Grappling with Peace Education in Serbia

Ruzica Rosandic

Peaceworks

Contents

Summary

Since the violent breakup of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia began in 1991, the children of Serbia have suffered the debilitating effects of wartime conditions. These include various forms and degrees of deprivation:social, emotional,moral, and intellectual. A committed group of Serbian psychologists and educators sought to ameliorate the effects of war on children through initiating more or less systematic and extensive peace education programs in 1992–98. Some of these were introduced into Serbian schools in 1996, with the approval of the Serbian Ministry of Education, as part of a United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) project on education for peace.

One of the programs, "The Goodwill Classroom:Elementary School Programs in Constructive Conflict Resolution (1993–97)," was headed by the author of this report, Ruzica Rosandic, and her colleague, Tunde Kovac-Cerovic, both professors of educational psychology at the University of Belgrade. Rosandic was a senior fellow in the Jennings Randolph Program for International Peace at the United States Institute of Peace in 1997–98, during which time she completed the research for this report.

The report presents seven of the peace education programs in Serbia, most for preschool and elementary school students, and shows how they fit into the field of peace education more generally. Rosandic discusses the methodology and content of the programs and presents evaluations of the programs' effects.

She notes that peace education can be approached in two ways: a more narrow, fact-oriented approach and a broader approach oriented to informal learning of attitudes, values, and behavior. The programs discussed here belong to the latter category. "Serbian psychologists and educators gave priority to programs that encourage and incorporate action,dialogue,involvement, cooperation, and participation," Rosandic writes. "This is because such an approach is more congruent with the message of peace and nonviolence and because it is, in itself, a way of teaching both about peace and for peace."

Because the social and political environment has such an important impact on peace education, Rosandic discusses the general mise-en-scène of contemporary Serbian society as well as the characteristics of the Serbian educational system, before looking at the programs themselves.

Part I, "Factors Confronting Peace Education Efforts in Serbia," looks at the broad social and political factors in Serbia affecting peace education programs. Chapter 1 examines the trauma of recent wars on the population,especially children. Chapter 2 explores the environment in which peace education was taught,looking specifically at the social and political turmoil in Serbia in the 1990s, a time when "the public sphere was saturated by threats, rumors, and poisonous propaganda." Rosandic describes how state paternalism,crude populism, and a clientist system prevailed.Educators had to grapple with the

state's implicit argument that the dominant culture of violence was somehow "natural" and "unavoidable."

Chapter 3 examines the Serbian school system, instruction methods, and teacher attitudes and expectations. Rosandic introduces the reader to the schools' traditional authoritarian instruction methods, left over from the days of communist rule, in which the teacher transmits his or her special knowledge, which the students then repeat back by rote, a process that socializes them to accept authority, to conform, and to obey. This chapter also presents the findings of a study of Serbian textbooks, which analyzed strategies taught for handling interpersonal and intergroup conflicts. The texts offered an argumentative strategy for dealing with out-groups, backed up by violence and armed struggle. Retreat from a conflict with outsiders was not considered. Indeed, notes Rosandic, history textbooks contained only two explicit references to a third-party mediating role.

A study of the teachers themselves showed an inability to elaborate on the nature of conflict and an inability to manage conflict "due to a traditional (aggressive-argumentative) understanding of conflict situations and the use of withdrawal and conflict avoidance as reserve mechanisms." The social reality of the school system was found to be essentially similar to that of the larger society, Rosandic concludes.

Part II, "A Look at Peace Education Programs in Serbia," presents seven peace education programs implemented primarily in Serbian preschools and elementary schools. The programs were developed based on insights from empirical studies seeking to assess the impact of the war atmosphere in Serbia on children, including refugees. Chapter 4 gives an overview of the programs, including their goals and method. The method itself—an elicitive approach to teaching—was perhaps the most potent aspect of the programs, addressing the core problems of socialization in the Serbian school setting, Rosandic notes. Among other things, the method transformed the teacher's role from a dominating to a facilitating one and the student's role from a passive to an active one. Chapter 4 also provides an example of an elicitive exercise, intended to help participants express, identify, and name feelings.

Chapter 5 discusses the evaluations of each of the programs. Generally, both teachers and students expressed strong enthusiasm for the peace education programs because of their content and their active, participatory methods. The evaluations found that in many cases students showed more positive social behavior after participating in the programs, or at the least, less negative social behavior.

Chapter 6 looks at the prospects for continued peace education in Serbia. The recent war in Kosovo and the uncertainty about further eruptions of violence have resulted in a renewed social crisis in Serbia. The government condemns pacifists, which would certainly include peace educators, as "unpatriotic" and strictly controls any deviation from the promoted patriotic discourse. However, Rosandic notes, there is some hope that participants in the peace education programs may find new ways to continue the process of social change by finding new venues for communication, among other measures. Further, Serbian teachers of peace education will not likely give up their hopes for transforming their society. Rosandic proposes an institutional response to the crisis in Serbia and in the Balkans more generally: creation of a Balkan Institute for Textbook Research, where dif-

ferent ethnic groups might jointly identify the differing views of history and moderate tales of victimhood, blame, and glory. A more temperate telling of the region's history through textbooks would help upcoming generations to deal with the traumas of the past and forge a more livable future.

Acknowledgments

A Telling Anecdote

In 1994, Yugoslav film director Zelimir Zilnik made a film that vividly illustrated the extent to which some Serbians lost touch with reality under the autocratic rule of Slobodan Milosevic. The making of the film, *Tito: For the Second Time among the Serbs,* was one of the strangest events to have taken place in Belgrade. An actor dressed up as Marshal Tito, who reunited Yugoslavia in 1945 and ruled the country until his death in 1980. While the actor wandered around Belgrade, Zilnik filmed people's reactions.

Amazingly, instead of seeing the funny side of Zilnik's prank, people reacted as though the actor were the real Tito. In the film, "Tito" says he has come back to see "what's going on." He strolls around the city greeted by both adoring and angry citizens, who accuse him of being responsible for the misfortunes that befell the country after his death. As "Tito" tours Belgrade, women crowd around the dead president to give him flowers. One tells him that she cried when he died, and he answers, "So did I."

"Tito" is wearing a military uniform and looks none the worse for his death. Many engage their former leader in conversation. "I am a Serb, and you are a Croat," says one man, "but I used to admire you."

Another man says that after "Tito's" death, the man had been part of the honor guard. "Yes, I remember you," replies "Tito" encouragingly. The man says, "You have been everything to us. You used to warm us like the sun."

Another disagrees, telling the former communist leader that he is "guilty, a bandit," and accuses him of hating Serbs. "I used to be one of your soldiers," says yet another, "but now there is no bread in the shops!" Another says that during his time there was only one Tito, but "now there are fifty-five."

The film's writers thought it was a joke, but as one can see, it became rather serious. In front of a Belgrade train station, a Gypsy accordionist strikes up a Tito-era tune and the crowd grows so large that the police have to intervene. They first tell the cameraman to move, then Zilnik. When Zilnik asks them to tell "Tito" the same, they say, "No, leave him out of it." One man explains to "Tito" that, nowadays, "everyone has a flag, a state, and a coat of arms; for only one hill, two to three hundred boys must die." An old man accuses "Tito" of being pro-American.

In the most pathetic scene in the movie, "Tito" finds himself by the monument to his comrades. Their busts have been removed. "Who was bothered by them?" asks "Tito."

"Those who don't like order, those who don't respect the past. . . . Those who are irresponsible," says an elderly man. He does not look up. "Tito" asks where he is from. The man replies that he is a refugee from the war in Bosnia.

"When will it end?" asks "Tito." The elderly man replies, "There is no end, my friend.'"

—Ruzica Rosandic

Part I: Factors Confronting Peace Education Efforts in Serbia

One

Introduction: Why Peace Education?

In November 1991, prompted by feelings of personal and professional responsibility, an informal group of psychologists from Serbia signed a petition they hoped would attract the attention of all the Yugoslav governing bodies still in power. Their petition pointed to the "incontestable fact that childhood is sacrificed in advance in any war, especially a civil war, regardless of the purposes for which that war is waged."[1] In this appeal, they pointed out that Yugoslavia had signed the Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted by the United Nations (UN) in 1989. Thus, Yugoslavia assumed certain commitments, which are flagrantly violated in wartime. The psychologists stressed that "children living in a country torn by war are the most endangered category of the population." The group explained that, in addition to the fact that children's lives are directly imperiled, "not a single vital aspect of their development is spared; in war, children are exposed to various forms and degrees of deprivation:social, emotional,moral, and intellectual." The appeal listed the following anticipated consequences:

> Drastic, vital deprivation caused by the death or wounding of persons close to the child,separation from the family, refugee status, and other forced changes of environment.

> Less conspicuous—but just as serious—deprivation inflicted by the substantial impoverishment in the necessary daily contacts between children and adults, resulting from the adults' constant preoccupation with war.

> An adverse environment for the child's normal emotional development resulting from the negative emotions adults experience in a war situation, such as feelings of helplessness, concern, depression, grief, despair, anxiety, fear, panic,fury, hatred,and related emotions.

> Impaired development based on a threatening, impoverished, and highly simplified picture of the world, and the formation of belligerent,war-induced values about civilization and humanity promoted in the media and in adult communication.

Unfortunately, these warnings later became bitter realities that then required professional attention.[2] Those psychologists who had signed the appeal were often the ones implementing various postwar interventions.

Helping children overcome the psychosocial effects of the trauma of war accomplishes a kind of necessary "sanitization." It is worth noting that some psychologists and educa-

tors took additional steps to introduce programs that would help lay the groundwork for society to move from hatred to tolerance and return to peace, harmony, and amicable relations. Such transformations are possible not only, and not primarily, through individual treatments but rather through more or less systematic and extensive educational activities. In their content and methods, some of the educational programs educated for peace. My intention is to present these programs and show how they fit into the field of peace education.

Like the concept of peace itself, the concept of peace education is a contested one, whose meaning varies through time and across cultures.[3] Early ideas of peace education, which grew out of World War I, speculated about the beneficial outcomes of "international colleges," where by being together, former enemies could learn how to live in harmony and peace.[4] These ideas have been superseded by theories of peace education as "planetary, conscious education for global responsibility,"[5] thus reflecting changes in the world and warfare, in the causes of violence, and in teaching practices.

The new concept of an isolated institution as, in fact, a "web" of peace education has expanded to global dimensions. "There are no clear and precise limits to, nor standards for, what should be included in peace education," points out Betty Reardon, a leading American peace educator.[6] Nevertheless, she organizes the vast, complex field of peace education into topical areas, such as conflict resolution, cooperation, nonviolence, multicultural understanding, human rights, social justice, world resources, and the global environment.[7]

An analysis of these topical areas suggests two underlying approaches: (1) a more cognitive, fact-oriented education *about* peace; and (2) a broader approach found in the term *education for peace,* oriented to informal learning of attitudes, values, and behavior. The programs presented here belong predominantly to the second group. The reasons for that are twofold.

On the one hand, more formal learning of subject matter requires radical changes in the school curriculum, which were impossible to accomplish in Serbia at the time. Although the Serbian Ministry of Education agreed to accept a United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) project on education for peace in the country's schools,[8] that did not mean the authorities were ready for radical changes to the system.

On the other hand, the authors of these programs were convinced that a change in the very methods of teaching would be far-reaching. As Birgit Brock-Utne points out, "It is of no help if the subject matter taught is of a critical nature selected to further democratic values and the character formation of individuals if the methods used to convey the subject matter are authoritarian, do not engage students, and do not appeal to their emotions."[9] Serbian psychologists and educators gave priority to programs that encourage and incorporate action, dialogue, involvement, cooperation, and participation. This is because such an approach is more congruent with the message of peace and nonviolence and because it is, in itself, a way of teaching both about peace and for peace.

To generate alternative visions, it was assumed that the concept of self, a personal sense of security, and the ability of an individual to cooperate are essential ingredients in peace education, especially in the initial phases, and were needed to counter the prevailing social

and political circumstances. The aim was to change the attitudes not only of students but of teachers as well. Thus it was important, as Birgit Brock-Utne notes, "to induce teachers to strive to counteract the hidden messages devaluing the students and giving them little hope for the future," and at the same time, to give students the "opportunity to develop their own interests and have these acknowledged in school."[10]

Also, the specific social and cultural settings in which peace education programs are implemented shape the ways in which each topic area is taught, specific issues are elaborated, strategies are followed, and target audiences are addressed. Each specific peace education program should be designed for the environment in which it is introduced.

Thus, the peace education programs discussed below need to be evaluated vis-à-vis: (1) the general mise-en-scène of contemporary Serbian society, and (2) the characteristics of the Serbian educational system, which is the setting in which these programs were implemented.

The many programs developed for preschools and elementary schools would have been almost impossible without the support of UNICEF. The educational system in Serbia is highly centralized and controlled and not much concerned with pacifist ideas.

Various peace education programs developed for high schools and universities have unfortunately remained marginal to the Serbian educational system. They continue to be offered in youth clubs[11] or in informal seminars for undergraduate or graduate students, teachers, or other education professionals willing to participate.[12] These programs are not included in this report—not because they are inferior in quality or influence but because they were not systematically implemented or observed, so direct comparisons are difficult.

In this report I discuss seven peace education programs. Following a short presentation of each program, my analysis focuses on two features—methodology and content—and includes a discussion of the programs' documented effects. Most programs included some type of evaluation. Some evaluations focused primarily on effects of the training on teachers and other adults working with school children. However, most used rather elaborate evaluation paradigms to record the effects on children as the ultimate beneficiaries of the training.

According to the original manuscript, the concluding chapter of this report was to outline the prospects for peace education in Serbia. At that time, in the autumn of 1997, those prospects looked far different than they do now, in the winter of 1999. The overall situation in Serbian society has changed from what appeared to be slow progress out of a severe crisis, to a new decline triggered by the violent conflict in Kosovo. The thorough deterioration of social and cultural life in Serbia threatens to undo the accomplishments of the previous peace education activities. What in the autumn of 1997 looked like promising prospects now seem quite utopian. But, if not optimists, educators are at least persistent in their endeavors. The prospects for peace education in Serbia might best be described as initiatives that should be pursued, if not in the near future, then at some more distant time. It would be helpful if resources were available to evaluate the impact the present crisis is having on past peace education efforts. Such an endeavor would likely yield the best grounds for determining not only the validity of these specific efforts, but perhaps the validity of peace education itself.

The Ecology of Peace Education in Serbia

The term *ecology* is derived from Urie Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory of human development.[13] It is used here to stress the importance of social structures in defining the contexts in which human beings develop and act. Every activity and setting, including the work of peace education, is seen as grounded in a set of assumptions about appropriate roles, goals, and means used by the participants in that setting.

It is difficult to achieve conceptual clarity without first inquiring into what constitutes peace in specific cultural and social environments, how it can be achieved, and how one can educate students to work for it. It seems insufficient to rely only on Betty Reardon's hope that "a systematic discourse about definitions will lead us to a broader and clearer notion of authentic processes and methods and the conceptual tools needed to refine them."[14]

Rather, the incorporation of global ideas into the applied programs, methods, and tools, and their test in practice could contribute to the search for clarity. Through systematic discourse, a conceptual gap between "actual minds" and "possible worlds" can be elegantly overarched.[15] Still, the practitioner is the one who must stagger and not fall, trying in specific settings and through practical actions to contribute to what is conceived of as a culture of peace. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO's) culture-of-peace program stresses the need for culturally sensitive models of peace-building mechanisms. The very efforts to culturally construct the meaning of a "culture of peace" are in themselves an essential part of building peace, as Michael Wessells points out.[16] Peace education must reflect diverse values, assumptions, and worldviews.

If, for what Paulo Freire calls "the pedagogy of the oppressed,"[17] a proper setting is one in which adult workers learn to read but do not have to pass exams, what would be a proper setting for peace education? Or, put another way, how does one determine which forms of peace education are appropriate for specific social and cultural settings? There is a dynamic relationship between the two, which makes practitioners' paths so difficult. It is one kind of challenge for peace educators to work in a setting where students learn in order to be graded, being part of a competitive system. Nevertheless, that appears to be a universal challenge. Quite different and added challenges confront peace educators working in, for example, a centralized, politicized school system that has an evident investment in perpetuating a cycle of violence from one generation to the next. Under such circumstances, how can peace educators develop strategies and mechanisms to make peace education as systemic and multidimensional as violence itself?

Again according to Betty Reardon, a number of basic topics, fundamental assumptions, and common elements remain to be defined. Also, elaboration of UNESCO's cul-

ture-of-peace program is still in its early stages, as is the work of Michael Wessells[18] and Malvern Lumsden,[19] who are defining some basic principles[20] and core mechanisms[21] of the teaching process.

Mise-en-Scène

What was it like for a practitioner trying to design a peace education program in Serbia in the early 1990s? Serbia was a conflict-ridden society, torn apart by political violence. Until recently, no war was actually waged on Serbian territory. However, the consequences of the wars in Croatia and Bosnia were evident in the everyday lives of Serbian citizens.

Many of the conflicts ravaging the former Yugoslav society resulted directly from state violence and related gross human rights violations against citizens. Eventually some of these conflicts developed into clashes between ethnic groups over access to state power. At the same time, as the former Yugoslav state was undergoing unavoidable social and economic transformations in the post-communist years, it lacked the strength and legitimacy to ensure a minimum level of order and rule of law.

This, of course, is not to say that ethnicity was unimportant in the development of the Yugoslav conflicts. The mere fact that ethnicity plays a part in a conflict makes that conflict especially difficult to resolve. Because ethnicity defines one's identity and relation to others, it tends to influence a person's or group's whole way of being. In addition, conflicts where people are mobilized along ethnic lines soon cease to be clashes limited to particular interests concerning, for example, political power. The people involved quickly believe that their very existence is threatened.

The former Yugoslav government had neither the power nor the authority to mediate or intervene in these conflicts. Nor could it secure an impartial public space essential for the emergence of civil society—a space where different groups could freely express their interests and opinions, discuss different alternatives in order to solve their problems, negotiate, and seek compromises. As a result, the "public spaces" were saturated by threats, rumors, poisonous propaganda, calls for unity and homogenization, misunderstandings, and fears, resulting in the extremely violent disintegration of the state. A peace educator in the former Yugoslavia had to address at least some of the consequences of these processes when they came to be expressed in the school-age population.

The nature of power relations in the country further complicated the picture. Nothing in contemporary Serbia is more valued than state power. Competition for power is pervasive. The concentration of power creates an almost warlike situation. With state power as strong and unchecked as it evidently is, competitors cannot afford to lose. They do everything both lawful and unlawful to win. Nothing looks worse than losing; nothing looks better than winning. This is the dominant model of conflict management in Serbia today.

The contemporary Serbian state does not legitimize its power as a democracy would, namely, through public participation in political dialogue. Further, no mechanisms exist for power-sharing or for checking the state's power. Political leaders coopt potential opponents through patron-client relationships or through repression and revenge.[22] A political leader's family and "friends" occupy strategic positions in the power hierarchy. Outside of this group, the leader buys the "friendship" of others who hold important positions in society. By the same token, public accountability, rights, and responsibilities are exchanged

for material benefits, favoritism of different kinds, and obedience towards patrons. Such modes of behavior bear little relation to personal autonomy and accountability and further delay the development of democratic processes.

Paternalism and personal rule have less to do with Serbian traditions than with the current ruling elite's apparent need to consolidate state power after communist rule. In the context of highly centralized state power, leadership is particularly significant. People are mobilized by their ability to trust and identify with political leaders instead of by their personal and group interests. Political organizations are usually formed around personalities rather than political programs. Needless to say, personal identification with leaders and resulting feelings of personal loyalty can most easily encourage ethnic attachments.

Crude populism and insults against other parties are common. Such behavior increases social intolerance. This behavior also increases politicization of ethnic identities, which, in the setting of a repressive state, easily leads to new kinds of antagonisms. Serbian leaders consider the state to be their personal property and use it for personal interests. The state is governed through a clientist system: As noted above, the political elite builds support by distributing resources on a personal basis to followers. Economic and financial management is geared toward this end. Thus, corruption and kleptocratic practices become an almost legitimate feature of governance.

Against this background of crisis in governance, an outsider may conclude that the ongoing social and ethnic conflicts are irrational and senseless, stemming from primitive forces within the nation. Serbian leaders themselves are keen to promote such an interpretation. But such explanations imply that ethnic conflicts are somehow natural and unavoidable, and that cultural identity is essential and durable, rather than a context-dependent feature of the social system. The government-controlled Serbian media also use, and thus promote, such overly simplistic and deterministic images of ethnic identification. Confronted with this climate, peace education programs must grapple with the argument that the dominant culture of violence is somehow "natural" and "unavoidable."

The Setting of a Closer Encounter: The Serbian School System

Presently Serbia has about 1,800 elementary schools employing approximately 53,000 primary school teachers and more than 2,000 expert associates, including psychologists, librarians, and pedagogues. (In Serbia, a pedagogue supervises teachers and ensures that instructions from the Ministry of Education and the ruling political party are implemented.) Approximately 100,000 pupils enroll in first grade every year (although this number has been falling in the past few years). An estimated 900,000 students are enrolled in primary schools in the country.

About 4 percent of the gross national product (GNP) has been earmarked for education annually in recent years.[23] However, because of the sharp decline in national income, education funds are in absolute terms very small (approximately $60 to $65 per resident).[24] Such economic conditions are reflected across all aspects of the school system, from depressingly low teachers' salaries to the deterioration of school buildings and equipment. For example, less than half of the schools have libraries. Only one third have specially equipped classrooms, with cabinets and labs. On average, schools have fewer than one computer. Among teachers, such conditions lead to insensitivity and apathy, a lack of professional motivation, and frequent strikes.

The former communist tradition—namely, to use the school system as a powerful instrument of propaganda to keep the system highly centralized—did not end with the formal transition to a multiparty system in Serbia. On the contrary, the same party is still in power, governing the school system in the same manner but less smoothly and skillfully. The new Serbian school system has taken the authority to make even minor decisions away from schools. It focuses almost exclusively on implementing extensive, prescribed curricula, leaving teachers and students with little time for innovation or extracurricular activities.

Further, no formal system is in place to address the educational needs of the adult population. Roughly 33 percent of adults have not finished elementary school. Though most are elderly, 25 percent are in their fifties. Large proportions of uneducated adults are found in rural and undeveloped regions, among females, and among nonprofessional workers.

General pauperization creates new problems, including an increase in the school dropout rate, underachievement, depression, and poor social integration. (Economic analyses show that about 40 percent of urban families with children fall within the impoverished category.) This national crisis contributes to greater social pathology among children, specifically, alcohol and drug abuse, increased aggressiveness, and juvenile delinquency.[25]

The highly politicized question of educating ethnic Albanian children in Kosovo may have to be addressed in better times. Meanwhile, the very serious problem of educating ethnic Roma (Gypsy) children remains. These children frequently drop out in the first four grades, are underachievers, and suffer from social stigma and marginalization. Also, more than 45,000 refugee children schooled in Yugoslavia demonstrate severe social and educational adjustment problems, including low achievement and psychological distress.[26]

Instruction Methods

The Serbian school system employs extremely traditional instruction methods, with the predominant form being "teaching by transmission." In this mode of instruction, the answer to the Bakhtinian question, "Who is doing the talking?", is more than evident: It's the teacher. "Transmission" instruction allows for no dialogue. The pedagogical outcome is well-known: Students taught by "transmission" have an inadequate understanding of the mediated material, which is memorized as information to be reproduced in a manner virtually identical to the form in which it was received. Knowledge acquired in this way is forgotten as soon as the demand to reproduce it disappears.

Socialization effects of this kind of instruction have not been adequately discussed: Such instruction contributes to the homogenization of students' minds and deprives them of responsibility for their actions. Such socialization establishes a clear power difference between teachers' voices and students' voices: The teachers' utterances function as "directives" that students are expected to follow.[27] Of course, such directives are designed to get the student to think and act in the "right" way. Students are thus socialized to accept conformity as a virtue, follow directives unquestioningly, and accept authority obediently.

Another feature of this instruction relates to opportunities for mediation and negotiation in a dominance hierarchy. James Wertsch analyzes this in his study on social language, stressing that social privileging (dominance) ensures that certain mediational means appear not only appropriate, but as the only "natural" choice.[28] Although negotiation is possible when it concerns who is privileged for what, opportunities for negotiation are minimal in the context of Serbian school instruction. Possibilities for negotiation depend on having access to other "zones" where patterns of privileging might be different. But, in principle, such variety hardly exists in any of the adult-child relationships in contemporary Serbia.

Few studies have been done on adult-child social interactions in Serbia. One study of mother-child interactions in a learning setting found that mothers did not help their children plan, check, or review problem-solving but rather intensely observed the child's responses (in front of the instructor). Although the mothers were tempted to offer the "right" answer, they did not help the child correct his or her mistakes nor explain the errors.[29] On the basis of this study and what is known about the Serbian educational system, one concludes that children have but the most limited framework for conscious reflection and, hence, for self-generated change and development of autonomy.

Unfortunately, this pattern of relationship prevails not only between adults and children, and teachers and students, but throughout the whole society. "Directives" to homogenize endure and prevail in Serbia's social language. The present Serbian government uses

directives abundantly in communicating with its citizens. The April 1998 referendum provides one such example. The referendum gave Serbian citizens yet another chance to differentiate "patriots" from "traitors" by saying "no" to international mediation in Serbian-Albanian negotiations over the status of Kosovo. Instructions on the "right" answer were repeated profusely through propaganda.

After a "properly" instructed citizenry voted, political leaders interpreted the meaning of the inevitable "no." For example, the president of the Serbian government, Mirko Marjanovic, said the "no" meant that the Serbian people "will defend their own sovereignty and independence."[30] The international community "will understand that it is normal for each country to defend its own integrity, and that the problem of human rights among Kosovar Albanians is greatly confabulated." And, Marjanovic explained, the Kosovar Albanians should understand the vote as saying that "there is no need to press anybody to negotiate," because the Kosovar Albanians "must become aware that they are citizens of Serbia with equal rights like everybody else."

The president of the Serbian assembly, Dragan Tomic, interpreted the "no" as new proof of the "great unity and homogeneity of the political parties, the people, and the leadership."[31] He closed the whole circle of possible interpretations by proclaiming that the "no" provides "the answer to all the questions."[32]

Another relevant finding in James Wertsch's research was that formal modes of instruction resist information from "outside" settings. His data show that in the American classroom, noninstructional statements are explicitly separated from formal instructional discourse.[33] No doubt similar research in Serbia would show the same pattern. Two features of these "outside-the-formal-instruction" references make them dangerous to the dominant instruction model. First, they may conflict with formal instructional utterances. Second, because they concern experience and knowledge to which the speaker (a student) has privileged access, they threaten to subvert the teacher's dominance.

Of course, even though a school may socialize children away from using their own experiences in the classroom, children are likely to learn from them anyway. Further, socialization influences cannot be viewed in terms of direct causality. For example, different individuals living in the same social context adopt different survival strategies. However, the issue of options remains: Do any public social settings exist in which students are allowed the "privilege" of having their own voices, thus giving them an opportunity to acquire strategies and skills necessary for dialogue? Moreover, students are socialized to understand and respect a sharp delineation between the realm of school and the realm of home.[34] The clear separation of learning and living contexts, of formal instruction and personal experience, has well-known pedagogical consequences. Chief among these is students' inability to transfer formal knowledge to out-of-school settings. Less often discussed is the impact on students' socialization: If nothing else, this divisive approach orients students towards hypocrisy.

Teaching Values

Teaching values continues to be a highly politicized issue in Serbia. After 1991 the new regime mechanically grafted layers of new nationalistic ideology onto the mostly untouched Marxist ideology interwoven in many school subjects in its banal, declarative

forms.[35] A survey of school textbooks showed, for example, that a 1992 fifth-grade textbook, which was written after the fall of the Berlin Wall, preserved the former chronology of chief historical epochs. Thus, the modern age still began some 70 years ago after the Bolshevik revolution,and, in this modern age, "a major part of mankind still lives in a capitalist society, while another part, to which we belong, is building a socialist society." To dispel any doubts regarding the onset of the "latest age," the textbook's illustration of evolution from prehistoric times to the present features a picture of a worker carrying the Soviet flag, with "1917" written below.[36]

In 1993 the Ministry of Education issued directives that implied not only terminological changes.[37] For instance,instead of "SFRJ"(Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) students were to use "FRY"(Federal Republic of Yugoslavia); "Serbian language" replaced "Serbo-Croatian language"; "boy or girl" was substituted for "pioneer" (a member of a youth organization). More important, a form of literary "ethnic cleansing" was introduced in which almost all literary contributions by non-Serbian, former Yugoslav writers were eliminated. For reasons of "ideological cleansing," many essays and chapters on Tito also were excluded.

Textbooks

Current Serbian school textbooks promote five core socialization patterns:[38]

1. Achieving competence in work (by promoting personal characteristics like discipline,thoroughness,stamina,diligence,creativity, and readiness for further self-improvement).

2. Preserving community identity (through struggle against two kinds of enemies, namely, foreign occupiers and internal class or ideological enemies).

3. Stimulating social adaptability within the dominant group (by developing kindness, openness, and respect for others who belong to the in-group).

4. Ensuring the physical survival of the community (by promoting the idea that Serbian people will pay any price for the freedom and sovereignty of their territory).

5. Stimulating joy of life.[39]

School textbooks in any society will avoid certain topics, but it is instructive to note which topics former Yugoslav and present Serbian textbooks do not mention. For example, the highly cherished ideal of a "conflictless" society is never questioned. No criticism of the existing social system is found, no acknowledgment that empathy for "enemies" is possible, and no mention that constructive relationships with other peoples are possible. These omissions have a socializing function of their own:Students are socialized away from these topics because they are considered "external" to the privileged worldview.

Conflicting messages are also a characteristic of Serbian textbooks. Some very significant values promoted by the textbooks are praised together with their opposites.[40] Thus, while the texts praise personal autonomy and self-trust,they also teach that in order to succeed in any endeavor, one must rely on in-groups and subordinate personal interests to collective ones. While advocating cooperation and trust, the texts also promote competi-

tiveness and teach that others pose a threat. Although the texts address the horrors of war, they promote bellicose behavior as a virtue. While admiring and trusting of youth, the texts praise paternalism toward youth. These conflicting messages are indicative of the declarative nature of authoritarian societies.[41] However, they also contribute to confusion over what is real and what is imaginary. Thus a fragile hold on reality results,[42] a feature of social systems based on the belief that there is a single truth.

Textbooks also promote national sentiments that overemphasize the emotional, sacrosanct components of a patriotic attitude. The nation is defined as a community with a unique history of suffering and hardships, as well as a community of common territory— the spaces where the Serbian people live, where their forefathers lived, and throughout which are scattered the sacred shrines of national history. These "sacred shrines" are at times monasteries, sources of spiritual values, but most frequently are graves and crypts, "the cradles of the new forces."[43] The strong "we" has changed from "we, the socialist class" to "we, the members of the Serbian nation." Traditional enemies are xenophobically described as a constant threat.

Needless to say, former Yugoslav and current Serbian textbooks for elementary grades endorse and promote a patriarchal model of gender roles.[44]

In addition to the cultural meanings textbooks convey, numerous narratives dealing with social conflict also can be identified. In 1997 an analysis[45] was made of two types of narratives about conflicts, which were: (1) narratives that reconstructed "what happened," and (2) narratives that reconstructed "what might have happened."[46] Using this distinction, a somewhat more complex model of conflict management appeared in the school textbooks. The narratives of "what happened," found primarily in history textbooks, strayed freely from the known facts. Only narratives that actually belonged to the fiction genre offered a variety of ways to manage conflict.

The analysis showed that textbooks distinguished clearly between: (1) preferred strategies for dealing with conflicts between individuals, and (2) strategies for dealing with conflicts between social groups. In conflicts involving out-groups, no matter what social types were involved (ethnic, class, religious, and so on), the preferred strategy was argumentative,[47] backed up by violence and armed struggle. Although no examples explicitly stigmatizing an out-group were found, textbooks repeated the following elements until they appeared to be canonized "rules":

> *Relationships between different social groups are, as a rule, conflictual.* Textbooks seldom mention cooperative relationships based on mutual interest, except for short-term alliances to strengthen one's own position when fighting a third party or group. Integrative mechanisms of in-group relationships are built on wariness and caution, and upon enmity toward other groups.

> *Retreat from a conflict is not considered or expected.* One should never yield to another. Yielding is a sign of weakness and most often leads to defeat.

> *Conflicts are resolved by force, including various forms of violence and armed struggle.* Chances for victory are greater if one has allies to strengthen one's position. Alliances are made or broken according to need and circumstance.

Only narratives on conflicts between individuals presented more flexible strategies and tactics, and hence more numerous, elaborate examples of integrative conflict resolution. It seems possible to use "softer" tactics in individual conflicts, even if the conflict is with an out-group member. Notably, texts teach that one can yield or retreat from a conflict without ending up a loser only in the safe haven of a family (especially if the other party is a woman or child). The search for a mutual, integrative solution to conflict is found only in narratives in family settings. Again, only in the safe realm of a family group can the mediating attempts of a third party (usually someone from the in-group—a mother or wife) contribute to the successful resolution of a conflict.

Only two explicit references to a third-party mediating role were found in history textbooks: (1) The role of the Russian czar in mediating between Serbia and Bulgaria during the Balkan Wars (1912), and (2) the role of the courts of reconciliation in solving agrarian disputes in parts of the country under Austrian rule before the fall of the Hapsburg empire.

In both cases, mediation did not prove successful as a long-term solution. In the literary readers, however, three cases included a third-party intervention. One involved the successful intervention of a mother in a father-son conflict. In the second, an elderly gentleman, a senior officer, successfully intervened between a wife who wished to visit her wounded husband in a hospital and a warden who refused to let her. The third was from a popular folk story in which a legendary figure of Serbian culture, Saint Sava, appears as a third party to arbitrate a conflict and administer justice. Printed below in full, this story illustrates the difference between the role of a mediator (a person who attempts to help the differing parties reach a voluntary agreement) and the role of an arbitrator (a person empowered to make binding recommendations for dispute settlement). In this story, Saint Sava takes on the role of arbitrator after he fails as a mediator in the first part of the story.

Saint Sava and the Two Rivals

One peasant takes a plot of land from another; the other peasant goes to Saint Sava to register a complaint. When Saint Sava has heard the complaint, he calls up the offender and politely tells him to return the land to his neighbor, to make peace, and to resume living as good neighbors should. When the offender doesn't agree, Saint Sava takes him to a fertile part of the land and says, "Since you wish to own so much good land, here it is; go, and whatever you cover on foot in this fertile part today, shall be yours. Just take care and be wary, for at sunset you must return to this very spot where we are now standing, otherwise your life is worth nothing."

The robber sets about his task. He starts running around the nice estate with all his might. This meadow is nice, and that one is fine, and these woods are good, and the orchard is beautiful, then that vineyard is excellent, and this field fruitful, and that pasture plentiful, and this and that . . . . So, the poor devil runs, hungry and thirsty, without rest, all the summer's day long. The sun starts to descend slowly beyond the hills, but the miserable one still runs around the slopes and thick pine woods. When he finally approaches the starting point, the sun has already set. Completely exhausted, he falls and dies, without reaching the mark he started from.[48]

Teachers

A recent study of 256 teachers from Belgrade, Subotica (in Vojvodina, an ethnically mixed northern region), Krusevac (in central Serbia, an ethnically homogenous region),and Niksic (in Montenegro, an ethnically homogenous southern region with strong attachments to tradition and long-standing patriarchal relationships) compared their implicit assumptions about social conflicts.[49] The study found that teachers overwhelmingly believe that: (1) conflicts are caused by conflict-prone persons with traits such as stubbornness,intolerance, and related negative attributes; (2) these traits are acquired in early childhood; and (3) teachers and schools are incapable of helping these troublemakers change significantly.

Teachers see conflicts primarily as a win-lose competition where both participants cannot come out as winners. Teachers do not believe it is possible to mediate conflicts nor do they believe that there might be more than one side to the truth. They view interests only in a negative light. In managing conflict, teachers seek either to establish who is the guilty party or to avoid or withdraw from a conflict. Many of them believe that retribution is justified and are not predisposed to accept apologies or engage in acts of forgiveness. In general, the teachers' implicit beliefs about conflict are conditioned by two dimensions: (1) rigid normativism, reflecting a traditional,patriarchal, and aggressive matrix found in teachers with longer work experience; and (2) abstract normativism, reflecting socially favorable and conciliatory attitudes characteristic of younger teachers.

Teachers from various parts of Yugoslavia show a high level of similarity, reflecting the same generational differences throughout the country. Whether this is a consequence of uniform education for teachers or a uniform cultural pattern remains to be determined, most likely by a comparison with non-teachers.

All of the teachers' convictions and behavior are characterized by: (1) a failure to sufficiently elaborate on the nature of conflict, and (2) an inability to manage conflict, due to a traditional (aggressive-argumentative) understanding of conflict situations and the use of withdrawal and conflict avoidance as reserve mechanisms. The study also detected several alarming tendencies,including:

1. A failure to understand and respect interests as motivators,

2. A lack of initiative,

3. An inability to make a reasoned assessment of the other side in a conflict,

4. An inability to take another's perspective, and

5. A failure to understand the language of needs and patterns of nonviolent communication.

Since these results are, roughly, in accordance with the stereotype of belligerence and authoritarianism, and thus bear a political connotation, it would be useful to make a future comparative analysis of teachers in different cultures and societies.

Not surprisingly, as the descriptions above indicate, the Serbian school system's social reality is essentially similar to that found in the larger society. Factors found in society at large, such as traditions,ideologies, and politics,are also found in smaller settings, such as

schools, where they influence learning conditions. It is thus assumed that violent cultures produce violent members.

Given that peace education's goals and programs stand in fundamental opposition to Serbian society values, including those of its schools, is it possible to initiate activities at the local level that may change conditions in society as a whole? Relations between the macro and micro level are complex, dynamic, and *inter*active in nature. At least in principle, an interdependence between the two levels of society exists. On this basis, peace educators push forward.

Part II: A Look at Peace Education Programs in Serbia

Four

An Overview of Peace Education Programs

The analyses above show that the school setting in Serbia constitutes a web of potential violence: The method of formal instruction paves the way for violence, as do the prevailing values and worldview. More comprehensive changes than peace education programs can initiate are needed to change such a depressing landscape. Peace education is just a start. Described below are seven peace education programs implemented in Serbia between 1992 and 1998, with short summaries of their main features. A later section discusses the programs' similarities and their strengths and weaknesses.

Many of the programs are based on insights from empirical studies performed in 1991–92.[50] Serbian preschool and elementary school children (including refugees) were observed and interviewed to assess the impact of the war atmosphere in the country. These studies provided the basis for developing the intervention programs. Briefly, the studies found that aggressiveness and intolerance had increased significantly at all age levels. Children's fears, especially fears concerning war, increased as well. All of the children—not just the refugees—were obsessed with war. It became a dominant theme in their play, drawing, and speech. Whereas drawings and games are typically the most imaginative forms of a child's expression, these play activities were almost completely lost; instead, play rigidly imitated reality. The children saw that adults close to them—parents and teachers—had become preoccupied with their own feelings and problems. They had ceased to provide support, leaving the children not knowing how to cope with their new experiences. Although the findings were alarming, they provided helpful information for developing the following programs.

Program Profiles

Hi Neighbor (1997–98)

Sponsored by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and Radda Barnen (Save the Children). Run by a nongovernmental organization (NGO) with the same name. Implemented first in collective refugee camps in Serbia and Republika Srpska, as well as in elementary schools in Republika Srpska. Teamwork headed by Vesna Ognjenovic, professor at the Preschool Teachers College, Belgrade.

Initially, the program sought to solve refugees' problems in toto: solve their existential problems by helping them regain their sense of life in a socially distorted context. During

23

the first years of implementation, the program consisted of complex psychological work-shops that activated various forms of symbolic expression (through movement, words, and painting) concerning threatening war experiences. The workshops focused on recovering normal social interactions. Their constitutive elements worked to: (1) increase awareness of the means of expression (movement, word,image), and (2) strengthen a sense of autonomy in using these means vis-à-vis an actual or imagined social context.

Workshop participants included children and their parents. The core topic was the support and reconstruction of the self-concept. Because the program sought to avoid labeling refugees as "traumatized" or "persons with specific problems," it aimed to build upon participants' strengths. No attempt was made to suggest specific actions they might take. Rather, the goal was to provide a special framework for social interaction, and model the "tools" with which participants themselves could discover and build their own and each others' personal resources.

The initial program grew and diversified as it was being implemented. All the subprograms carry a common title: "Child and Culture." The program emphasized the social and cultural integration of both adults and children in local settings. Altogether more than 4,000 children and adults participated.[51] There are no data evaluating this program.

Smile Keepers (1993–95)

Sponsored by UNICEF. Run by the Institute of Psychology, University of Belgrade. Teamwork headed by Nada Ignjatovic-Savic,lecturer at the department of psychology, University of Belgrade.

This program aimed to:

1. Reduce the negative psychological impacts of war and of other drastic changes in the environment,

2. Protect and promote students' personality development,

3. Prevent the development of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and related disturbances in children and adolescents exposed to traumatic events,

4. Help suffering children and adolescents overcome their psychological problems,

5. Facilitate refugees' adjustment to the new environment, and

6. Support and increase the personal and professional competence of preschool and school psychologists, pedagogues, and teachers.

The program strove to help all children in Serbia, because all had been affected by the war.

The Smile Keepers program focused on identity and continuity of the self,memories, worries, emotions, communication and cooperation, conflicts,anger, fears,sadness, dreams,love, child rights, and future aims.

Psychologists, pedagogues, and teachers were trained to facilitate the workshops with children. Training seminars were organized in forty-four localities in Serbia and Montenegro for 6,000 trainees. Direct beneficiaries were preschool children ages 5 to 7, primary school students ages 8 to 15, and high school students ages 16 to 17, for a total of 81,000 students.[52] An evaluation of the program was conducted.

Cognition through Games (1992–94)

Sponsored by UNHCR. Run by the Center for Anti-War Action, an NGO in Belgrade. Teamwork headed by Tunde Kovac-Cerovic, professor of educational psychology, University of Belgrade.

The program was developed initially to help refugee children gain social skills and competence in learning. Workshops were designed to help participants: (1) articulate and process a series of important cognitive experiences (hesitation, doubt, confusion, and so on); (2) take part in a cooperative learning process; and (3) adjust to their new situations as refugees in collective camps or in schools. Two forms of the program were developed: one for ages 7 to 10 and one for ages 11 to 14. The workshops were designed for after-class settings.

The Cognition through Games program was initially run in collective refugee camps, but trained school psychologists have since implemented it in many schools in Serbia (and even in some other former Yugoslav republics).[53] There are no quantitative data evaluating this program.

The Goodwill Classroom: Elementary School Programs in Constructive Conflict Resolution (1993–97)

UNICEF sponsored the program through development, testing, publication of a manual by various international NGOs, and training. Run by the Center for Anti-War Action, Group MOST, Belgrade. Teamwork headed by Ruzica Rosandic and Tunde Kovac-Cerovic, professors of educational psychology, University of Belgrade.

The program was developed in three formats: two for elementary school students, ages 7 to 10 and 11 to 14, and one for high school students. The program included workshops on cognitive and behavioral skills in constructive communication, analysis of interests and needs, self-control and self-affirmation, tolerance of individual differences, maintenance of trust between partners, resistance to group pressure, personal accountability, control of strong emotions, analysis of conflicts, and techniques of nonviolent conflict resolution.

After the initial training for teachers, school psychologists, and pedagogues, efforts were made to establish a network of trained school staff. These individuals in turn trained others. Twenty-five additional staff members were trained and led through all the phases of the sponsoring process.

After more than forty seminars and more than 1,000 training hours, 1,150 teachers, psychologists, and pedagogues were trained to facilitate workshops with students. An evaluation was made of the training and of the program's effects on students.[54]

Primer on the Rights of the Child (1994–97)

Sponsored by UNICEF and Radda Barnen. Run by Friends of Children, a Serbian NGO. The main aim of the program was to promote the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Teamwork headed by Mirjana Pesic and Ivan Ivic, professors of psychology, University of Belgrade.

This program was based on a publication, *Primer on the Rights of the Child,* printed as a picture book with poetry rhymes and children's comments concerning articles of the

Convention. In numerous seminars, the program acquainted participants (mainly teachers, but also elementary school students and various professionals working with children) with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Participants received training in how to organize mechanisms to monitor and protect children's rights in local communities. Teachers also learned how to teach students to monitor and protect their own rights (through solidarity actions for children whose rights are in some way jeopardized, establishing child lobbies, and related actions by children for children). A special focus was on genuine children's participation in this action.

After more than eighty seminars with 2,770 participants, the program reached about 400 localities in Serbia. An additional sixty instructors were trained. An evaluation was made of the training and implementation.[55]

Mutual Education: Giraffe Language (1995–97)

Sponsored by UNICEF. Run by the Institute of Psychology, University of Belgrade. Teamwork headed by Nada Ignjatovic-Savic, lecturer at the department of psychology, University of Belgrade.

This project had two complementary goals, which were to: (1) teach adults working with children to use nonviolent, compassionate communication, and (2) train children and young people to adopt basic skills in nonviolent communication. Nonviolent communication skills were presented as an efficient tool in: (1) preventing misunderstandings, conflicts, and violence in interpersonal relations; (2) intervening and resolving problems and crises; and (3) affirming and developing a nonviolent model of interpersonal relationships that implies autonomy (freedom of choice and personal responsibility), mutuality, and interdependence. Workshops for teachers, pedagogues, psychologists, and children ages 5 to 10 included topics such as communication skills, self-respect and self-approval, personal responsibility, mutuality, compassion, empathy, respect for differences, equality, and cooperation. The strategy was, first, to teach adults working with children to use nonviolent, compassionate communication skills, and second, to develop a mutual education model, which was then used to teach new students basic communication skills and active participation in the learning process.

Altogether 552 adults from fifteen localities in Serbia were trained, and 9,400 students received training. Ninety new instructors also were trained. The training was evaluated.[56]

Enhancing Preschool Children's Self-Esteem through Cooperative Communication (1993–97)

Supported by UNICEF. Run by the Preschool Teachers College, Novi Sad, and the NGO Friends of Children of Vojvodina, Novi Sad. Authors: Ibolya Gera and Ljubica Dotlic, professors at the Preschool Teachers College, Novi Sad.

This project, an integral part of UNICEF's psychosocial program, focused on preschool children and their parents. It trained both children and the adults working with them in cooperative communication skills, self-identity and self-esteem, emotional experiences and expression, and tolerance. The topic of children's rights also was part of the program. The project started after a large influx of refugees into Vojvodina. Trainees were kindergarten teachers and specialists. During 1997 the program began to target children with

special needs: children in hospitals and children's wards on territory belonging to Serbia and Montenegro.

A total of 550 teachers were trained, and more than 19,500 preschool children and their parents participated. The training and program were evaluated.[57]

Method as a Grapple

Peace education programs in Serbia are using two grapples to cope with the social situation, which suffers from the extensive impact of violence: educational method and program content.

Much in the methodological approach is inspired by Jean Piaget's idea that the task of an educator is to mold a spiritual tool in the hand of a child—not a new habit, or even a new belief, but rather a new method, a tool that will permit the child to understand and find his or her own way. Another major inspiration comes from theories of social interaction and the importance of cultural tools developed by L. S. Vigotski and his followers. According to this conceptual framework, the most potent aspect of the peace education programs in Serbia would lie in the method of instruction itself. Rich experience in training convinces us that these programs offer "handy" peace tools for trained teachers and the students with whom they work, tools through which self-initiated changes can be made. With a more favorable mise-en-scène, these tools would demonstrate increased usefulness and success over time.

The method of instruction that these programs employ addresses the core problems of socialization in the Serbian school setting. They do so by means of the following features:

1. They mediate various patterns of interactive instruction, such as cooperative learning, learning by discovery, and learning by problem-solving.

2. They transform the teacher's role from a dominating one—the teacher as "the sole source of knowledge"—to a facilitating one.

3. They transform the student's role from a passive to an active one.

4. They introduce experiential learning, which opens doors to "outside" information, believing that students' personal experiences and insights provide a legitimate basis for knowledge acquisition. In that sense, many programs work intensively to recover and refine the way students express their personal experiences.

Between prescriptive and elicitive approaches—as Lederach labels the two opposing types of training[58]—the basic characteristic of the methodology employed in peace education programs in Serbia is semi-structuredness. Lederach labels as prescriptive training that which "delivers the product." For example, the trainer acts as an expert who imparts know-how and techniques to implement the strategic approach. Experts know what the participants need. As Lederach points out, the cultural and ideological underpinnings of this model are rarely made explicit. The trainer defines the needs, names the model, provides the content, oversees the process, and provides direction and correction. Participants acquire the mediated knowledge.

The elicitive approach, according to Lederach, "starts from the vantage point that training is an opportunity aimed primarily at discovery, creation, and solidification of models

that emerge from the resources present in a particular setting and respond to needs in that context."[59]

Workshops used in most of the listed programs—no matter how spontaneous and "natural" they may seem—are semi-structured. They are based on carefully designed, previously drafted scripts. The scripts are precisely defined in advance in order to structure participants' activities (frequently games). However, the specific knowledge, the insight that participants are expected to acquire during the workshop, is not transmitted as a "ready-made product." Rather, it is elicited from participants who co-construct it through their active contribution to the process.

Participants work in groups and subgroups. They change partners in social interactions, which gives them the opportunity to acknowledge and share various perspectives on the same issue—a matter of utmost importance in overcoming the prevailing pattern of one authority, one truth.

Scenarios That Elicit Personal Experiences

Arising from these principles, the micro dynamic of an educational workshop implies progression through several stages. First, scenarios featuring certain topics are selected to elicit relevant personal experiences (relevant to the participants as well as to the topic to be elaborated).

To accomplish this aim, the workshop has to fit the developmental characteristics of the students. Psychological studies of child development show that sometimes an age difference of a mere six months considerably alters the way a child reasons, as well as his or her social behavior and maturity. The content (topic) of the workshop, play context, difficulty of the tasks, dynamics and organization of activities, as well as type of material used, must be carefully adjusted to differences in age. Also the volume of selected topics should be adjusted to different age groups, with certain ones divided into smaller units for younger children. These same topics are elaborated on in a more comprehensive way for older children. (As mentioned earlier, the Goodwill Classroom program has three formats: one for younger and one for older elementary school students, and one for high school students.)

To attract younger children to participate in the activities, the play context must be richer, clearer, and more elaborate. Symbolic play is a spontaneous form of children's activity, and resorting to symbolic activities is the easiest way to motivate them. This is why we introduce children to certain activities by first involving them in the symbolic world of imagination. For example, we tell them, "Imagine you are detectives in a police station and your job is to solve this case," or, "Imagine the object in front of you is a magic wishing well."

The play context is not as crucial for older children, who find it more natural to start a new activity by recalling some of their everyday experiences that might be relevant, without a dramatized introduction. The older students' greater cognitive maturity enables them to fulfill the memory request by applying more complex intellectual operations and greater reflexivity and awareness.

The difficulty of the assignments obviously must coincide with the students' cognitive capacities. It is important to always bear in mind that tasks should be neither too easy nor

too difficult. If they are too easy, students might become bored; tasks that are too difficult will confront students with failure and all the consequent negative emotions.

Workshop dynamics depend on the quality of participants' attention. This differs with age. Workshops for younger students must contain the greatest possible variety of activities. Also, workshops must include a number of motor activities. In this way, students' natural desire to move is channeled through activities that are thematically relevant but include movement, drawing, and changing seats or positions in the room. Workshops for older students may comprise only a single activity calling for longer mental and physical involvement of one kind (for example, resolving problems in small groups).

Scenarios introduced must be construed so as to evoke participants' authentic experiences, and interaction and elaboration needs to occur so as to make sense to each participant.

For example, the Goodwill Classroom program workshops, which focus primarily on the experience of being in a conflict, are designed to elicit related relevant experiences from participants. These could include feelings of discomfort when not listened to, experiencing the other party as an enemy, difficulty in beginning communication, coping with spite and the wish to have things one's own way, avoiding and postponing apologizing, and so forth.

The next step involves asking participants to find a successful way of overcoming a conflict. They usually do so by realizing, for example, that the other side wants to fulfill his or her very important need, feeling that the conflict is not irresolvable, noticing a change in the other party's behavior after an "I" message is uttered, or experiencing similar insights.[60]

"Sculpturing" Feelings and Learning to Resolve Conflict

The following—an example of *I am Sorry and Thank You,* a Goodwill Classroom workshop activity for younger students—is taken from the Goodwill Classroom training manual.

> **"Sculpturing" Feelings.** In this game students are divided into pairs, and one is asked to "sculpture" a feeling that has been randomly attributed to the other. When the technique of sculpturing is used for the first time, it is essential that the instructor first demonstrate how it is done. For example, the instructor might sculpture how he or she imagines the feeling of fear might look in one child. The child should stand completely relaxed while the instructor sculptures the expression of fear. At the same time, the instructor should provide basic instructions on how to make a figure out of clay. For example: "Now I am going to make her open her eyes wide. I am going to put her hands in this position. I am going to bend her body forward a little." It is expected that the clay will respond to the sculptor's intentions.
>
> The children stand in two concentric circles, an inside one and an outside one, so that they may form pairs. The instructor tells them, "Those in the inside circle turn toward your partner in the outside circle." All those in the outside circle are sculptors, and their task is to sculpt a sad figure of their partner in the inside circle. The sculptors should sculpt a figure in a way they think someone looks when sad. There are no "right" or "wrong" ways to do this. There are no beautiful or ugly figures. It is just important that

the sculptor is satisfied with the way the "clay" is turned into a sculpture. Once the sculptors are finished, they should move slowly around the inside circle looking at the rest of the figures until they get to their partner again.

When this part is over, the children change roles. "Now the children in the inside circle are the sculptors. Your task is to make a happy figure. When you finish your sculpture, move around in a circle to see the other sculptures, and then return to your partner."

"Now we will begin to sculpture in the following way. You will stay in the same pairs, but we won't stand in a circle any more. Instead, the pairs will take turns standing in front of the rest of us. We will be the audience. We will watch carefully what is happening. I will give the sculptor a slip of paper with a description of a certain situation in which his or her partner may have been at some time in the past. Here is, for example, one such situation. It says, 'You have accidentally torn your partner's new jacket.' But the sculptor will not tell his or her partner or us what is written on the slip of paper. Instead he or she will sculpture a figure of his or her partner that shows how he or she thinks the partner would feel in such a situation."

Situations on the slips of paper include the following: "You have accidentally spilled dirty water on your partner's drawing during the art class"; "You have loaned your bicycle to your partner for half an hour"; "You have shared a chocolate with your partner"; "You have forgotten about the arrangement to meet your partner in the playground after school, and he waited for a long time"; "You have accidentally told your partner the wrong time of the parents' meeting, and her mother didn't arrive until just before the end"; "You have invited your partner to your birthday party," and so forth.

Once the sculpture is done, the sculptor tells everyone the situation that was described in his or her note. Now that his or her partner knows what the situation was, he or she can, if willing, make changes to the sculpture to illustrate further how he or she might look in such a situation by, for example, changing the position the sculptor has put him or her in or some other changes.

After that, the instructor asks the sculpted child how he or she feels as a result of the situation described and then depicted in the sculpture. The instructor may have to persist in asking questions until the child names and describes the feeling (for example, sad, angry, happy, or grateful) because in this part of the game the children practice expressing, recognizing, and naming feelings.

If a sculpture represents unpleasant feelings as a result of the situation described, the instructor asks the sculptor, "What would you do now that you have heard how your friend is feeling?" After the sculptor replies, the instructor asks the sculpted child how he or she feels. For example, how does the child feel if the sculptor has offered an apology?

When the sculpture represents pleasant feelings, the procedure is repeated. After the performance of each pair, the other children (who are holding cards with smiling or frowning expressions) are asked to evaluate how each of the "actors" feels at the end of that interaction by raising a happy or unhappy face.

An elicited experience remains inarticulate and, therefore, incommunicable until it is given shape using a symbolic implement: a word, a drawing, or an action. Thus, shaping an experience is the key point of the workshop. The skill of the workshop's facilitator and author is reflected in the design and presentation of the request to shape the experience and in the appropriateness of the form of expression chosen (in the above example, through clay sculpture). By bringing "outside" experience into the instruction setting, students are no longer pressed to produce a desired response (the "right" one). On the contrary, an important goal of these programs is to support the students in integrating into their repertoire of everyday behavior an active role in acquiring knowledge. Shaping spontaneous, authentic experiences, achieved through the workshop's play structure, is the chief means toward that end.

Each participant shapes his or her own experience through the same symbolic means. This enables the process of sharing, of exchange among participants. Sharing is one of the most fruitful ways of becoming aware and enriching one's own accumulated experience. Sharing has two functions. By expressing and explaining our experience to others, we become more aware of it and the way it affects our behavior. Too, other participants' accumulated experiences, particularly regarding ways of dealing with different—and especially unpleasant—situations and the experiences they cause, supplement our own and help us gain a range of insights.

The process of sharing helps participants to elaborate on their experience and, further, to generate new knowledge from multiple transformations that occur when the experience goes from being articulated as an individual insight to becoming generalized knowledge. These transformations occur when experience passes from the idiosyncratic to the communicable and social, from the isolated to the integrated, and from the covert to the fully conscious. The degree of elaboration depends on the goal, topic, purpose, and age of the participants.

The workshop as a method of group work has specific rules. It is important that the participants are sitting in a circle. This rule clearly implies that all are equal. No one is in a better or worse position, in the front or in the back; the facilitator and participants are addressing everyone; everyone sees everyone else. In a workshop everyone has a chance to speak and be heard—everyone has a voice. Each opinion, no matter how different or isolated, has a right to be heard (not only that, such an opinion is precious, because it enriches our own opinion). A workshop has no hierarchy resembling the school one. There are no observers in the workshop. Everyone is a participant, but each participant has the right to hold back his or her experience (namely, to not share with the group something he or she does not want to talk about). All these are important innovations in the classroom setting.

The workshop brings about desired changes by creating conditions for effective interactive learning. To this end participants must learn to communicate with each other in new ways. These factors together create an environment in which change can take place.

Focus of the Peace Education Programs

All the programs presented here seek to educate *for* positive peace rather than to educate *about* peace, if we follow Betty Reardon's definition of these two aspects of peace educa-

tion. Reardon defines the notion of positive peace as tending to cluster around three sets of values: communal and civic values, life-affirming values, and the value of the human person and positive human relationships.[61] She offers a conceptual shorthand for these three sets of values: citizenship, stewardship, and relationships.

A survey of the peace education programs described herein confirms their orientation: All seek to redress the shortcomings of elementary school education in Serbia, which socializes students away from all three sets of values. Either through the method of instruction or through the values taught, the Serbian system socializes students (as do the main agents of school socialization—teachers and textbooks) away from cooperation and civic values, and away from an appreciation of individual and cultural differences and of human dignity as the essential basis for human relations, both interpersonal and social. The Serbian system socializes students to obey and to conform, to react rather than be active or proactive in life. It constrains students to a narrow worldview based on a rigid ideology, which supposedly provides the only answer to dealing with the purported "threatening" surroundings. It does not socialize in favor of nonviolent conflict management.

Thus, all peace education programs in Serbia share two fundamental aspects. First, they work to develop the individual and, above all, seek to understand individual needs and to encourage self-expression, self-esteem, self-confidence, and personal accountability. Second, they work to develop constructive understanding and assertive relationships with others, in the sense of appreciating individual and group differences as well as social responsibility.

These two fundamental aspects get elaborated on according to which of the following special problems a program addresses: recognition of one's own needs; acceptance of another person's needs; development of nonviolent communication strategies; stimulation of self-affirmation, self-expression, tolerance, and openness; or presentation and modeling of ways to resolve conflict constructively.[62]

In addition, one program—the Primer on the Rights of the Child—focused on an explicit set of ideas about human (children's) rights. The programs encompassed a wide area of cognitive and behavioral skills. De-centering, or learning to "stand in someone else's shoes," involves learning the language of needs as a positive, affirmative language concerning what we want and what we need—not what we are expected to do, forced to do, or tricked into doing. Establishing a partnership relationship involves learning to accept others, especially because depersonalization is one of the most important (and dangerous) features of school socialization in Serbia.

Many programs focused on learning nonviolent communication strategies, active listening, and listening to emotions. The list includes many other skills that are well-known in nonviolent conflict resolution programs, such as paraphrasing, I-speech and reframing, outlining the field of communication (reasons for misunderstandings and conditions for understanding), physical obstructions to communication, and so forth.

Some programs dealt with important topics such as personal accountability or resisting group pressure. Support of tolerance and openness was another basic component of all programs. The Goodwill Classroom, especially, models procedures for constructive conflict resolution and offered extensive training in cooperative communication strategies.

Five

Evaluations

Such complex, long-term programs as these call for appropriate models and methods of evaluation. Basically, two general forms of evaluation are necessary: (1) to establish to what degree the programs were implemented, and how the results compared with the original goals; and (2) to evaluate the actual impact of the programs.

Since these were rather different programs, different criteria were used in assessing the effectiveness of the training. Some programs used objective criteria, including psychological test scores, observed behavioral patterns, and interviews. Another set of indicators included statements about the impact of the programs from trainees, students, and the teachers of students who had participated in the program.

Also, different aspects of the training programs were evaluated, such as:

1. Handbooks,

2. Training and evaluative seminars organized after the programs had been implemented for a determined period,

3. Implementation supervision,

4. Monitoring,

5. Application of acquired skills, and

6. Children's reactions to the programs.

An evaluation by UNICEF found the following outcomes: Local experts (the authors of the programs) were able to develop creative concepts for all of the projects quickly, implement them in the form of practical handbooks, and develop the concept of seminars for training teachers, expert associates, and volunteers.[63]

The teachers readily accepted the projects and their methods of implementation. A serious question in the initial stages of implementation was whether teachers and expert associates would agree to engage in this process, considering the depressing circumstances in which they live, circumstances that have led to a general apathy and a decrease in professional motivation. The results were encouraging: 90 to 95 percent of the participants—or 10 percent of elementary school staff—embraced both the contents of the UNICEF-supported projects and the methodology. On a five-point scale, acceptance of the projects ranged from 4.5 to 4.9.

Analyzing the reasons for such a high degree of acceptance shows that these projects responded to certain of the school staff's (particularly the teachers') important human and professional needs. Namely, the contents and instruction methods restore dignity to the teaching profession, reaffirm teaching competencies, restore meaning to teaching (which

is otherwise almost totally lost), help teachers improve communication with other adults, and contribute to individual and professional insight and self-awareness for both students and teachers. To reiterate, the programs' contents and their active and participatory methods accounted for the widespread, positive response.

The Goodwill Classroom program continuously applied this form of evaluation. Four months after the initial training, trained teachers met for a day to discuss their experiences and problems in implementation, giving and receiving feedback and support from other teachers and the original trainers, and informing the group about future plans. Through May 1997 there were twenty-five such meetings. Teachers' reports presented during these meetings were helpful in evaluating the qualities of the program, its effects on children's behavior, and its reception by other teachers, parents, and school authorities.

On the basis of these reports, analysts concluded that teachers were using their new knowledge and skills not only to facilitate workshops with students but also to work with parents. For example, teachers applied the workshop format to organize parents' day meetings and to solve problems in the class with parents and students cooperatively. The positive effects on children were recognizable on several levels, and even those who had not participated in the Goodwill Classroom had commented on them. Teachers were satisfied with the manual. The main barriers to implementation were technical, namely, a lack of space, time, stationary, and staff. Teachers suggested that school supervisors and principals be included in the training.

Almost 12 percent of the teachers underwent two- or three-day training for at least one of the peace education programs. Nearly all school expert associates—more than 2,000 psychologists and pedagogues employed at schools—participated in the training. Groups of these trainees have received additional training to become trainers themselves so that they may conduct further training in their communities.

It remains to be seen what percentage of the remaining elementary school teachers will be receptive to peace education programs. It is encouraging that these projects have attracted teachers with good reputations among their peers. Improvements due to peace education programs were noticeable in schools where ten to fifteen teachers had undergone some training.

Children who participated in the programs also expressed strongly positive attitudes toward them. (It should be noted that children's attitudes were not evaluated in all programs.) The reasons for the teachers' and children's positive attitudes are more or less the same—for both groups, the interactive and participatory work methods proved inviting. Children's positive reactions to the project affect the teachers because they experience the children's reactions as a reward for their involvement.

Handbooks and other instructive materials were the first objective results of these programs. More than 50,000 copies of related material were published (nearly one per elementary school teacher).[64]

The evaluations followed the same logic as the programs themselves. Thus, if the programs aimed to change the attitudes and behavior of each participant, the evaluation, using a psychometric approach, focused on measurable and stable personality changes. The majority of the programs aimed to change not only participants' individual traits but also the climate of the classroom and perceptions of the social environment. Cooperative and

experiential learning—being the means of acquiring certain cognitive and behavioral skills—assumes that changes in individuals are closely linked to changes in social settings and in relationships among students and between students and teachers. From this perspective, the effects of the program should depend on the degree to which these social realities coincide with newly acquired skills and perspectives. Therefore, social realities and new skills and perspectives can mutually support or weaken each other to the extent that the desired changes actually take place in the immediate and broader environment. The project should show sensitivity to the general context in which the workshops are conducted. This is why traditional effect-evaluations in several programs have been expanded to include an evaluation of the program's potential to induce changes within the settings.

The evaluation of the project on The Rights of the Child illustrates this approach. This evaluation revealed many significant findings. More than 500 local groups advocating children's rights had been formed. Forty-three percent of the informed parents had a positive attitude towards the UN Convention and were willing to participate in some action. Twenty-four percent of parents were somewhat interested but reluctant to acknowledge the child's rights (commenting, for example, "What about our rights?"). Thirty-three percent of parents were reserved, not interested, or opposed to the very idea of children's rights.

Other trends observed in primary schools and local communities belong in the same category of indices. For example, providing information about children's rights was gradually becoming an ongoing, permanent activity. School staff better understood the specific problems and needs of children. Interested individuals and institutions outside the school started to provide support and to cooperate. School actions were growing in quality and range, spreading from the school to other schools or to local communities.

The Goodwill Classroom project applied a traditional evaluation of impact, with testing before and after implementation, using experimental and control groups. However, the measures of change involved a combination of psychometric and ecological indicators, focusing on changes in the microenvironment (the class) as much as on changes in the students' individual attitudes. Three kinds of eco-indicators were used: (1) student responses to the questionnaire concerning the quality of relationships in the classroom, both among students and between students and teachers; (2) teachers' responses to the questionnaire (also on the social climate in the classroom); and (3) sociometry indicators, such as the ratio of positive responses (acceptance) to negative responses (rejection) to peers for suggested common activities.

This evaluation was organized in seven schools in which eighteen classes were selected (nine participated in the Goodwill Classroom program, and nine did not). The experimental (trained) classes and the control (untrained) classes were similar according to all basic characteristics other than participation in the program: class size, average grades, and discipline.

More than 90 percent of the students in the experimental group regularly participated in the Goodwill Classroom program (once a week for 90 minutes). Almost the same proportion wanted to continue with these activities (with somewhat greater support among girls). Out of the list of feelings associated with participation in the Goodwill Classroom, the most frequently selected were "nice" (94 percent), "delighted" (72 percent), "grateful"

(58 percent), and "encouraged" (38 percent). The least frequently selected feelings were "bored," "frightened," "mad," "anxious," or "sad." Both boys and girls liked the program for similar reasons: the way the workshops were convened and the resulting relationships (new friendships, as they pointed out). The younger students liked the play aspect of the activities.

The results showed no significant increase in the number of positive sociometric choices after the workshop. However, participation in the Goodwill Classroom workshops brought a significant decrease in negative choices, such as refusal to cooperate with peers in common activities, which indicates that the effects of the Goodwill Classroom were evident through the decrease in negative tensions among the students.

Because of a high dropout rate among older elementary school students participating in the Goodwill Classroom, it was difficult to get meaningful data. Of 104 older students at the beginning of the experimental classes, only 68 percent remained at the end of the semester. The high dropout rate did not allow comparisons of the sociometric indicators.

The teachers received a list of possible problems to check off as the most perplexing they might encounter in working with a class. The teachers' answers revealed that, for example, communication problems between teachers and students significantly decreased after implementation of the Goodwill Classroom program in the experimental classes.

Further evaluation is required to determine how long changes will last. From the data one can determine the attitude of trainees (and of those whom they trained afterwards) toward this new knowledge (although there are no indices concerning how well they learned it), and how potent the new knowledge is (how far it "radiates"). Still, none of the programs offered the opportunity for a long-term evaluation.

It has been shown that local experts managed to quickly develop original, basic concepts for the programs, to adjust them to local circumstances, and to address the relevant shortcomings of the school system. The primary, available educational resources—the strongly motivated teachers and almost all of the school specialists—made this positive assessment.

However, the rigid Serbian school system resists innovations in general, and peace education in particular. Current events in Serbian society (the policies of the Serbian and Yugoslav governments toward the Albanian population in Kosovo, for example) will only reinforce these tendencies. Also, the foreign funds that supported these programs are fading, and internal resources are almost nonexistent. These are serious obstacles to further implementation of peace education and to the retention of what has already been accomplished.

In a study of factors that promote retention of peace education training, Ian Harris and his collaborators conclude that, by taking a peace education class, professional educators can become more aware of problems of violence, but this does not guarantee that they will use what they learned.[65] In the United States, for example, personal factors—such as family support and feelings of urgency—and professional factors—such as administrative support and a positive school climate—influence whether or not teachers use new knowledge. More important, it is not the abstract formal content of a peace education class that motivates teachers to apply its methods, but rather their personal experiences related to violence and peace that influence this. If it is true that personal factors (support of col-

leagues,friends, and family) are more influential than school-related factors (whether a supportive administration encourages an educator to begin a peace education program, for example), and if this finding can be generalized to other contexts,then we can expect that trained peace educators in Serbia will continue to implement what they have learned.

Prospects for Continued
Peace Education in Serbia

I n 1478 in Cetinje Monastery, Montenegro, the first print shop in Southeastern Europe was established and went on to play an enormous role in the diffusion of books and literacy, as well as in spreading culture well beyond the local area. The first book printed on the Obod press by monk Makarije was the Orthodox service book, *Octoechos*, which is the first printed Cyrillic book of the South Slavs. The story goes that not long after the book was printed, the leaden letters of the Obod print shop were smelted into cannonballs.

There is fear in present day Serbia that after the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bombing and a new war in Kosovo—which left behind thousands of dead, displaced, and traumatized civilians and renewed nationalistic and militaristic propaganda hysterically spreading fear and false commitments—the results of peace education to date will also melt into the prevailing atmosphere of violence and despair. And indeed, the renewed social crisis poses a big challenge to work in peace education. The government condemns pacifists as "unpatriotic" and strictly controls any deviation from the promoted patriotic discourse. This control extends to the schools.

But the challenge could be of another kind. If what was done in the area of peace education proved influential and relevant enough, then such social circumstances could pose a challenge to rediscover vigorous, attractive, innovative, and expressive new ways of peace-building, perhaps created by some of the young participants in peace education workshops. There is hope that they will find new ways to continue the process by finding new venues for communication, and symbols to express their peace commitment. Also, many who have designed and taught peace education programs to date will not easily give up their efforts and the satisfactions inherent in peace education. However, they have to take stock of social contradictions and tensions before they proffer an alternative to conflict. An ongoing confrontation with the changing social reality appears necessary.

In response to worsened conditions, those dedicated to transforming Serbian society could establish an active, affirmative network of persons already trained in peace education, refine the concepts and programs, enlarge or refocus the scope of the programs, conceive new strategies of grappling with the environment, and endorse new visions of society. Peace educators' past experience is that such commitments help overcome despair.

If peace education is to deal with existing circumstances and conflicts that include ethnic hostilities and recent traumatic experiences, humiliation, and bitterness, new programs will have to be developed to address the very core of group identity and collectivity. New ideas have to be developed to fit something that could be called "education for reconciliation." This would not only attempt to change mind-sets about the "other(s)," but

the disposition to accept the narratives of the other(s) and to approach both their own history and the future in a new way.

The ways out of these gloomy circumstances may even be of a symbolic nature.One such option is a proposal to establish the Balkan Institute for Textbook Research.Placing such an institution in Cetinje, in Montenegro, which is the site of the first Balkan print mill and of the production of the first Cyrillic book of the South Slavs, could add yet more symbolic weight.

A parallel institution—the Georg-Eckert-Institute for the Study of Textbooks (Georg-Eckert-Institut für Schulbuchforschung) in Germany, founded in 1951 by UNESCO— proved worthy. Two of its most praised projects were the German-French and German-Polish history textbooks, written cooperatively by historians from the respective countries.

This report has discussed the role the former Yugoslav and contemporary Serbian text-books have played in grounding a culture of intolerance. At present, it is extremely hard to imagine Serbian and Albanian historians sitting in the Serbian Ministry of Education and writing a common history textbook. However, perhaps it is possible to imagine them with other Balkan and international experts discussing the problems of history textbooks at a new institution with different and broader goals. In the spirit of a new institution, re-counting the histories of various groups should not be an effort to homogenize differing views and interpretations of history, but rather to provide an opportunity to jointly iden-tify the different narratives, and to moderate tales of victimhood, blame, and glory. A new way of weaving history into the fabric of relations could be a symbolic as well as a practi-cal way out of the present crisis.

Notes

1. The appeal called "Stop the War," initiated in November 1991, was signed by sixty-five prominent Serbian psychologists and sent to all federal and republican governmental bodies in the former Yugoslavia, as well as to all the leading dailies and weeklies in the country.

2. Serbian political leaders focused on these problems only later, mainly as a source of arguments against the so-called "unprovoked, undeserved, unjust" sanctions.

3. See "Perspectives on Peace Education," in Ake Bjerstedt (ed.), *Educational Information and Debate,* 89 (Malmö, Sweden: School of Education, Lund University, vol. 121, 1990), pp. 55–75.

4. M. Lawson, *The International People's College, Helsingor, Denmark: Seven Decades of Peace Education,* Peace Education Miniprints, no. 71 (Malmö, Sweden: R&D Group, 1995).

5. See Betty Reardon, *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988).

6. Reardon, *Comprehensive Peace Education,* p. 14.

7. Reardon, *Comprehensive Peace Education,* p. 14.

8. In 1994-95, UNICEF's Belgrade office launched its Education for Development project. The author, Ruzica Rosandic, directed one of the composite projects, The Goodwill Classroom, during its first two years. The Goodwill Classroom is discussed later in this report.

9. Birgit Brock-Utne, "Peace Education at the End of a Millennium," in H. Lofgren (ed.), *Peace Education and Human Development* (Malmö, Sweden: Malmö School of Education, Lund University, 1995), p. 62.

10. Brock-Utne, "Peace Education at the End of the Millennium," p. 68.

11. Most such clubs are sponsored by the Fund for Open Society in Belgrade. Some (for example, youth training seminars on the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, run by the Center for the Protection of Child Rights, Belgrade) are sponsored by Radda Barnen, which is Swedish for Save the Children. Group MOST from the Center for Anti-War Action (CAA) in Belgrade also has organized numerous youth seminars in conflict resolution, mediation, negotiation, and dispute settlement, not only in Serbia but in Kosovo and Montenegro as well.

12. In early 1999 an informal program in peace studies was begun in Belgrade at a summer school sponsored by a private bank. Members of the Group MOST, who belong to academia, offer informal courses in conflict resolution for undergraduate students of psychology or at the Teachers College. However, these are all informal, unsystematic forms of peace education.

13. Urie Bronfenbrenner, *The Ecology of Human Development* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979).

14. Reardon, *Comprehensive Peace Education.*

15. Jerome Bruner is the author of a book with the same title, *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1986).

16. Michael Wessells, *The Role of Peace Education in a Culture of Peace: A Social-psychological Analysis.* Peace Education Miniprints, No. 65 (Malmö, Sweden: School of Education, 1994), p. 5.

17. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: The Continuum Publishing Corporation, 1986), pp. 57–58.

18. Wessells, *The Role of Peace Education in a Culture of Peace.*

19. Malvern Lumsden, "*Breaking the Cycle of Violence,*" Journal of Peace Research, vol. 34, no. 4 (1997), p. 67.

20. Wessells (1994) stresses that peace education must be integrated across a variety of social levels; that cooperative orientations are essential components of the psychological substrate for a culture of peace; and that there is a need for cooperation on superordinate goals, empathy and multicultural understanding, and a thorough reorientation of the structure, content, and pedagogy of peace education toward positive peace.

21. Lumsden (1997) sees the following leverages as efficient: creativity, healing, education, and communal rites.

22. A recently issued law giving the government control over universities reflects such a policy. In retaliation for the demonstrations in the winter of 1996–97, in which students and university professors took the most prominent part, the Serbian government issued a law that gave it total control of the universities. The government used its new power as an instrument of repression and revenge against the opposition intelligentsia.

23. See Spending for education in the majority of East European countries in transition has exceeded or is approaching the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) mean. The largest increase, related to 1989, was in Hungary (in 1994 it was close to 7 percent). A negative trend is registered only in Albania. See B. Laporte and D. Ringold, *Trends in Education Access and Financing during the Transition in Central and Eastern Europe* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank), Technical Paper no. 361, 1997, p. 20.

24. As for comparative military spending, the data show that according to the public expenditures per soldier, Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) ranks 42nd out of 160 countries, while for GNP it ranks 88th. See Ruth Leger Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditures 1996* (Washington, D.C.: World Priorities, 1996), p. 50.

25. *Evaluation of the UNICEF-Supported EducationProgram in Yugoslavia: 1995–97* (Belgrade: UNICEF, 1998).

26. *Evaluation of the UNICEF-Supported EducationProgram in Yugoslavia.*

27. J. V. Wertsch, *Voices of Mind: A Sociocultural Approach to Mediated Action* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991), p. 112.

28. Instead of "dominant," Wertsch uses "privileged" as more appropriate for the study of psychological processes. Wertsch, *Voices of Mind,* p. 124.

29. T. Kovac-Cerovic, "Metakognitivne komponente socijalne interakcije majke I deteta" ("Metacognitive components of mother-child social interaction"), Ph.D. thesis, 1997, defended at the Deptartment of Psychology, University of Belgrade (unpublished).

30. According to the former Serbian newspaper *Nasa Borba,* April 24, 1998.

31. *Nasa Borba,* April 24, 1998.

32. *Nasa Borba,* April 24, 1998.

33. In an analysis of videotapes of six full days of interaction in a first-grade classroom, Hagstrom and Wertsch found only twelve instances of noninstructional experience statements by students. Three of these days involved a teacher who was generally viewed as quite orderly and strict in her approach to classroom control, and the other three involved a teacher whose class-room was considered more open in style. However, the noninstructional experience statements were so infrequent that a comparison of the two settings was impossible. See Wertsch, *Voices of Mind,* p. 129.

34. A rather common practice in many communist countries, including the former Yugoslavia, was that, out of fear of political consequences, parents were urged to forbid their chil-dren to carry information that they had accidentally overheard from home to school. Otherwise, children could be used (and were used) as informers in prosecuting their own parents.

35. One of the basic principles (defined as such at the Tenth Communist Party Congress), the fifth among twelve listed, is, "Marxism as a science and as the ideology and praxis of the working class is basic for all education." T. Bogavac, *Skolstvo u Srbiji na putu do reforme: razvoj skolstva 1945–1975 (Serbian School System on the Way to the Reform: Developments from 1945–1975)* (Belgrade: Prosvetni savet Srbije, 1980), p. 316.

36. See D. Stojanovic, "History Textbooks Mirror Their Time," in R. Rosandic and V. Pesic (eds.), *Warfare, Patriotism, Patriarchy: The Analysis of Elementary School Textbooks* (Belgrade: Center for Anti-War Action, 1994), p. 88.

37. *The Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia,* XLII, August 13, 1993. See more details in Rosandic and Pesic (eds.), *Warfare, Patriotism, Patriarchy,* pp. 49–50.

38. The availability of pure (these years almost nonexistent) research funds is not the only rea-son for so extensively studying school textbooks as a means of school socialization. School text-books are a powerful means of socialization in settings with a high percentage of illiterate people and low reading habits, where school textbooks may be the only books available.

39. D. Plut, "Socialization Patterns of Elementary School Textbooks," in Rosandic and Pesic (eds.), *Warfare, Patriotism, Patriarchy,* pp. 25–28.

40. Rosandic and Pesic (eds.), *Warfare, Patriotism, Patriarchy,* p. 23.

41. The following offers a hint of what one can get from a text on peace education, written by a Soviet specialist: "The present stage of development of the socialist world system and the inter-national working-class and youth movement provides convincing proof of the vitality of the idea of socialist internationalism. Public ownership of the means of production, scientific manage-ment of socio-economic life, the politically and ideologically unanimous way the workers support the communist and workers' parties, the comprehensive development of the people's social activ-ities, the rise in material prosperity and the cultural standard are becoming decisive factors in pro-moting an almost completely international way of public life for socialism. . . ." (This quotation ends with some quotes from Brezhnev.) See G. N. Filonov, "Educating Young People in the Spirit and Ideas of Internationalism and Peace," in Ch. Wulf (ed.), *Handbook on Peace Education* (Frankfurt/Main-Oslo: IPRA, 1974), p. 77.

42. See the description in this report of the film *Tito for the Second Time among the Serbs,* *p.viii.*

43. R. Rosandic, "Patriotic Education," in Rosandic and Pesic (eds.), *Warfare, Patriotism, Patriarchy,* pp. 41–58.

44. I. Jaric, "Vicious Circle: Images of the Male and the Female," in Rosandic and Pesic (eds.), *Warfare, Patriotism, Patriarchy,* pp. 111–124.

45. R. Rosandic, "Culture-Specific Models of Conflict Management Transmitted through the School Textbooks" (Berlin: Berghof Center for Conflict Management, 1997), manuscript.

46. Inspired by Jerome Bruner. See J. Bruner, *Acts of Meaning* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990).

47. The conceptual matrix for the analysis of conflict management strategies is defined according to Pruitt's and Rubin's classification. See D. G. Pruitt and J. Z. Rubin, *Social Conflicts: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1986), pp. 139–164.

48. From the *Reader for the Eighth Grade* (Belgrade: Zavod za udzbenike I nastavna sredstva, 1992), p. 26.

49. T. Kovac-Cerovic and G. Opacic, "Teachers' Implicit Theories and Teachers' Actions in Conflict Management" (Berlin: Berghof Center for Conflict Management, 1997), manuscript.

50. See "We, Children, War," in *Psiholoska istrazivanja,* no. 5 (Belgrade: Institut za psihologiju, 1994).

51. This overview is based on a 1998 article by Vesna Ognjenovic, "Program psiholoske podrske deci pogodjenoj ratom" ("The Program of Psychological Support to Children Affected by War") (forthcoming).

52. N. Ignjatovic-Savic, "Programs for Supporting and Promoting Child Development within War Affected Social Context: Smile Keepers" (Belgrade: UNICEF, Education for Development Program, March 1993–December 1995).

53. Based on the leaflet published by the Center for Anti-War Action (CAA), Group MOST, 1997, no. 12.

54. R. Rosandic and T. Kovac-Cerovic, "Goodwill Classroom: School Program for Constructive Conflict Resolution" (Belgrade: UNICEF, Education for Development Program, May 1995–July 1997).

55. Friends of the Children of Serbia: Committee for the Protection of Children's Rights, "Application of the Primer of Children's Rights in promoting the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child" (Belgrade: UNICEF, Education for Development, October 1997).

56. N. Ignjatovic-Savic, "Mutual Education: Giraffe Language in Kindergartens and Schools" (Belgrade: UNICEF, Education for Development Program, October 1995–June 1996).

57. G. Ibolya and L. Dotlic, "Enhancing Children's Self-Esteem" (Belgrade: UNICEF Program of Psycho-Social Assistance within the Republic of Serbia, 1993–1997).

58. J. P. Lederach, *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1995), pp. 39–70.

59. Lederach, *Preparing for Peace,* p. 55.

60. For an extensive elaboration on this methodology, see S. Jankovic and T. Kovac-Cerovic, "Basic Principles of Workshop Procedure" in T. Kovac-Cerovic, R. Rosandic, and D. Popadic (eds.), *The Goodwill Classroom: School Programs for Constructive Conflict Resolution* (Belgrade: CAA, Group MOST, 1995), pp. 36–51 in the English manuscript translation.

61. Reardon, *Comprehensive Peace Education,* pp. 29–37.

62. For an elaborate account of the main topics of intervention programs, see D. Plut, "Basic Principles of Intervention Programs or Conflict Resolution," in T. Kovac-Cerovic, R. Rosandic, and D. Popadic (eds.), *The Goodwill Classroom: School Programs for Constructive Conflict Resolution* (Belgrade: CAA, Group MOST, 1995), pp. 15–27 in the English manuscript translation.

63. *Evaluation of the UNICEF-Supported Education Programs in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia: 1995–1997* (Belgrade: UNICEF, 1998).

64. All of the material was empirically tested, which has increased its value. See the UNICEF report, note 63 above.

65. J. Glowinski, I. M. Harris, and N. Perleberg, "Factors That Promote Retention of Peace Education Training" (Milwaukee, Wis.: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Peace Studies Program, 1998), manuscript.

About the Author

Ruzica Rosandic is a professor of psychology at the University of Belgrade. In the early 1990s, she became active in the Center for Anti-War Action, where she co-founded and for several years headed the Group MOST, an agency for training and research in constructive conflict resolution. She co-edited two books published by the center: *Warfare, Patriotism, Patriarchy,* a critical analysis of Serbian school textbooks, and *The Goodwill Classroom,* a manual in constructive conflict resolution for elementary schools. In 1998–99, she was a senior fellow in the Jennings Randolph Program for International Peace at the United States Institute of Peace, Washington, D.C. Currently, she is a visiting professor teaching graduate courses in alternative dispute resolution at the School for Social and Systemic Studies, Nova Southeastern University, Fort Lauderdale,Fla.

About the Institute

The **United States Institute of Peace** is an independent, nonpartisan federal institution created by Congress to promote research, education, and training on the peaceful management and resolution of international conflicts. Established in 1984, the Institute meets its congressional mandate through an array of programs, including research grants, fellowships, professional training, education programs from high school through graduate school, conferences and workshops, library services, and publications. The Institute's Board of Directors is appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.

Chairman of the Board: Chester A. Crocker
Vice Chairman: Max M. Kampelman
President: Richard H. Solomon
Executive Vice President: Harriet Hentges

Board of Directors

Chester A. Crocker (Chairman), James R. Schlesinger Professor of Strategic Studies, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University

Max M. Kampelman, Esq. (Vice Chairman), Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver and Jacobson, Washington, D.C.

Dennis L. Bark, Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University

Stephen J. Hadley, Esq., Shea and Gardner, Washington, D.C.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, President Emeritus, University of Notre Dame

Zalmay Khalilzad, RAND Corporation, Washington, D.C.

Seymour Martin Lipset, Hazel Professor of Public Policy, George Mason University

W. Scott Thompson, Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

Allen Weinstein, President, Center for Democracy, Washington, D.C.

Harriet Zimmerman, Vice President, American Israel Public Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.

Members ex officio

J. Stapleton Roy, Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research

Daniel H. Simpson, Vice President, National Defense University

Walter B. Slocombe, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy

Richard H. Solomon, President, United States Institute of Peace (nonvoting)

Other Titles in the Peaceworks Series

OF RELATED INTEREST

Many other publications from the United States Institute of Peace address issues of direct relevance to peacebuilding in the Balkans.

RECENT INSTITUTE REPORTS INCLUDE:

Three Dimensions of Peacebuilding in Bosnia: Findings from USIP-Sponsored Research and Field Projects, edited by Steven M. Riskin (Peaceworks No. 32, December 1999)

Training U.S. Army Officers for Peace Operations: Lessons from Bosnia, by Howard Olsen and John Davis (Special Report, October 1999)

De-Balkanizing the Balkans: Security and Stability in Southeastern Europe, by Andrew J. Pierre (Special Report, September 1999)

"Yugoslavia": Building Democratic Institutions (Special Report, April 1999)

Montenegro—and More—at Risk (Special Report, January 1999)

To obtain an Institute report (available free of charge), write United States Institute of Peace, 1200 17th Street NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20036-3011; call (202) 429-3832; fax (202) 429-6063; or e-mail: usip_requests@usip.org.

RECENT BOOKS FROM USIP PRESS INCLUDE:

Herding Cats: Multiparty Mediation in a Complex World, edited by Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (November 1999)

Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies, by John Paul Lederach (1997)

Transitional Justice: How Emerging Democracies Reckon with Former Regimes (3 vols.), edited by Neil J. Kritz (1995)

To order books, call 800-868-8064 (U.S. only) or 703-661-1590, or fax 703-661-1501.