post-graduate programmes has contributed significantly to building the country's expert cohort in this field. To date it offers a diverse package that entails a Graduate Diploma in Peace and Governance; a Masters in Peace and Governance Programme; an Executive Masters in Peace and Governance; a Masters Degree in Human Rights, Peace and Development as well as a Masters Degree in Public Policy and Peacebuilding. Forty seven year old Mrs. Gulati¹ is one of AU's former and pioneer students who has taken the Masters in Peace and Governance Programme and shared at length on what motivated her to undertake these studies:

I embarked on peace and governance studies and only Africa University offered this seemingly novel package then. As a mid-career professional I found this programme relevant to my line of work as I was already working with an International NGO. I was not drawn to it because of a personal commitment to peace but because of the career demands of the time and the future prospects that it could possibly open for me. Peace studies sounded like a likely route to landing a job with the United Nations which I am sure is most individuals' dream employer. While I cannot claim factual knowledge of the institutional motivations behind the introduction of the programme, I know for a fact that the programme was well funded, one just had to apply and get accepted. It was also initiated at a time when the issue of peace was still peripheral in government and even within non-state actors' circles. It's something you sensed when you told even some learned high profile individuals that you were studying peace and you would get that

¹*Not her real name. Also note that all names marked with an *asterisk in the interviewees list annex are pseudonyms. A significant number of respondents expressed their insecurity with the subject and addressed this in various ways that included refusal to participate; withholding names and simply not entering any detail or signing on the name section. Others consented without giving their names and said I could name them as I pleased once they were gone. This was the case with a female focus group discussion at NUST. The females were generally not keen on giving their names even during interviews with some MSU students. Some deliberately signed in using fake names and stated they had done so at the end of the interview. However except for the few that totally rejected participation, the majority were keen to participate arguing that they still wanted their opinions to shape the future of peace education in Zimbabwe.

“what for?” look that quietly wondered what exactly you were studying and what you could do with a qualification in peace studies in Zimbabwe. Then the government was concerned with the dynamic of regime security, with peace conceptualized in militaristic terms. Non state actors on the other hand focused on questions of governance, human rights and its subsidiary strands such as women’s and children’s rights and universal access to treatment, among other issues. In the then socio-political framework, issues of peacebuilding, truth-telling, forgiveness and reconciliation were marginal (Mrs. Gulati, Retired Educationist, now a development practitioner).

Some of Mrs. Gulati’s sentiments were also echoed during an interview with Mr. Rodgers Manungo who was part of the second group of these AU students. He confirms that it was still a novel area of study which he learned of through a friend at a time when he was contemplating further studies. He explains that “I got to know of it through a friend and after analyzing the course content and focus I fell in love with it.” He is currently lecturing at the Solusi Adventist University which also offers peace studies at the undergraduate level.

From the foregoing sentiments I argue that the motivation for peace studies in the pioneer group of these students was mainly career advancement and not necessarily a personal commitment to the promotion of a culture of peace. At Institutional level it also was premised on the desire to carve out a unique niche for the institution at a time when the government and other universities were not yet contemplating a similar move. The political developments in the period after the 2008 Presidential Run–Off elections confirm this in line with Mrs. Gulati’s foregoing sentiments. Peace and reconciliation issues began to feature prominently in national discourse and civil society circles in the post year 2009 period as an offshoot of the Global Political Agreement which for first time acknowledged politically motivated violence as a problem in Zimbabwe and requiring specific mechanisms to address it. This is substantiated by Raftopoulos and Eppel (2008:370) who reveal that the Memorandum of Understanding signed on the 21st of July 2008 amongst the three parties to the Global Political Agreement mandated them to commit to “putting an end to the polarization, divisions, conflict and intolerance that have characterized

our country's politics" as part of working towards a violence free society. This development, coming five years after the introduction of peace and governance studies at Africa University was part of a broader national agenda that has seen more Zimbabwean universities introduce a diversity of peace education programmes. In the next section I analyze the motivations and dimensions of peace education at the National University of Science and Technology in 2009 and the Midlands State University in 2014.

3.2 Compulsory Peace Education at the National University of Science and Technology

Since 2009 NUST offers Peace, Leadership and Conflict Transformation courses to all its first year students irrespective of their specialization. Some of the modules offered include Understanding Conflict; Understanding Peace and Conflict; Theories of Conflict and Conflict Analysis. This in-depth focus on conflict is commendable given the need to change citizens' orientation when it comes to dealing with conflict.

NUST, by virtue of being a Science and Technology institution takes on the foregoing foundational approach as advanced by Maxwell. Due to the uniqueness of its approach NUST formed the major focus of my study and from it I drew the larger part of my respondents. Students expressed varied and sometimes ambivalent sentiments concerning this compulsory study of peace for various reasons. The National University of Science and Technology (NUST) introduced peace education as a compulsory service course to be taken by all its first year undergraduate students as a development from the optional post graduate Africa University peace programme. The NUST approach, I argue, espouses Bar Tarl's (2002:1) observations that in the quest to resocialise the young:

Schools are often the only institution that society can formally, intentionally and extensively use to achieve this mission...a society can set its objectives for peace education, prepare the curriculum, delineate the contents of the textbooks and instructional materials, set guidelines for organizing the political climate in the schools...instruct schools to show the initiative and oblige students to participate in this learning.

As already noted, NUST students expressed mixed and often conflicting sentiments concerning this compulsory approach. Drawing from Bar Tarl for example, synonyms for *oblige* are innumerable and can range from the seemingly positive ones that include persuading, encouraging, charming, convincing and coaxing to the seemingly negative ones like manipulating, coercing and forcing. This was evident in the students' responses to the first question in the students' questionnaire that elicited their *motivation* for undertaking peace studies. Responses to this question were also multifaceted but all pointing to having been *obliged* to undertake peace education. From the NUST students the responses ranged anything from questions to protest statements that included:

Did I have a choice? It's Compulsory! I had no choice! I had no option because it's compulsory. Is it not compulsory? I thought it was compulsory! Are we not obliged? It's an obligation if you want to study here.

One female level two Civil and Water Engineering student in an attempt to specifically respond to the question's aspect of *motivation* lengthily specified that she:

Had no option, its compulsory. I was not **motivated**² really, I was forced because I think it's part of the unwritten contract to study at NUST but see now you only know about it when you get here.

In line with this most respondents stated that they knew nothing of this field of study until they came to NUST. Some stated that after being exposed to the content they believe even if it had been an elective course they would still have undertaken it arguing that daily life is about negotiating various forms of conflicts and even as scientists peace studies equips them with

² Respondent's emphasis.

important skills for interacting with other people at various levels. They further pointed out that they need the conflict resolution skills that the programme has equipped them with as the programme relates to their day to day life and teaches them to appreciate human diversity and therefore to be conflict sensitive.

3.2.1 Peace Education for All Approach

Here I analyze the various explanations given by the respondents who believe the compulsory approach is the ideal way in the quest to entrench peace values. Brandon Kanemanyanga is a level 1 student who stated that he has “learnt to love”³ this course which he emphasized should be taught to all university students as it teaches students to deal with conflicts in a productive manner. During a focus group discussion an Applied Biology female student who withheld her identity had similar sentiments concerning the value of peace education arguing that it:

...is an important course that promotes living well with others and should be taught to everyone .Maybe it should be factored into other daily routines to transform people instead of being examinable. Maybe it should be factored into sport or clubs, something like that.

This was the sentiment shared by only four of the participants in this group of nine females. Tatenda Moyo⁴, who says peace education is generally not taken seriously by students at NUST, shares similar sentiments and believes that in order to meaningfully entrench the values of peace it should not be a once off course but a compulsory one for all first level students in all the country’s universities. Beyond that individuals can then voluntarily specialize in optional postgraduate courses as it best suits them. Tatenda, who stressed that peace education transformed his attitude towards women and taught him to respect them as equal partners

³ His own words.

⁴ Not his real name. Respondent opted to fill the questionnaire himself away from the researcher and upon submission indicated that he chose to use this name and indicated on the consent form that the subject is sensitive but he still wanted to share his opinions and participate.

deserving of empowerment further asserted that in terms of approach “Peace should be treated the way gender studies have been treated where everyone in the country has been taught about it every day, everywhere.” Tatenda here calls for a wider social campaign as an approach to peace education, an approach which resonates with Bar Tarl’s (2002:5) observations that peace education should not be an isolated venture in schools and if objectives to entrench peace as part of a societal culture are to be achieved:

A society that places peace education on its agenda has to spread its messages through other social institutions and channels of communication, in order to show the pupils that they are part of a general effort to change society. Peace education without a wider social campaign is fruitless and disconnected from social reality. Pupils soon feel that it is irrelevant to their life experience and view it as an insignificant endeavor.

Sibanda Melford is a Civil and Water Engineering student who concurred with Bar Tarl’s observations pointing out that “people are shaped by their environment, and if the environment isn’t biased towards peace, it ceases to make effect on the society and people may lose confidence in the peace studies.” He calls for a connection between societal priorities and peace studies which he says is “a must do” for students. Sibanda particularly commended NUST’s multifaceted approach to peace studies as it also entails the Leadership and Conflict Transformation aspects which he believes target the right people as university students are future leaders who need to appreciate the challenges of leadership and should be equipped with skills to handle different kinds of people.

Melinkosi Ndlovu advises that students should not perceive of peace studies as a subject only but value its lessons as tools for negotiating their daily life as they interact with others. Further to this some respondents advanced the argument that the current peace education curriculum should go beyond its current theoretical frame and also be expanded in order for it to be a transformative tool. In line with this, one of the peace education lecturers who requested

anonymity noted that it is the nature of introductory modules, unlike full- fledged diplomas or degree programmes as offered at AU and MSU to touch on the surface of issues. He noted that these courses have contributed to provoking not only an interest but personal commitment to the promotion of peace values and principles in some students. He cited one of their Engineering students who expressed an interest in deepening his knowledge and skills in peace education and went on to further specialize in peace studies at Sweden's University of Uppsala.

Key to the foregoing sentiments from these students who support compulsory peace education is their belief in its indispensability and therefore their proposal that it should not be reduced to a subject but a way of life that permeates every sector of society. For these students society must be daily assailed through the formal and non-formal channels of its education with skills in peace-building and the constructive handling of conflicts. Chapter five will examine some of these proposed channels for an ongoing resocialisation towards a culture of peace. In the next section I analyze the opinions of respondents who argued that peace education should be optional.

3.2.2 Peace Education should be Optional

Some of the students however differed strongly on the need to make peace education compulsory. In spite of their acknowledgement of its importance and transformative power, they felt that the current approach of compulsory peace education at NUST is an unwelcome imposition which took so much of their study time which should otherwise be accorded to their major studies. They indicated that due to time constraints they often “crammed”⁵ in order to pass and progress to the next level. In a focus group discussion with level three and four NUST students the general sentiments were that the study of peace should be an individual choice.

⁵ Respondents' own term.

Some agreed with the views of the above-mentioned Applied Biology colleague that as a value entrenching programme it should still be non-examinable even for those individuals who opt for it.

Another set of students argued that peace education belongs to the Arts and Social or Human Sciences and it should be offered as an elective there. This group of respondents insists that even within the relevant faculties it should not be imposed upon the students and should remain non-examinable.

Reginald Chitiyo, a level 4 Engineering student argues that compulsory study compromises what peace education is meant to achieve and in the same vein notes that “Compulsory study is bad because it is usually done for GRADE and MARKS not CONCEPTS and PRINCIPLES⁶.” Interviews with another lecturer who is not in the peace studies department confirmed the concerns raised by students like Reginald. He argued that memorizing concepts in order to pass differs from internalizing them for the purposes of personality and character development and thought the expectation that students should pass placed pressure on their already loaded syllabi and the concepts may be forgotten as soon as the pressure to pass that exam is over. He furthered that:

Everywhere, service courses like the peace programme here at NUST are always received begrudgingly by students. Even institutionally they may not enjoy the same respect and support as the core programmes. I know from my experience with communication skills modules during my undergraduate studies. I can safely tell you that even the lecturers themselves did not seem as confident as the other crop that taught the major disciplines. Some concepts are seen as divorced from the students’ core programmes and I have no doubt that if the programme was optional the uptake ,at least here at NUST ,would go down given that this is a Science and Technology institution and peace feels more relevant in the humanities or arts .While it is the assumption that if they pass it means they have grasped the values, in reality we will never know, remember that after all some

⁶ Capitalization is respondent’s own emphasis (see to questionnaire).

of these pupils already hold the good values that peace education teaches way before they come to NUST. For some peace values are part of their upbringing for example through religious exposure back home. While it's a good initiative, I am convinced that students would be better transformed in less academic, casual and non-formal settings such as voluntary clubs as happens at Primary and Secondary school levels. The Interact Clubs for example have already been serving to promote living and working together, tolerance for diversity, community responsibility and regard for human life. My last words are, yes peace education is good, in fact important, but let's free it from the rigidity of academic obligations.

The lecturer raises quite pertinent issues concerning approach to peace education. One of these is that peace education is not necessarily new to Zimbabwe; what is new is its official packaging and institutionalization through tertiary level programmes like the ones at AU, NUST and MSU. He cites the family as one of the central social players in entrenching a culture of peace, something that I venture into in chapter 4. Before I conclude this chapter, I briefly discuss the MSU peace education programme which, having begun in 2014 is still at its infancy.

3.3 Midlands State University's Peace Studies Programme.

In 2014, the Midlands State University's Department of Politics and Public Management began offering a full-fledged undergraduate Bachelor of Science in Peace Studies Honors Degree. Professor Chigora, the Chairperson of the Department of Politics and Public Management explained that the introduction of this programme was born out of consultations with the Organ on National Healing, Reconciliation and Integration which identified MSU as one of the institutions to establish a peace education programme. He explained that its objectives are premised on the need to "produce graduates with knowledge on peace, conflict and security situations who are able to work as practitioners in various organizations" at different levels.

Amongst some of this programme's notable specific objectives is the articulation of the need and necessity of peace and harmony in all contexts as well as the promotion of the culture

of peace in personal and social settings. Professor Chigora further explained that although peace and conflict studies related modules are already a component of some of the programmes being offered within the faculties of Social Sciences and Arts, a separate degree programme was necessary as this “is an emerging subfield of politics that requires rigorous teaching and research given the conflict situations that are confronting mankind today-nationally and internationally.”

Like Africa University, this programme is available as a career option for those students who have an interest in a career in peacebuilding or conflict management. The difference is that MSU offers a foundational specialization in Peace Studies and entry requirements include a compulsory pass in English Language as part of the mandatory five Ordinary level passes that can entail either of the indigenous languages, Sociology, Economics, Geography, History or Divinity. At the discretion of the Departmental Board it is also open to holders of relevant Diplomas. Being a four year degree programme it offers an in-depth appreciation of peace studies. Professor Chigora also revealed that there are plans to introduce a part time One and a Half year Master of Science in Peace and Security Studies programme. Entry requirements at this level are a good honors degree in Political Science or Public Administration/Management, Peace Studies, International Studies, Law, History, Economics or Development Studies. This yet again confirms the cross cutting and interdisciplinary nature of peace studies as a field of study. At the same time the pre-requisite subjects for entry into this programme partly justify the sentiments echoed by some of the NUST students that it is a programme that belongs to the Arts or Social sciences.

On student response Professor Chigora explained that the uptake is moderate and those taking the programme have shown interest in it. This was also confirmed by some of the students who explained that although they had only discovered through their admission letters that they

had been enrolled into the peace programme, they were enjoying it and looking forward to the opportunities that lie ahead. Some of these students indicated that they had never heard of such a field and had initially applied for other programmes within the Faculty of Social Sciences such as Politics and Public Management, Media and Society Studies, Psychology and Local Governance. From the Faculty of Arts some had opted for History and International Studies and Development Studies. Erin Chimbazo, a level two student had this to say when asked about what motivated her to study peace:

I now enjoy it but what happened is when I applied it was not even there on the list of programmes. I was shocked when my acceptance/admission letter came and informed me that I have been given peace. We are an experiment; we are the pioneers of the programme.

This was also echoed by Enesia Chigodo who indicated that her initial application had the options of Politics and Public Management, Media and Society Studies and Psychology but found herself in Peace Studies and later read more about it and then liked it. This MSU programme is still at its infancy and the institution is yet to release its first set of graduates as its earliest group is yet to complete the second of this four year programme.

This said, it is worthwhile that peace and reconciliation issues have been brought onto the public agenda through tertiary level peace education.

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has analyzed the multiple dimensions of peace education and brought to light firstly that Africa University was pivotal in the founding of the peace programme at NUST and also contributed significantly to the first cohort of peace practitioners in Zimbabwe. Although the AU programme began as early as 2003, peace and reconciliation issues with a bias towards education only began to feature prominently in Zimbabwean discourse in the post 2008 period. This was

after the signing of the Global Political Agreement which birthed the Government of National Unity which was mandated with establishment of the Organ on National Healing, Reconciliation and Integration (ONHRI). As part of this development, ONHRI went on to found peace education programmes in institutions like the Midlands State University in 2014.

Peace education is still a fairly new field as confirmed by a number of students who have found themselves enrolled by chance. However as an area of study that resonates with daily life, most acknowledge they have taken a liking to it and find it an indispensable initiative in the quest to propel the country towards constructive ways of dealing with conflicts. Students however raised concern with the current approaches to peace education which are not supportive of learning from the country's realities. Although the debate on the need to make peace studies compulsory remained inconclusive, the general consensus is that it is an indispensable initiative whose approaches need a review.

In the next chapter I discuss views from AU, NUST and MSU students who argue that the current peace curriculum and its approaches need a total overhaul if it is meant to empower citizens with voice and promote sustainable peace. Some respondents defined it as a "shackled peace education" that has been reduced to propaganda. These sentiments were also strongly raised by some of the retired educationists that I interviewed during the study. They argue that peace as it currently stands is not likely to be transformative unless accompanied by significant, drastic structural changes within the socio-political context.

Chapter 4

The Socio-political Context of Peace Education in Zimbabwe

4.0 Introduction

Haralambos and Holborn (2000) reveal that the systems theory on education views society as a system of interrelated social institutions of politics, economy, education and the family among numerous others. In this realm families and schools play a functional role of socializing the young into the values of each given society. This theory acknowledges peace education's ambiguous position, where it not only operates within a potentially impeding socio-political context but may also serve as a socialization tool to impede any effort at questioning social injustices. In this chapter therefore I explore the core of this study, the socio-political context and its impact on peace education in Zimbabwe. Drawing from student sentiments I also seek to show how current peace education programmes are also impacting the socio-political context. Bar Tarl (2002:2) drawing from Vriens relevantly observes that:

...it is possible to see peace education as a mirror of the political-societal-economic agenda for a given society, since peace objectives often contain a direct challenge to the present state of a society within the suggestions of change. In effect, peace education mobilizes pupils and teachers to take part in a campaign for change. They are to raise their banner towards an alternative vision of society with the aim of counteracting the beliefs, attitudes and actions, which contradict the objectives of peace education.

In seeking to ascertain the impact of the country's socio-political context on university level peace education initiatives, respondents were asked to share the concrete ways in which the family, community history, mass media and political rhetoric related with their peace teaching and learning experiences. As this discussion goes on to reveal, there was a general consensus that the socio-political context is a key determining factor to the efficacy, or lack thereof of any peace education initiatives. One of the respondents captured it as follows:

The socio-political context is the Gatekeeper. For example Africa University had to seek the buy in of government stakeholders who had to give their blessing. I am aware that there are initiatives right now that are engaging the country's security sector through workshops and short course as part broadening the peace promotion agenda which are not well received and viewed with suspicion.

The pre-interview deliberations confirm the unease that characterizes the socio-political context for peace education as I briefly show in the following section. I will then proceed to analyze the various existing aspects of the socio-political context as it was critiqued during the interviews. I will begin with a look at the political context for peace education in Zimbabwe, then look at the media and political rhetoric and end the chapter with a focus on the social i.e. Family and community history.

4.1 Peace Education and the Media

I have already noted in the foregoing discussion that peace education is perceived as a contradiction to Zimbabwean mainstream politics and its hegemonic nationalist imaginations. The line between politics, which plays out through political rhetoric and the state aligned media is so blurred in Zimbabwe as shown by the fact that this state aligned media has been instrumental in buttressing the hegemonic and exclusionary nationalist imagination whose values undermine peace education.

This was evident during interviews with a section of respondents pointing out that this state aligned media is in the business of "advancing chaos" because that is what sells. Instead of calming it aggravates conflicts and even provokes violence in some cases. Enesia Chigodo however believes that a responsible media should not bring certain issues onto the public realm for discussion as this aggravates conflicts. This was also noted by one of the lecturers who pointed out that during class sessions some students are not comfortable discussing some issues

and some are politically apathetic. This view however was a point of contestation as some individuals argued that the public has a right to opinion on issues concerning their livelihoods no matter how sensitive or controversial they are. This latter group of respondents argues that a media committed to peace would package such issues with a clear intention to construct society. Francis Mawarire also noted with concern that the media is biased, a point that was supported by Ronald Chifamba, a level 4 student who states that “Mass media offers a forum for public debate, conception and development of opinions. However, media can proffer biased information.” The two students cited programmes like Chimurenga Files, Nhaka Yedu (Our Heritage), Zvavanhu (What belongs to the people) and Melting Pot as programmes packaged not only in exclusionary terms but often driven by hate speech with a clear intention to advance ruling party interests. Francis further argues that “The presence of one TV station in this country is enough evidence of how intolerant we are of innovativeness and alternatives.”

Quite a number of NUST and MSU students, especially those in their first year confessed they did not follow the Zimbabwean Television station because it’s “too biased”. This was confirmed by one of their lecturers who acknowledged that “Students complain that the media is partisan and most of them confirmed that they do not follow ZTV-partly as protest because they argue that it’s aligned to the ruling party. Most say they follow Voice of America.” This was also echoed by Kelvin Msimanga who stated that they do not follow the media while others indicated they had not watched or followed the news or any programme on ZTV for years now.

On a different note Andiswa Mlibazi says most of them did not watch mainstream news because they are too busy with not only their schoolwork but other alternatives like Facebook, WhatsApp and other forms of media. I noted from my discussions with different students that the lower level students are generally apathetic with shifts towards keenness in current affairs

evident from the third year up. The general sentiment however is that state aligned media is too partisan and not worth following.

That said about the electronic media I draw on one key print media example of how the media has promoted a hostile environment for peace education in Zimbabwe. When perceived through the state aligned media lens, it is apparent that peace education as it stands in Zimbabwe today is in a dilemma. It is perceived with suspicion by those in support of the status quo while still received with skepticism by the students and other players who are agitating for a change to the status quo. The interviews confirmed that peace is a sensitive subject being implemented in highly contested circumstances and this is evident in the writings of one *Godobori Godobori*. He has made it his vocation to pen serialized accounts in the Zimbabwean Weekly, *The Patriot*, in attack of the introduction of peace education in Zimbabwean universities. In one of the attacks he states that peace education is the product of:

...a diplomatic campaign executed through the United Nations (UN) aimed at introducing a new form of colonialism through Africa's education system. The new colonialism would be achieved through subverting Africa's education curriculum to produce an elite with a Western mindset that can be used to reverse the achievements of the nationalist era. Waving the red card of 'wars and instability in Africa', Western countries pushed the United Nations to go on a continent-wide campaign to convince African governments, universities and security institutions to agree to the introduction of Peace Studies which would, supposedly, create a pool of experts with the skills to resolve situations of conflict and war.

The hostile environment that peace education operates in was evident in participant responses. With the exception of a few seemingly militant male respondents, when it came to concrete examples, a majority of respondents exercised extreme caution, some engaged in self-censorship, which could be a pointer to a culture of fear that was cited by students as one of the major impediments to their study of peace. Various sentiments were raised that point to the sensitivity of the subject of peace in Zimbabwe. Some of the respondents who gave their real

names still demanded assurance that the final report will give them anonymity, this in spite of the commitment already clearly outlined on the consent form. Some totally withheld their identities, others used fake names while some opted not to respond to certain questions altogether. In cases where I was administering the questionnaire myself, as was the case in most of the interviews, some would request to pass without responding to some questions and some would echo "...hmmm that one...that's political I cannot give you my opinion on that. I do not know you so I cannot trust you."

Some declared from the onset that their consent to being interviewed was on the condition that they could use phony names of their own choice. The common thread in all these interview conditions was a sense of insecurity, something which already spoke volumes about the socio-political context before the discussion even unfolded. In the following section I look at how peace education has been packaged by the ruling party sympathetic state media.

4.1.1 Peace Education as a Threat to the National Imaginary

The political context engenders inherent contradictions for peace education when analyzed in light of the national imaginary. As already noted, another article in *The Patriot*, a weekly that defines itself as being "proudly Zimbabwean" by the already aforementioned writer, not only condemns the compulsory teaching of peace education at NUST but in Zimbabwe as a whole. In one of these articles the introduction of peace education is not only retraced to the Africa University's Peace and Governance Programmes but to the University of Bradford. The NUST lecturers as products of this AU programme are described as "people whom the country has lost to the service of the Whiteman." It further alleges that:

Bradford is the university where Pamela Machakanja⁷ obtained at least four postgraduate qualifications in Peace and Security Studies and appears to be the premier British academic institution charged with the responsibility to transform African students into champions of self-hate and Afro phobia for the benefit of the white man. Britain exercises influence in Zimbabwe through Bradford.

This perception is very revealing of the precarious socio-political terrain peace education has to negotiate in Zimbabwe. Although there has been an increase in the number of universities introducing peace education in the country, a development that assumes government approval, this article is evidence of residual resistance to the teaching of peace education. In an interview, one of the respondents expressed no surprise at the foregoing article's trajectory. She underscored that The Patriot is a ruling party aligned weekly whose editors and journalists are either war veterans or intelligence operatives, most of whom use strange pseudonyms as a cover as they fulfill their mandate of "spewing vitro" on perceived ruling party opponents and any alternative voices. This observation was also substantiated by the historian Terence Mashingaidze who argues that:

At the centre of the idea of the Zimbabwean national imaginary is the idea that the country emerged out of the spewing of blood and sweat by its valiant sons and daughters mainly through the Second Chimurenga or Liberation War that was waged in the 1960s and 70s. Some of the surviving combatants in the Second Chimurenga perceive of themselves as the **gatekeepers**⁸ of the nation. They assume that the ruling ZANU (PF) under whose banner the Second Chimurenga was executed is the only authentic national redemptive agent, with an exclusive monopoly to rule the country. This mindset partly explains the constant resort and sanctioning of violence by war veterans and their allies within the ruling party against real and imagined opponents. Anyone who advances ideals of democracy, human rights and political plurality –these being principles and values which true peace education should advance, is reductively viewed as an enemy of the state and an agent of western imperialist forces.

⁷ Pamela Machakanja is the Director of the Institute of Peace and Governance which offers postgraduate peace studies at the Africa University.

⁸ Respondent's emphasis.

This resonates with BarTarl's (2002:4) view that in any given context there are groups and individuals who may be afraid of losing the status and privilege that comes with their political power as:

...societies differ with regard to their commitment to peace education .While some see it as a mechanism to change society for the better, others may avoid reference to controversial issues and restrict it to particular objectives or even ban it altogether.

Viewed in this light, the foregoing sentiments from The Patriot subtly propose a ban on peace education programmes as currently offered at NUST and other universities and proposes instead the teaching of “ ‘African Studies’ that would raise greater awareness of African issues,” in order to counteract the western agenda peace education is alleged to advance. Peace education in its quest for plurality advances tolerance for diversity within a nation that imagines and advances a homogenous national identity that is premised on valorization of the liberation struggle and overriding of any alternative narratives. Lindelani Masekela, a final year student at one of the universities raised related concerns during a focus group discussion that:

Peace education is silent on the violence of our revolution. We should be taught both sides. Nothing else confirms more than the daily narratives on Zimbabwean state television and radio that if we are to ever attain freedom or any change to the status quo-it is by the use of the tools of violence, yet peace education attempts to teach us differently. If daily political rhetoric celebrates that *Zimbabwe yakauya nehondo, Zimbabwe ndeyeropa* (Zimbabwe was born through the barrel of the gun, Zimbabwe was won through the spilling of blood), how are we expected to balance that with the teaching on alternatives to violence. Unless the socio-political context begins to walk the talk in our classes, PLC remains a mockery of our intelligence.

These young men argue that there is no relationship between the peace advancing values they are taught in the classroom and the polarized and intolerant political culture surrounding them. According to Dr. Bhebhe, a retired educationist the greatest contradictions are strongly evident amongst top level political leadership:

Yes government may have granted the teaching of peace at tertiary level but as a country we never learn to deal with things-Mnangagwa even as Vice –President still says I was trained to kill and I can still do it again-that does not create a conducive environment.

Rita Moyo, a retired lecturer who has taught peace studies modules as a component of Development studies at MSU concurs that such non-conciliatory political rhetoric only serves to entrench polarization that results in self-censorship on key issues during lessons. She pointed out that some however in spite of threats still speak out on these controversial issues. Another key observation that she made is that university classrooms are infiltrated by elements of the Central Intelligence Organization, some of whom are clearly known. Moyo expressed a deep concern that: “Sometimes we worry about the security of our students when they exercise their right to freedom of expression.” She also noted that the political situation is an impediment to effective learning and teaching which cannot be executed ““comfortably”⁹ due to infiltration. The feeling of a hovering invisible state agent; that one is being watched and listened to, inhibits “freedom of expression.” Apart from this evident culture of fear, that has been further compounded by the state aligned media and its advancement of partisan politics, students also complained about peace education’s hidden curriculum as a key aspect of the political context which has been subtly advanced through a control on content and even approaches. This I discuss in the next section.

4.2 Peace Education’s Hidden Curriculum

Some NUST and MSU students expressed concern that peace education as it is currently packaged and delivered is not about promoting a culture of true or positive peace. They maintain that the classroom experience curtails meaningful discussion on the real issues that characterize the immediate socio-political context, something which compromises their appreciation of the

⁹ Ms. Moyo’s own words

value of the programme. Lindsay Marumo complained that “The current peace education is part of a broader strategy of the continuation of the patriotic history projects that were offered at polytechnics, designed to make us as young people governable so that we do not question the injustices that surround us.”

Some respondents, during a focus group discussion further pointed out that there is absence of freedom of expression during class sessions, something which speaks to the Marxist theory on education as an instrument open to manipulation by the powerful elite in advancing their interests and upholding the status quo. Students bring to light how peace education as it is currently being rolled out serves, together with the state aligned media, as part of “...the *primary ideological state apparatus* that militates against proper comprehension of the oppressive nature of ... society.”(Althusser 1970). The forthcoming discussion shows how peace education in Zimbabwe finds itself trapped within a political environment that is intent on building a façade of a commitment to the promotion of a culture of peace before the whole world yet tightly holding the leash by subtly controlling the content and determining the approaches. The students from all three institutions made a number of pertinent remarks concerning the current programmes. The general feeling was that the current programmes leave a lot to be desired. Some of these opinions were further substantiated by the former educationists interviewed during this study.

Students protested that the programmes are not only too theoretical but detached from their lived reality as some lecturers and other students seem more comfortable drawing examples of conflicts and violence from other countries like Rwanda, Syria and South Africa among others. The students point out that there seemingly is a deliberate, unwritten but operational rule within the classrooms to evade or censor reference to immediate or present empirically grounded

realities which are often perceived as too political or sensitive. Edwin Masimirembwa, who indicated that media censorship, has a negative impact on his understanding of peace argued that “Peace education is a good idea but it is now being used as a propaganda tool.” This element of political tampering was also raised by Danika Moyana in her concern that:

Sometimes our right to freedom of expression during lessons is affected when we are told to “...remain academic.” This is a term used to stop us from discussing controversial yet very important issues. These issues are many and the bold among us are always bringing them up only to be gagged by being reminded that we must remain academic. We believe this is where present and future conflicts are rooted. These are issues like politically motivated violence in Zimbabwe, corruption, tribalism, the post 1980s killing of ZAPU supporters, a majority of them Ndebele speaking people and the current factionalism fights within the ruling party. All this is often called non-academic.

It seems use of the term academic has become a euphemism for steering the students from politically sensitive local examples as confirmed by most students from the different institutions. Other students confirmed this explaining that they have attempted in vain to discuss issues related to the violence born of resource access injustices and development projects induced displacements like Tokwe Mukosi and the accompanying disasters, the evident marginalization of some parts of the country and manipulation of communities’ resources by the political elite and outsiders for their personal gain. Tyrone Gukhwa, a level four student further explained that:

We bring up these issues; diamonds in Marange, timber in Tsholotsho and fisheries in Binga but we are always told to stick to being academic. What is being academic tell me? Does it mean being detached from reality? Some of us live with the scars of the violence that has been a way of life in this country since. Those histories hang over us and we are burdened with inheriting anger from the injustices suffered by our fathers and grandfathers, injuries that the leadership of this country has never bothered to address.

As the foregoing reveals, this group of students argued that peace education as it is currently packaged “defies common sense”¹⁰ as it shies away from the Zimbabwean experiences. They are concerned that it has become the safer norm in the classroom to invoke abstract, spatially and

¹⁰Respondent’s own term.

temporally distant examples. They stated that these issues that they are blocked from discussing are the very issues that will determine whether as young people they will be transformed by this peace education or not and whether they will shun a culture of violence when it seems to be the modus operandi around them. The student further argued that the public media is awash with examples of the official use of violence as it is the way political business is conducted in this country because it works. He pointed out that young people could only remain silenced for so long and if the current initiatives are about the promotion of positive, real, sustainable and just peace, then students should be allowed to interrogate these controversial issues.

Respondents also emphasized that Zimbabwe is clouded by fear and peace education may not yield much where citizens feel insecure after giving their opinions on what directly affects them. Ednos Makioni hinted on this fear stating that “In Zimbabwe it’s hard to tell because speaking the truth and exercising peace comes with a price, (just saying¹¹).” This was further buttressed by William Mavhengere, a retired educationist who occasionally teaches peace and conflict modules. He argues that in view of the security situation this fear is not unfounded and exercising caution is wisdom for both lecturers and students and the country’s citizens at large:

In all our institutions we have a government that has infiltrated the education system...in a peace class...sometimes when I teach conflict...eg when we talk about peace and reconciliation it’s difficult to talk about these subjects without giving relevant examples. It will be foolhardy to go on teaching without drawing from the students’ lived experiences.

Given the foregoing the students are concerned about the contradictions of being subjected to peace studies yet being forbidden from applying it to the community around them. They argue that the socio-political and even economic context is a drawback to the possibility that one day peace education may move Zimbabwe forward; from a culture of violence to that of peace.

¹¹ Respondent’s emphasis.

High youth unemployment was also cited as a key feature of the political context that students felt they were not given adequate space to debate in class. One of the NUST students explained that:

Youth unemployment is also one of those issues that we have not openly discussed in class. Some of us are in our final year and next year we may be selling airtime in the various street corners of Zimbabwe where we come from and yet when we attempt to talk about the violence of youth unemployment and our right to the national cake, we are told to stick to the academic.

She argued that if this history of violence is not confronted and the current ever increasing youth unemployment is not addressed, these would be the roots for conflict and a basis for future violence. In the next section I examine the social context of peace education in which I interrogate some aspects of some individual respondents' personal history and how these have shaped them.

4.3 Family and Community History

"It is time we confront the evils of the grandfathers on both sides and decide, they should never happen again, because every life matters!"

This section is going to be characterized by lengthy verbatim quotations in order to enable me to capture some of the intricate nuances of the social contexts that impact the learning and teaching of peace.

Responses to the impact of the social context on peace education brought to light numerous contradictions that point to the complexities of peace education in Zimbabwe. There were respondents who were not willing to engage beyond their simplistic and reductive responses that peaceful families promote peace and violent families promote violence. However, Lesley Khuphe who believes that some of the theories learnt in the PLC course can be used to solve some of the problems faced by the society perceived of this differently:

Family advocates for a peaceful environment, however, many a times, families are caught up in strife which offers the student insightful case studies. By doing peace studies, the student is able to relate and apply concepts/theories of achieving peace.

The foregoing student does not believe that being brought up in a violent family necessarily makes one violent. As far as he is concerned it can actually motivate one towards a desire and commitment to peace. Other responses however were clearly censored, some deliberately slippery and ambiguous. One MSU student who required anonymity argued that Zimbabwe is peaceful and the economy is supportive of a peaceful environment while a colleague from the same class argued that “Zimbabwe is to a certain extent a negatively peaceful country because of poverty and hunger and this can affect our understanding of peace.” Others, like Melinkosi Ndlovu responded with an ambiguous “Not Applicable.” to the question of the relationship between their peace education experience and the local context.

Overally most agreed that the socio-political context is the most important factor in shaping peace education and that family values matter as the family is the primary socializing institution. One student, who pointed out that his family taught him to mind his own business, further stated that there is no real freedom in Zimbabwe as freedom of speech did not guarantee freedom after speech. He also believes that some Zimbabwean dancehall music promotes violence. Masimirembwa who argued earlier that peace education had been reduced to a propaganda tool further stated that “ZANU PF resorts to violence as a way of influencing ideas into people and this is contrary to my beliefs in peace. Media censorship also affects the way we understand peace.”

From the foregoing student responses, there is a missing strand in their responses compared to what emerged from the discussions with some of the adult educationists. I will begin here by sharing at length on the life history of William Mavhengere, a retired educationist with more

than thirty years teaching experience within which he served in various capacities in many parts of the country. He pioneered the opening of some of the leading schools and argues that while the introduction of peace education in Zimbabwean universities is a step in the right direction, it is insufficient on its own for entrenching a culture of peace. What is foundational according to him is a structural and wholesome, official confrontation of the nation's history and experiences of violence. As he shared at length about his family history, he emphasized that these are the strands of history that need to be confronted if Zimbabwe is going to move beyond a culture of hate and the violence that has been engraved for more than a century:

I am 77 years old. One aspect of our family's and community history which was passed from generation to generation was that of the Ndebele raids and abductions among the Shonas. We grew up with Ndebele people sometimes referred to as "*madzviti*"¹² based on this history. This happened more than a hundred years ago but I believe, it still does, to a certain extent influence the socialization patterns amongst some Shona speaking families. This aspect of history is specifically relevant to those who, as I go on to show in my narration, had a family member who was a direct victim of the raids. Over the years as I was growing up we were told the story of our great grandmother who was abducted during one of King Lobengula's raids. She was already pregnant then with my grandfather who was born and grew up in Ntabazinduna and later conscripted into King Lobengula's army in which he distinguished himself and was later given a wife, maDlodlo. It is from this union that my father and his brother would be born. Years later my grandfather decided he wanted to return to his own people and took his wife with him. It is said that my great uncle Matshe, brother to my grandmother, followed them there and insisted that his sister could not be married to a "*musvina*"¹³ He managed to force march my grandmother back to Ntabazinduna but insisted the children were "*masvina*" and therefore could not come with her, something which troubled my grandmother. On the way back, it is said somewhere in Filabusi, uncle Matshe engaged in

¹² Historically, among the Shona, the term was largely ascribed to Ndebele raiders, however in general Shona everyday usage it may be applied to refer to a raider or simply to connote rapacious behaviour.

¹³ A term historically used among the Ndebeles to refer to the Shona people. Follow up on the genealogy of this term with one elderly man who hails from a strongly mixed transitional zone community mainly consisting of the Ndebeles and Shonas revealed interesting dynamics to this term. He explained that this became an identifying term which in its origination was not intended to be derogatory but born out of the Shona people's constant use of the term "*tsvina*" which means dirt. Some would often be heard in their daily conversations say "*panetsvina* (Its dirty)" "*handidi tsvina (I do not want to be near dirt)*" or "*usagare panetsvina (do not sit where there is dirt)*" This strand of its history seems to have been used more for purposes of identifying them more than insulting, dehumanizing or degrading as later became the case. I understood this to be something like the modern day reference people sometimes make to the Chinese as ZhingZhong, a term not necessarily originating from an intent to insult or dehumanize but more of an identifier based on the sound of their language.

beer drinking and while at it, my grandmother escaped and successfully found her way back to Masvingo, where she arrived two days later. She insisted she could not leave her two children behind and was reunited with her husband until her death. She is actually buried in Masvingo. Years later during my career I found myself in Ntabazinduna and followed up on this history of my great grandmother, uncle Matshe and Gogo maDlodlo and was reunited with some of my great uncles who confirmed this story. It was a turning point in which I ceased to be "*the Shona stranger*" in the community but was appropriated as the beloved lost *mzukulu*¹⁴ even up to this day. This is a history that shaped me to realize that, in spite of the ills of our history; we are all human and should treat each other as such. Ndebele speaking people are no longer the "*madzviti*" to me as I had been socialized to believe but my people with whom I share a common sacred humanity both because of and in spite of this history. However this is one aspect of our communities' history that still continues to hover upon Ndebele and Shona people, being used to socialize, dehumanize and justify tribal hate and ethnic intolerance and even violence and the most unfortunate development is the politicians' manipulation of this history. It is the same with Gukurahundi, a tragic experience so immediate to our existence as Zimbabweans as some of its direct victims are still alive. We cannot afford the papering over its reality that I see especially on the part of the leadership that is known to have instigated it. I was in Matabeleland and parts of the Midlands during Gukurahundi, another dark era of our nation's history that has further served to foment tribal hate and ethnic divisionism. I saw its brutality first-hand the same way I saw the brutality of black upon black in the execution of the liberation war. During Gukurahundi I visited a pit latrine into which someone, a human, someone's child, father or brother had been thrown head on and left to die. The body had not fully fallen into the latrine and part of the lower limbs still jutted out at the mouth of the pit. Horrific sights and memories that have never been openly acknowledged or confronted! This post-independence brutality brought back to me memories of the liberation war brutality I had witnessed in various parts of the country earlier. My child, in one incident I saw a man forced to open his mouth and a burning log inserted, all I remember is the tongue expanding because of the fire, am sure it eventually burst as he writhed in agony to his death. Horrific! So many Zimbabweans have lived with this horror ever since and it shapes our families and communities. It is not the current generation but the grandfathers on both sides that have brought us to these unfortunate circumstances whose memories haunt us. It is upon us who are here to confront this history and ensure this does not happen again. My years of experience living and working in education among the various communities in Zimbabwe remind me that we are all victims of the evils of the grandfathers on both sides. We cannot change the past but we, especially when we guide the young people constructively, can gradually change ourselves and aim to live anew and thereby create peace for ourselves. I am not saying it is going to be as simple; it's quite a complex matter which over the years has been further complicated by the insensitivity of our political leadership that has continued to violate its people. I am not asking us to forget but maybe we will need to remember in ways that will, with time address the rancor, foster healing and instill in our current generation that this should never be allowed to happen again. It is time we confront the evils of the grandfathers on

¹⁴ Ndebele for nephew.

both sides and decide, they should never happen again, because every life matters. This is the foundation that will ensure peace education works.

Mr. Mavhengere acknowledges that apart from the foregoing, which has mainly influenced relations amongst the Ndebele and Shona people, Zimbabwe has a diversity of ethnic communities, each shaped by unique family and community histories and experiences of violence that should be taken into account as the nation maps the way forward.

As I have indicated, this family and community history did not emerge during the interviews with students and lecturers. At no point were these two aspects of history raised as William Mavhengere has alluded to in his life history. In the only focus group discussion where Gukurahundi emerged, it was not because an individual linked it to their personal history but it was mentioned in passing as one of the issues that they had been curtailed from discussing in the classroom. As the interview with the former MSU lecturer Rita Moyo reveals, family and community history is immediate to some of the students in spite of the fact that for various reasons they do not readily discuss it:

Some students get emotional because they have been traumatized—As a lecturer sometimes you find yourself in a fix where you would be preaching something contradictory to their experience. The Gukurahundi experience is a strong socializing aspect of most Ndebele families and communities. This is what you pick especially from the older Masters level students who are not only mature but directly relate with it. My observation is that for most of the younger generation of students in their first year it is something that has been passed on and some are not even clear about what exactly happened. Without necessarily being reductive, it becomes a case of the Ndebele group of students against the Shona group of students who also then adopt a defensive attitude and the discussions never really head towards an amicable understanding on either side. I believe that's where the impact of family and community history is evident. Even in the configuration of assignment groups one notes that their composition is often based on ethnic belonging, i.e. to the extent that one's identity can be premised on their surname, the names lists, as much as possible are either all Shona or all Ndebele although this is not always achievable given the demographic imbalances. However I observed that there are students who seem to handle difference more positively and comfortably fit into either of these groups. Then there are individuals who simply do not harbor racial or tribal prejudice and they relate with people on the basis of their humanity and character.

Secondly there are students who have a dual identity because parents belong to both groups. There is another group that also embraces this diversity because they are from transitional zones where they grow up within fairly peaceful cohabitation between the Ndebeles and Shonas. Then there are those from other groups outside of these two major ones. However I want to appreciate that identity is quite complex and want you to note that I am not implying that all these scenarios are cast in stone. These are purely my own subjective observations but I believe they are quite revealing in terms of helping us understand how identity and primary socialization are interacting with our efforts to entrench a culture of peace at tertiary level.

The foregoing sentiments were further buttressed by Dr. Bhebhe, a retired educationist who worked in Matabeleland during Gukurahundi. He concurred with Mavhengere and Moyo but emphasized that the major problem is that these histories and the violence accompanying them have not been confronted as national problems:

After Gukurahundi the government did nothing. What students exhibit is a symptom of our failure as a nation to give voice to all these issues? Some of them may not have been the direct victims themselves but it's a history so central to their identity and their welfare because it did not only cost family members' lives but parents and breadwinners. For some direct victims it cost them homes, an education and their sanity. It cost them a future. If people's relations are impacted by a history of almost a century ago, which is not any less significant but equally justified because it happened to one of their own, what more the violence of twenty eight years back that went on for a good seven years after the attainment of independence. We have divided memories as a nation because as one side was overwhelmed with Independence euphoria the other side was being engulfed by fires and murdered in various ways. The bitterness and trauma are real and Gukurahundi is still fresh. Go to Kezi, Tsholotsho and surrounding areas-people still whisper as if soldiers are still outside...Small boys were given axes to chop parents at gunpoint. The parents died, the boys are still there, physically grown but unhealed men! The past memory lingers and haunts present. No efforts have been done to deal with the trauma. In Bulawayo you see a lot of these men who are mentally deranged as a product of that...That is the socio-political context of peace education and the realities it is faced with in Zimbabwe.

The three respondents, Mavhengere, Moyo and Bhebhe all agreed that there is need to address the socio-political context if current peace education initiatives are going to be transformative. In light of Isenhardt and Spangle's (2000:1) Transformational Theory they view conflict not only as an inevitable reality but importantly as a constructive social process. Mavhengere particularly argues that the conflicts that Zimbabwe has endured are a lesson enough on the ills of violence in

which “we all have suffered” and form a sufficient basis for a shared desire for a new social order. In the next chapter, which is my last substantive chapter before I conclude on this study, I engage in a back and forward looking analysis to ascertain the possibilities of making a difference through peace education and what needs to change if this is to be realized.

4.4 Conclusion

Entrenched within the systems theory on education, this discussion revealed the various ways in which peace education has been negatively impacted by the media, political rhetoric, community history and the hidden curriculum.

Firstly, there are indications particularly in the reportage of the state aligned media like The Patriot that peace education is not well received in Zimbabwe. It is a sensitive subject which is perceived as a western inspired, imperialist opposition political agenda. In the same vein it has been shown that peace education, which seeks to promote values of plurality runs contrary to the dominant homogenous and exclusionary national identity narrative. The majority of respondents argued that they do not follow the local, particularly state aligned media because they believe it is biased in favor of the ruling party.

Political rhetoric was also shown to be exclusionary and non-conciliatory. Respondents argued that it is driven by discrimination and hate speech, all of which impact negatively on the teaching of peace education.

Family and community history were also revealed to be central to individuals’ responses to peace education values. It emerged that this history, if not confronted can undermine the values of tolerance, forgiveness and reconciliation that students are taught within the peace

education classroom. The two former educationists interviewed here emphasized the need to confront the past if peace education is going to be relevant to students.

Lastly, one of the major factors raised is that the offering of peace education in Zimbabwe is in itself not enough as it is currently constrained by a hidden curriculum that is shaped by partisan political tampering. The content is controlled and the approaches to its teaching are structured to maintain the status quo.

It is evident from the raised socio-political factors that peace education requires a comprehensive review if it is to meaningfully contribute to the promotion of a culture of peace in Zimbabwe.

Chapter 5

Making a Difference through Peace Education

5.0 Does Studying Peace Make a Difference?

In this chapter my point of departure is that the current national environment is retrogressive to the values that students are learning. They are taught tolerance, yet live in intolerance that is entrenched through political articulations aired daily through the media. As noted by the NUST students who concluded that peace education defies common sense, in such a socio-political environment young people will eventually ask “how long does one keep giving the other cheek. Where does one draw the line?” Respondents’ mixed reactions as to the possibility of peace studies making a difference to the culture of violence in Zimbabwe point to a disillusionment and helplessness given the cyclical violence that is largely politically motivated and election related. All are agreed that there is need for ongoing inculcation of alternatives to this culture of violence and only sustained peace education can achieve this in the long run. For Gulati peace education is like a long term investment that enables the sowing of the seeds of peace through the targeted generation and she emphasizes that:

... peace education in Zimbabwe is aimed at developing a generational cohort of literate and conscientious Zimbabwean citizens who can promote a culture of peace and establish peaceful approaches to resolving conflicts in the country. Peace education at tertiary level is an important development. The presumption is that these students will cascade these ideas and ideals of peace or harmonious existence to their families, communities and workplaces. It may take years but consistently applied it will begin to transform our nation.

This was supported by that section of NUST students who have argued for compulsory teaching of peace to university students since these are tomorrow’s leaders. This resonates with the United Nations General Assembly’s year 2000 resolutions (Harris 2000, 31) to educate for a culture of

peace by starting with the young. A majority of the students interviewed throughout the course of this study confirmed that peace education had transformed some of their perceptions for example Tatenda Moyo who acknowledged a more positive attitude towards women. This is an example that it has the potential to transform individuals and then society at large. Other students argued that peace education does make a difference because they have known that violence is damaging. Mavhengere who shared similar sentiments furthered that:

Given our deep etched history of violence, we cannot right a wrong by a wrong. If as a nation we are all hurting products of this violence then, yes peace education is relevant and, if appropriately and adequately reviewed and then applied, can make a difference. It avails us an opportunity to envision a new social order built on a culture of peace where tolerance for diversity and regard for human life are paramount. Once we begin to realize that every life matters, then our nation will be on the path to transformation.

Some students however cautioned that while peace education is indeed well intentioned, the structural circumstances in Zimbabwe are serving to aggravate the different types of conflicts in which the young people are the most affected, and therefore given the current underlying tension that is so evident within the classrooms, this is an urgent matter that can no longer be procrastinated upon. One elderly civil servant who demanded anonymity, while he agreed to the urgency of the matter and the possibilities of peace education making a difference raised a concern that:

Peace education remains window dressing as long as the President of the country remains as Chancellor, anything related to peace becomes equivalent to “jumping the gun.” Even V.P. Mphoko, like most political leaders, when he speaks on peace and conflict, he only aggravates the anger of those harmed. The programmes may only be good on paper but currently they are purely cosmetic. If ever at Africa University they may be free from state interference, the fact that this is a private institution means it’s accessibility and reach is limited.

This raises very important concerns as there is a clear absence of political will in a nation whose politics has continued to be divisive even beyond the attainment of independence, yet there have been numerous opportunities that should have marked turning points for the political

leadership especially given that only one party has been in control for the past thirty five years. Gulati has argued that it is the same party that has been instrumental in the entrenching of the culture peace education is seeking to address and therefore it is upon its political will to transform the nation. Mr. Matwaruse, a retired educationist argued that unless the socio-political context changes peace education may just be a lulling pastime for university students who will inevitably experience a rude awakening once they join the unemployment movement after graduation. He argued that “There is need to work towards an education that promotes change. Currently we have produced graduates who are excelling in selling airtime ...we are nursing a sick system that will eventually turn on itself.” Given these complexities underlying the implementation of peace education a number of pre-conditions were raised by the various respondents as I highlight in the following section.

5.1 Creating an Enabling Socio-political Environment for Peace Education

During the study it emerged that peace education faces innumerable challenges which are espoused within each of the given proposals. Various proposals, most of them structural and therefore long term, were raised by the respondents towards promoting an enabling environment for peace education in Zimbabwe. Bhebhe argued that “If we are going to leave our children anything, we want to leave them a peaceful nation. This will happen if we prioritize, lots of money going to waste should be redirected to this effort” Of the numerous propositions made by the various respondents during this study the overarching one was the need for the state to exercise political will by making tangible structural changes as a commitment to making a break with the culture of violence. This is also echoed by Machakanja(2010:iv) who recommends that “...there is need for a clear and credible account of the past involving acknowledgement for past violations as a process of facilitating individual and national healing and reconciliation...” This

was supported by Mavhengere who gave a detailed outline of how peace as one of the major subjects should entail a wider social campaign within which:

Steps towards reconciliation have to be taken...All the evils that were done by the grandfathers on both sides need to be confronted. Let us confront our HISTORY...truth telling is a key pillar. There should be apologies from the highest levels of our nation's political leadership and they should be able to say "I am sorry" as a pathway to reconciliation. We cannot promote peace without confronting our HISTORY...there is need to look at the past...For me I believe that my days are numbered and I believe I just have to tell the truth.

In affirmation of this, Bhebhe, who argues that Zimbabwe does not have peace education yet, also proposes a re-packaging of peace education so that it is premised on an acknowledgement of past harm. This resonated with Gulati who argues that:

Social units like the family, the political parties and the media, if not wired or structured for the promotion of peace can continue playing a contrary role to what young people are taught. Some families who have been victims of violence in the past are likely to socialize their young to be intolerant of those groups that have harmed them. Family histories shape collective community histories ...because these family and community histories remain "un-publicly" confronted they threaten to destabilize all other effort at promoting social stability and peace. As currently is the case in Zimbabwe right now, the hostility emerges to contaminate every sector of the nation's day to day life be it soccer, workplaces or even churches because citizens are yearning for an outlet.

Peace education should start at the lowest levels just like other subjects in order for its values to take root. This was also raised by one of the lecturers who requested anonymity who noted that:

It is good that universities, colleges and all educational institutions—All potential structures of education should offer peace education; it will help shape our future leadership. Full-fledged peace programmes that are practically oriented for example interacting with the UN and other stakeholders e.g. Security Sector is key, churches etc.

In the same vein, Douglas Munemo, a lecturer of peace studies at MSU recognizes that there is a need for peace educators to review their methodologies and be open minded. Munemo argues that "People speak because they have demands-the outbursts are premised on reality – there is need to confront these realities." He also called for a holistic but synergized approach to

peace education that begins at the grassroots to ensure that peace education, like HIV/AIDS education is mainstreamed into various levels of the society's structure. Another lecturer, in the same manner proposed that peace education be introduced right from pre-school in order to inculcate values of tolerance and constructive resolution of conflict. Moyo, the former Development Studies lecturer from MSU also proposed a secondary level peace education programme as she believes primary schools, by virtue of their ethos of promoting love and care for others as well living and working together, have always been working to promote peace.

There is a pervasive perception among students that Zimbabwean universities and other tertiary level institutions are heavily infiltrated by state security operatives who have been planted to counter oppositional political developments. Therefore, another pre-condition for peace education was the urgent need for the state to address infiltration so that peace can be taught and learnt comfortably. Students across the universities were in support of this view arguing that infiltration creates an air of criminality and illegality, something that not only exhibits the Janus face of a government that wants to be seen to be “doing something about peace” yet curtailing it. Apart from the perceived infiltration Gulati argues that the media is also the biggest culprit. It exposes the double standards of a government that seems to have given its blessing to the teaching and learning of peace education yet the state aligned media is engaged in advancing contrary values. She notes that:

It's unfair that a student emerges from a peace studies class where they have been learning tolerance for alternative views to encounter a leading public paper like the herald with a headline that dehumanizes all contrary opinion. Zimbabwe needs, through families, political leadership and the media to walk the talk in the given peace studies curriculum. That way, young people can begin to be transformed.

However when it comes to the media it is not only the state aligned media that requires transformation. Students noted that both locally and internationally the media is driven by what

sells and war, instead of peace is what sells. They drew examples from the Cable News Network reportage that they argue is driven by conflicts, especially those in Africa and various parts of the developing world. There is a huge disproportion between reporting aimed at promoting peace and that which seemingly valorizes wars in Syria, Sudan and Nigeria, just to name a few. One MSU student stated that each time she switches on the television the motivation is to check “where is the chaos happening, who has been murdered or deposed in a coup”

As already noted, peace education still requires a lot of groundwork in Zimbabwe, most of which entirely rests on the political will of the current leadership. In the next chapter I summarize on the recommendations that have already been raised in this chapter as part of drawing conclusions on this study.

5.2 Conclusion

This chapter has explored, in the present socio-political circumstances, the prospects of university level peace education to contribute to sustainable peace in Zimbabwe. All respondents generally agree that peace education is a necessary long term alternative to fighting the deeply etched culture of violence and argue that it should be compulsory in all learning institutions from the lowest levels like pre-school. However concern was raised that since the violence is largely official and politically motivated, there is need for a structural approach which not only tackles security sector and media reforms but should, importantly, create official space for confronting Zimbabwe’s violent past. Such an approach, they argued would prioritize truth telling as a pathway to forgiveness and reconciliation. Most respondents concluded however that in the present circumstances peace education in universities remains mere “window dressing.”

Chapter 6

Conclusion and Recommendations

6.0 Moving Zimbabwe Forward Through Peace Education

This study has revealed that peace education has been ingraining its foothold for more than a decade now with Africa University being the first to offer post-graduate packages. While still a fairly infant field of study, after more than a decade it is important to review it in order to contribute to future programmes and government policy. Although, as already noted peace education as it began at Africa University in 2003 was not necessarily part of a broader national campaign aimed at social transformation but was rather more career advancement focused, it was instrumental in providing the experts who would found later programmes in institutions like NUST and Solusi. Further to this, its introduction at undergraduate level, even as an optional study area as it stands at the Midlands State University points to a commitment to socialize Zimbabwe's young into a culture of peace. NUST's wholesale approach is even more important as a learning point for other institutions that may not necessarily desire to offer fully fledged programmes but intent on promoting a culture of peace by targeting every student.

This study has shown the centrality of the socio political context in the teaching and learning of peace. Every individual is a product of their community and the MSU and NUST targeted students are young people around the ages of 19-21 whose ideas of hate and prejudice are often, by this age, already been deeply imprinted through socialization. Within the university these young people encounter various forms of prejudice and upon completion of their studies they are immersed in communities where life is mainly lived through the modality of intolerance, prejudice, ethnic and regional divisionism. One of the conclusions that emerged from this study

is that one year peace modules as offered at NUST are helpful but insufficient in the long term promotion of a culture of peace. However, in spite of this foregoing fact respondents felt that the short courses open space for alternative thinking where young people interrogate the roots of conflicts and develop their skills towards non-violent alternatives. Some students argue that in spite of a hostile socio-political context which hangs over the peace classroom, the fact of studying peace itself has enabled them to provoke untrodden, prohibited yet pertinent subjects.

6.1 Conclusion and Postscript

In this study I have argued that the current socio-political context is not conducive for peace education to contribute effectively to a culture of sustainable peace.

Firstly, the introduction of peace education in the post year 2000 period coincided with heightened political instability due to contestations for political space between the country's leading political parties. These political contestations saw ZANU (PF) heighten its repressive state apparatus through the education system and the media. The implementation of peace education therefore is a complex process within a hostile environment which is not only shaped by fear of reprisal for questioning societal violence and injustice but also self-censorship that does not enable room to engage with pertinent issues.

Secondly, there has been a lack of political will and commitment to confront the country's past violence experiences; something which students argue is a contradiction to the values they are being taught through peace education. Without officially enabling truth telling it is impossible to set the country on the path to forgiveness and reconciliation.

A multipronged approach, where state leaders and leaders of political parties as well as churches and civil society work together towards the promotion of peace, is proposed here. Within this multi-pronged approach there should be sector specific initiatives that go beyond the current university initiatives to ensure that every citizen, including the political leadership and security sectors undergo relevant peace education that will ensure each person plays a role in the promotion and maintenance of peace.

The greatest concern however, raised by various respondents during this study is the prohibitive socio-political context which they argued engenders fear which compels them to censor their views on important matters, something which compromises the efficacy of peace education. They argue that if peace education is to effectively resocialise the nation's young citizens it should be open minded and also be freed from the demands of academic rigor and propagated through less rigid non formal channels.

As part of promoting an enabling socio-political environment the following steps were recommended:

- Prioritization of peace education through budgetary support
- Curriculum review and repackaging of current programmes in order to ensure they are broader, context specific and relevant and open minded.
- Implementing a specialized peace pedagogy training programme that will equip teachers and trainers with specific skills on how to identify components of the peace education package, how to manage the peace classroom and the psycho-social issues that may emerge among other related educational concerns

- Entrenching peace education within and as part of a broader national healing and reconciliation strategy so that it is not a theoretical and abstract pursuit divorced from the nation's realities. This strategy will have at the apex of its priorities a clear methodology of constructively dealing with the histories of violence.
- In line with the foregoing, entrenching peace education within a wider synergized social campaign that will see peace education, like HIV/AIDS campaigns permeate every sector of the society beginning at the lowest levels. Within the formal education sector it should run from pre-schools while informal channels like community workshops will ensure families and communities are also involved. Some Civil Society organizations have been engaged in this approach for a while now only within a prohibitive socio-political context.

An enabling socio-political context remains paramount on the part of a government that a government that has, since 2003 sanctioned the teaching and learning of peace. The evidence of this political will lies in the facilitation of legislative, media and security sector reforms that will ensure that peace education indeed serves as education for transformation from a culture of violence to that of peace.

References

(a) Published Works

Adam, H. & Adam, K. (2000). "The politics of memory in divided societies", in W. James and L. van de Vijver (eds.), *After the TRC: Reflections on Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa*, Cape Town: David Philip.

Althusser, L. (1970) *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses* in "Lenin and Philosophy" and other essays. London: Monthly Review Press.

Botcharova O. (2001). "Implementation of Track Two Diplomacy: Developing a Model of Forgiveness", in R. Helmick and R. Petersen (eds.), *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Religion, Public Policy and Conflict Transformation*, Radnor, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.

Brock-Utne, B. (2000). "Peace Education in an Era of Globalization", *Peace Review*, 12:1, 131-138.

Burns, R. & Aspeslagh. (1983). "Concepts of peace education: a view of western experience." *International Review of Education*, 29, 311-330.

Bar-Tarl, D. (2002) "The elusive nature of peace education" in G. Salomon & B. Nevo. (Eds.) *Peace Education: The concept, principles and practices around the world*. New Jersey: Larry Erlbaum Associates.

Barnaby, F. (Ed). (1989). *The Gaia Peace Atlas*. New York: Doubleday.

Berg, B.L. (2001). *Qualitative Research methods for the Social Sciences*, 4th Edition. Allyn and Boston: Bacon.

Cairns, E. (1996). *Children and Political Violence*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace in Zimbabwe and The Legal Resources Foundation (1997). *Breaking the Silence, Building True Peace: A report on the disturbances in Matabeleland and the Midlands 1980 to 1988*, Harare: Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace and The Legal Resources Foundation.

Catholic Education Office & New South Department of Education (1986). *Educating for Peace: Explorations and Proposals*. Canberra: Commonwealth Schools Commission.

Coady, M. (1985). "Some problems for peace education in the pre-school". *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 10(4), 24-27.

Cook-Huffman, C. (2002). "Paths for Peace Studies." *Peace Review*, 14:1, 41-47.

Cresswell, J.W.*et al* (2010).*Best practices for mixed methods research in health sciences*. Article commissioned by the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research (OBSSR)

Davies, L. (2005). "Evaluating the link between conflict and education". *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 2(2), 42-58.

Dovey, V.(1996). "Exploring Peace education in South African settings." *Peabody Journal of Education*, 71(3), 128-150.

Eppel, S. (2013). "Repairing a Fractured Nation: Challenges and Opportunities in Post-GPA Zimbabwe", in B. Raftopoulos (ed.). *The Hard Road to Reform: The Politics of Zimbabwe's Global Political Agreement*, Harare: Weaver Press.

Ewing E (2003) "Rape, gender and the justice system", *Agenda*, 56,54.

Fien, J. & Hutton, D. (1987).*Teaching for Peace. Educational Innovation and Information*. Geneva: UNESCO International Bureau of Education.

Floresca-Cawagas, V. & Swee-Hin, T. (1989). "Peace Education in a land of suffering and hope: Insights from the Philippines." *Convergence*, XXII, 11-24.

Gervais, M. (2004). "The Baha'i Curriculum for Peace Education". *Journal of Peace Education*. 1(2) 205-224

Godwin, P. (2010). *The Fear, The Last Days of Robert Mugabe*. London: Picador.

Haavelsrud, M. (1983). "An introduction to the debate on peace education." *International Review of Education*, 29(3), 275-287.

Haralambos, M. & Holborn, M. (2000). *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*, London: HarperCollins.

Harber, C. (1996). "Educational Violence and Education for Peace in Africa." *Peabody Journal of Peace Education*, 71(3) 151-169.

Harris, G. and Lewis, N. (1999). "Structural Violence, Positive Peace and Peacebuilding" in G. Harris (ed.), *Recovery from Armed Conflict in Developing Countries*. London: Routledge.

Harris, I. (2002). "Challenges for Peace Educators at the Beginning of the 21st Century". *Social Alternatives*, 21 (1).

Harris, G. (2008). "The Potential of Non-violence in Building Security in Sub-Saharan Africa", *African Security Review* 17(2), 108-123.

- Houghton, T. and John, V. (2007). "Towards Sustainable Peace Education: Theoretical and Methodological Frameworks of a Programme in South Africa." in Bekerman and McGlynn (Eds), *Addressing ethnic Conflict Through Peace Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kent, G. (1993). "Analyzing conflict and violence", *Peace and Change* 18(4), 373-398.
- Koylu, M.(2004). "Peace educational Islamic approach." *Journal of Peace Education*. 1(1 59-76).
- Lantieri, L., (1995). "Waging Peace in our schools: Beginning with the children." *Phi Beta Kappan*, 76(5), 386-388.
- Machakanja, P. (2010). "National Healing and Reconciliation in Zimbabwe: Challenges and Opportunities" Zimbabwe Monograph Series, 1.Cape Town: Institute for Justice and Reconciliation.
- Mashingaidze T.M.(2010). "Zimbabwe's illusive national healing and reconciliation processes: From Independence to the inclusive government, 1980-2009", *Conflict Trends*, 1.
- Maxwell, A.(2004). "The role of education in demilitarizing sub-Saharan Africa", in Harris, G.(ed.), *Achieving security in sub-Saharan Africa: cost effective alternatives to the military*, Pretoria :Institute for Security Studies.
- Melko, M. (1999). "Peaceful societies" in S. Young and J. Perez de Cuellar (eds.). *World Encyclopedia of Peace*, New York: Oceana.
- Mlambo, A. and Raftopoulos, B. (2010) The regional dimensions of Zimbabwe's multi-layered crisis: an Analysis. *Election processes, Liberation movements and Democratic change in Africa*.
- Morgan, D.L. (1996). "Focus Groups", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 129-152.
- Muzondidya, J. and Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J.(2007). "Echoing Silences: Ethnicity in Postcolonial Zimbabwe, 1980-2007," *African Journal on conflict Resolution: Special Issue on Identity and Cultural Diversity in Conflict Resolution in Africa*, 7 (2), 257-297.
- Nathan L. (2000). "The four horseman of the apocalypse": The structural causes of crisis and violence in Africa". *Peace and Change*, 25, 2, 189-200.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S, J. (2003). "Dynamics of the Zimbabwean Crisis in the 21st Century." *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 3, 1, 99-13.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S, J. (2009), *Do 'Zimbabweans' Exist? : Trajectories of Nationalism, National Identity Formation and Crisis in a postcolonial State*. London: Peter Lang
- Pearl, N.(2004). "No Peace Without Justice-No justice Without Peace". *Contemporary Justice Review*, 7,2,241-244.

- Perez de Cuellar, N. and Young, S.C. (1999), *World Encyclopedia of Peace*), New York: Oceana.
- Raftopoulos, B. and Eppel S. (2008). “Desperately Seeking Sanity: What Prospects for a New Beginning in Zimbabwe?”. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 2: 3, 369-400.
- Ranger, T. (2004). “Nationalist Historiography, Patriotic History and the History of the Nation: the struggle over the Past in Zimbabwe”. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 30, 2.
- Reardon, B.A (1988). *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility*). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B.A (2001). *Education for a culture of peace in a gender perspective*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Robson, C. (1997). *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner Researchers*. Cambridge USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Rude D. (1999). “Reasonable men and provocative women: an Analysis of Gendered Domestic Homicide in Zambia”, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 25, 1.
- Sachikonye. L (2011). *When a State Turns on its Citizens: 60 Years of Institutionalized Violence in Zimbabwe*. Cape Town: Jacana Press.
- Salomon, G. (1999). “Research on Peace Education: Provocative Questions, Challenging Criteria”. Paper presented at the NCPCR meeting, Phoenix, AZ.
- Salomon, G. (2002). “The nature of peace education: Not all programmes are created equal”. in G. Salomon & B. Nevo (eds.) *Peace Education: The concept, principles and practices around the world*. New Jersey: Larry Erlbaum Associates
- Sathiparsad, R., (2005), “‘It is better to beat her’: Male Youth in Rural KwaZulu-Natal Speak on Violence in Relationships”, *Agenda*, 66, 79-88.
- Smit, M.E. (2005). “Education for peace: a theoretical model for analyzing conflict resolution programmes.” Paper presented at the Conference “Sustained Peace Education Efforts for Social Cohesion in International Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies” held between the 6th and 8th of June 2005, Jerusalem, Israel.
- Zembylas, M. and Bekerman, Z. (2008). “Dilemmas of Justice in Peace/Coexistence Education: Affect and the Politics of Identity”. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 30: 399-419, Routledge.

(b)Zimbabwean Newspapers

The Patriot

(c)Institutional web pages

Africa University – www.africau.ac.zw

Appendices:

Appendix 1:

(d)Interviews

Bhebhe Phillip (Dr.)
Bhebhe Sindisiwe*-MSU, 23 Oct 2015
Chakaonda Munashe Irene-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Chigora Percysledge –MSU
Chibazo Erin*-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Chifamba Ronald*-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Chigodo Enesia*-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Chikomo Rumbidzai*-NUST
Chirisa Tabeth*-MSU, 23 Oct 2015
Chisi Melody *-NUST
Chitiyo Reginald*-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Choruma Judith*-MSU, 23 October 2015
Donga Melvin*-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Gukhwa Tyrone*
Gulati Julian*–Former AU student
Jintu Melisa *-MSU, 23 Oct 2015
Kanemanyanga Brandon-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Khuphe Lesley*-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Mafu Gwendolyn*-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Makioni Ednos *-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Makoni Ednos
Makuku Chip*-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Makunike Rodwell-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Manungo Rodgers-SAU
Marumo Lindsay*-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Masekela Lindelani*-NUST
Masimirembwa Edwin-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Mashingaidze Terence-MSU, 10 Oct 2015
Matwaruse*-Retired Educationist
Mavhengere William -MSU, 05 Oct 2015
Mawarire Francis*-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Mazenge Tatenda-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Mlibazi Andiswa*-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Moyana Danika*-MSU, 23 Oct 2015
Moyo Rita*-Former MSU Development Studies lecturer
Moyo Tatenda*-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
MoyoYeukai*-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Msimanga Kelvin*-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Msipa Lungisani*-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Munemo Douglas- MSU
Ncube Simelokuhle*-MSU, 23 Oct 2015

Ndlovu Melinkosi-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Ndlovu Sandra*-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Ngwenya Lindelani-MSU, 23 Oct 2015
Ntini Simelokuhle*-MSU, 23 Oct 2015
Nyathi Ashley*-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Phiri Anelisa*-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Phuthi Moreblessing*-NUST, 16 Oct 2015
Sibanda Melford*-NUST, 17 Oct 2015
Takavarasha Lillian*-MSU, 23 Oct 2015
Thwala Sithandekile *-NUST, 16 Oct 2015

Note:

- i) In addition to some of the listed individual interviews 3 Focus group Interviews were held at NUST.1 was with a group of 8 male students and the other two were with 8 female students each. Some of the opinions are represented through the pseudonyms reflected above while some, especially in the females group, withheld their names.**
- ii) 2 Focus group interviews were also held at MSU**

*-Pseudonyms. Some respondents gave me the liberty to choose for them some used own choice.

There are also a number of respondents who withheld their names and are not included on this list.

Appendix 2:

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU NATAL

School Of Social Sciences

Dear Respondent,

Master of Social Sciences Research Project

Researcher: Sikhululekile Mashingaidze (+263 776 692 885)

Supervisor: Dr Joram Ndlovu (+27791809561-WhatsApp)

I, **Sikhululekile Mashingaidze**, student number **209 526 105**, am a Master of Social Science student at the University of KwaZulu Natal.

I invite you to participate in a research project titled **“The Socio-political Context and its Impact on Peace Education in Zimbabwe.”** This is a project that seeks to understand the value of studying peace education. Through your participation in this interview I hope to understand from your experiences the opportunities, challenges and recommendations towards enhancing peace programmes in Zimbabwe.

Kindly note that your participation is voluntary, you may refuse or withdraw anytime with no negative consequences. There will be no gain, monetary or otherwise for participating in this exercise. Confidentiality and anonymity of records identifying you as a participant will be maintained by the School of Social Sciences, UKZN.

If you have any questions or concerns about participating in this study, please contact me or my Supervisor on the numbers listed above.

The interview should take about 20 minutes to complete.

Yours faithfully,

Sikhululekile Mashingaidze

Investigator’s Signature.....

Date.....

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU NATAL

School Of Social Sciences

Master of Social Sciences Research Project

Researcher: Sikhululekile Mashingaidze (00263 776 692 885)

Supervisor: Dr. Joram Ndlovu (+27791809561-WhatsApp)

CONSENT FORM

I,..... **(Full names of participant)** hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I consent to participating in the research project. I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time should I so desire.

.....

Participant's signature

.....

Date

Questionnaire for Peace Education Students (Current and Former)

Name :.....Sex:.....

MajorDepartment.....

Current Occupation and Designation (If Applicable)

.....

Age range

18--22.... 23-27.... 28-32.... 33-37.... 38-42....42-46.... 47-52.... 53-57....58-62.... 63-67....

Set of Questions

1. What motivated you to undertake peace education?

.....
.....
.....

2. What are/were your experiences?(**Benefits, strengths and gaps of the programme**)

.....
.....
.....
.....

3. In what ways does the programme specifically address questions of **gender, ethnicity and race**?

.....
.....
.....

4. Bar Tarl, a peace scholar asserts that ‘The socio-political context supersedes the rest in peace education...’ What are your thoughts on this?

.....
.....

5. In what ways do you think the local context or environment relates with your peace education experience?

6. What role does family and mass media play in your understanding of peace education? (**In other words:** *How does the family, community history, the local and international media and political rhetoric impact peace education*)

.....

.....

.....

.....

7. From your experience, what difference does studying peace make?

.....

.....

.....

.....

8. In what ways do you see/have you seen Peace Education being relevant beyond the classroom?

.....

.....

.....

.....

9. Some peace scholars argue that ‘...university level peace education is bound to be ineffective because it targets the wrong people in the wrong setting.’ What are your thoughts on this?

.....

.....

.....

10. What recommendations would you make to students and universities contemplating peace education

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thank you for your time!

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU NATAL
School Of Social Sciences

Master of Social Sciences Research Project

Researcher: Sikhululekile Mashingaidze (+263 776 692 885)

Supervisor: Dr. Joram Ndlovu (+27791809561-App)

Research Office:

Dear Respondent,

I, **Sikhululekile Mashingaidze**, student number **209 526 105**, am a Master of Social Science student at the University of KwaZulu Natal.

I invite you to participate in a research project titled **‘The socio-political context and its impact on peace education in Zimbabwe**. ‘This is a project that seeks to understand the value of studying peace education. Through your participation in this interview I hope to understand from your experiences the opportunities, challenges and recommendations towards enhancing peace programmes in Zimbabwe.

Kindly note that your participation is voluntary, you may refuse or withdraw anytime with no negative consequences. There will be no gain, monetary or otherwise for participating in this exercise. Confidentiality and anonymity of records identifying you as a participant will be maintained by the School of Social Sciences, UKZN.

If you have any questions or concerns about participating in this study, please contact me or my Supervisor on the numbers listed above.

The interview should take about 20 minutes to complete.

Yours faithfully,

Sikhululekile Mashingaidze

Investigator’s Signature.....

Date.....

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU NATAL
School Of Social Sciences

Master of Social Sciences Research Project

Researcher: Sikhululekile Mashingaidze ([REDACTED])

Supervisor: Dr. Joram Ndlovu ([REDACTED])

Research Office:

CONSENT FORM

I,.....(**Full names of participant**) hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I consent to participating in the research project. I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time should I so desire.

.....
Participant's signature

.....
Date

Questionnaire for Peace Education Head of Department and Lecturers

Name :.....Sex:.....

Designation.....Department.....

Age range

26-30.... 31-35..., 36-40..., 41-45..., 46-50.... 51-60.... 61-65.... 65-70....

Set of Questions

1. When was peace education introduced and what influenced this?

.....
.....
.....

2. What are its objectives: Short, Medium and Long term?

.....
.....
.....
.....

3. Why do you offer peace education as you do./What philosophy informs your delivery approach? (*Was it necessary since some of the students are already exposed to aspects of peace and conflict studies that are espoused within some of your programmes such as Development Studies, History, International relations as well as Politics and Public management*)

.....
.....
.....

4. How is the student response/uptake of the programme? (What do you perceive is the motivation behind those students who take up peace education?)

.....
.....
.....

5. Bar Tarl, a peace scholar asserts that 'The socio-political context supersedes the rest in peace education...' What are your thoughts on this?

.....
.....

6. From your experiences, in what ways does the family, community history, the local and international media and political rhetoric impact the teaching and learning of peace education

.....
.....
.....

7. In what ways does the programme specifically address questions of **gender, ethnicity and race**?

.....
.....

8. What difference do you think studying peace makes given the foregoing context?

.....
.....

9. Some peace scholars argue that ‘...university level peace education is bound to be ineffective because it targets the wrong people in the wrong setting,’ what are your thoughts on this?

.....
.....
.....

10. What notable experiences can you share from your teaching of peace education?

.....
.....
.....

11. What recommendations would you make for your current programmes and to universities contemplating introduction of peace education?

.....
.....

Thank you for your time!

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU NATAL

School Of Social Sciences

Dear Respondent,

Master of Social Sciences Research Project

Researcher: Sikhululekile Mashingaidze (+263 776 692 885)

Supervisor: Dr. Joram Ndlovu (+27791809561-App)

Research Office:

I, **Sikhululekile Mashingaidze**, student number **209 526 105**, am a Master of Social Science student at the University of KwaZulu Natal.

I invite you to participate in a research project titled '**The socio-political context and its impact on peace education in Zimbabwe.**' This is a project that seeks to understand the value of studying peace education. Through your participation in this interview I hope to understand from your experiences the opportunities, challenges and recommendations towards enhancing peace programmes in Zimbabwe.

Kindly note that your participation is voluntary, you may refuse or withdraw anytime with no negative consequences. There will be no gain, monetary or otherwise for participating in this exercise. Confidentiality and anonymity of records identifying you as a participant will be maintained by the School of Social Sciences, UKZN.

If you have any questions or concerns about participating in this study, please contact me or my Supervisor on the numbers listed above.

The interview should take about 20 minutes to complete.

Yours faithfully,

Sikhululekile Mashingaidze

Investigator's Signature.....

Date.....

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU NATAL

School Of Social Sciences

Master of Social Sciences Research Project

Researcher: Sikhululekile Mashingaidze (+263 776 692 885)

Supervisor: Dr Joram Ndlovu (+27791809561-WhatsApp)

CONSENT FORM

I,..... **(Full names of participant)** hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I consent to participating in the research project. I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time should I so desire.

.....

Participant's signature

.....

Date

Questionnaire for Educationists and Peace Practitioners

Name :.....Sex:.....

Designation.....Department.....

Age range

26-30.... 31-35..., 36-40..., 41-45..., 46-50.... 51-60.... 61-65.... 65-70....

Set of Questions

1. Several Zimbabwean Universities have and continue to roll out peace education programmes. (Africa University, Solusi, NUST, Bindura, ZOU and MSU) What are your thoughts on this development in the tertiary education sector?

.....
.....
.....

2. What are your thoughts on the assertion by some peace scholars and theorists that ‘The **socio-political context** supersedes the rest in peace education...’?

.....
.....
.....
.....

3. In what ways do you think the family, community history, the local and international media and political rhetoric may impact the teaching and learning of peace education?

.....
.....

4. Some peace scholars argue that ‘...university level peace education is bound to be ineffective because it targets the wrong people in the wrong setting,’ what are your thoughts on this?

.....
.....

5. Do you think Zimbabwe is ready for peace education and is peace education relevant for the country

.....
.....
.....

6. What should be its key components? (Recommendations)

.....
.....
.....

THANK YOU!