

FIGHTING FOR PEACE IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN CLASSROOM: PEACE EDUCATION THE MISSING LINK?

Vuyisile Msila

University of Johannesburg, South Africa

E-mail: vmsila@uj.ac.za

Abstract

The post-apartheid education in South Africa is based on the Constitution of the Republic (Act 108 of 1996). Among its aims are to heal the divisions of the past and improve the life of all citizens. The policy is also intent on preparing the learners to live in a free non-racial and democratic country. This curriculum is ideal; with learner-centred approaches, learners are expected to act in the interests of a society that respects human dignity and morality. Schools are seen as institutions that could instill the democratic ideals in a country that is still trying to address the past ills left behind by the apartheid damage. However, years after the attainment of the democratic society, there are a number of challenges that schools face: drug abuse, sexual violence and hate crimes are among these. Recently, South African children have witnessed widespread xenophobia meted by society against black African foreign nationals.

This article explores Peace Education, an aspect that the current system is hardly emphasizing. Effective Peace Education goes beyond building peaceful citizen; it yearns to develop citizens that can enhance democracy and social justice. There is a need to create proactive citizens who will be creative peace soldiers, who manage conflicts effectively, showing respect for fellow human beings. Teachers and schools can play a vital role in the creation of these future citizens. Some critics perceive Peace Education as a contentious and value-laden approach; however, the society needs strategies to act against the threat of violence that has brought the culture of learning and teaching almost to a standstill in many schools.

Key words: *peace, peace education, human rights, Ubuntu*

The Quest for Peace

Many might argue that there is much need for *Peace Education* in South African schools. Like the majority of African countries that experienced violent wars; the apartheid war was very violent as many who witnessed its atrocities from the past will attest. Yet it seems as if *Peace Education* is not a distinct part of the South African national curriculum. The society is experiencing a number of despicable events on school grounds. The xenophobia against black African foreign nationals has also not made schools better and safer places. Many learners have internalized the hatred of the society; after all, schools are the microcosm of the society.

The premise or thesis of this article is that democracy cannot be attained in its fullest without the introduction of *Peace Education* in the school curriculum. This claim can be true for all nations that have been ravaged by war and oppression. Striving for democracy in an unpeaceful world is as good as looking for water in a dry desert. *Peace Education* should be high on the agenda of schools, especially within new democracies. The reconciliation and peace model in South Africa is usually said to be among the best in the world. The perpetrator and the victim testified in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). Some (the perpetrators), were pardoned for past demeanors, yet others (victims), were left forlorn and destitute for they maintained that they did not receive any justice in the process. The direction in which peace and reconciliation has taken is also questioned by some. The chair of the Human Rights

Commission, Kollapen, was quoted questioning the manner in which reconciliation took place in South Africa:

My own view was that the reconciliation process was at the expense of transformation. I also argued that and I continue to argue that in terms of transformation hardly anything was asked of white South Africans. . . What the TRC didn't do is to begin a conversation between you and me... we never spoke, we never spoke about what apartheid meant for you and about what it meant for me. I think the challenge is to transcend the sense that we have over our blackness and our whiteness... I think it requires ordinary people to speak to each other.

(Mail and Guardian, 2008: 3)

In this regard, schools have a huge task on their doors. Among others, they need to ensure that black learners and white learners speak to one another; there needs to be more understanding and communication as they interpret history. The new generation needs to be built on foundations of peace.

The national education curriculum in South Africa is based on sound principles of the Constitution of the Republic. The Constitution provides a basis for curriculum transformation and development. The Preamble of this document states that its aims are to:

- heal the divisions of the past and establish a society based on democratic values, social justice and fundamental human rights;
- improve the quality of life of all citizens and free the potential of each person;
- lay the foundations for a democratic and open society in which government is based on the will of the people and every citizen is equally protected by law; and
- build a united and democratic South Africa able to take its rightful place as a sovereign state in the family of nations.

(DoE 2002:1)

Despite these noble foundations, *Peace Education* emphasis is not very pronounced in the curriculum. Arguably, schools can be an opportune starting point to teach society about peace. Some writers do not perceive *Peace Education* as homogeneous. Tandon (1985:56-57) cites Okamoto who deliberates four types of *Peace Education* developed since the 19th century:

- *Peace Education* as a criticism of war. This is related to humanitarian and religion-based peace organizations. It took the form of anti-war movements.
- *Peace Education* as liberation education. The objective here is the liberation of the human being. It deals with human rights, political oppression, racial discrimination, solution of problems of poverty
- *Peace Education* as a learning process. This seeks to help individuals embrace qualities of tolerance and creativity.
- *Peace Education* as a lifestyle. This emphasizes the lifestyle of individuals and people have to be changed so that peace can be brought about.

In addition to the above, Tandon cites Kekkommen who lists seven sections for *Peace Education*:

- (i) Cultural Education
- (ii) Environmental Education
- (iii) Human Rights education
- (iv) Disarmament Education
- (v) Equality Education
- (vi) Development Education
- (vii) Moral Education

Various peace researchers have defined concepts in this area in a number of ways. Peace research for example, is said to have emerged as a distinct field in the late 1950s (Duczek 1988:7). Duczek contends:

Critical *Peace Research* regards peace as more than the absences of war; peace is seen as something which still has to be created and constantly recreated through individual and collective action. Thus, peace becomes not only a goal but also a process. From this standpoint, *Peace Education* cannot mean educating for peace as such, but rather educating for a 'peace capacity'.

Similar arguments are found in Tandon's definition. He defines *Peace Education* as:

...education for changing violent or non-peaceful relationships into non-violent or peaceful relationships. It is education for attaining not only negative but also positive peace as defined above. *Peace Education* is action-oriented. It is meant to animate people, make them active and enable them to struggle and contribute to the achievement of positive peace.

Brock-Utne (1989) states that *Peace Education* is a controversial concept, which is regarded as political and even endangering the security of the country. Brock-Utne also avers that the field of *Peace Education* is difficult to treat in a scholarly manner because it can have so many different political interpretations. Usually the term is intentionally made to be open to various interpretations and accommodate various viewpoints. Furthermore, Brock-Utne (1989:77) differentiates between education for peace and education about peace.

The division of *Peace Education* into various subfields like human rights education, disarmament education, and development education may be looked at as an attempt to make the unwieldy *Peace Education* field somewhat easier to handle analytically. Roughly speaking, those who place most emphasis on the structural violence part of the peace concept would also like to see development education as the most central part of *Peace Education*.

Looking at this complexity, it is not easy to promote *Peace Education* for as some discussions above illustrate, it can be contentious. In many schools around the world, there is persisting violence from teachers towards learners that is still used as a disciplinary method (Brock-Utne, 1989). In South Africa corporal punishment in schools was abolished in the early 1990s, although there are still reported incidents of violence in many schools. Brock-Utne also highlights that even in countries where corporal punishment is outlawed, there is direct violence going on in schools, especially among boys at recess. She also points out that many learners get scars for life; mostly of a psychological nature. Some unexpected factors such as competition in classrooms can be very disconcerting to learners' well being. Rohrs (1983) cites Galtung who avers that it is difficult to teach peace in a classroom where competition is supported. When there is competition among learners, there tends to be a hidden curriculum; a certain percentage of learners will get bad grades. The latter is an example of structural violence. "The children who get the lowest grades often, also get deep psychological wounds, they lose their self esteem, and the esteem of teachers and parents, often also of school mates. Some of these

children try to fight back by misbehaving and downgrading the values of the school” (Brock-Utne, 1989). According to Hull (2002) competition is a necessity in today’s classrooms for the learners need to be prepared for the world competition which awaits them after their school career. Schools might be a good place to prepare the learners for this future out there.

However, competition needs to be controlled and it is crucial that the learners should know when to compete and when competition hurts their effectiveness (Hull, 2002). For the attainment of *Peace Education* though, learners need a cooperative goals structure. Furthermore, Hull (2002) avers that the ideal should be a cooperative classroom where learners work together with other learners to gain rewards, for in this environment a learner’s success depends on the comparable success of other learners. In a cooperative classroom everyone is encouraged to succeed. John and Johnson (1989) contend that in competitive environments the norms make it undesirable to help others within the group to succeed, and this traditional classroom often develops anti-academic norms. However, cooperative learning produces harmony among learners and it minimizes tensions and conflicts. Effective cooperative learning has two major components: positive interdependence and individual responsibility (Johnson & Johnson, 1996). The latter is effective for *Peace Education*. In a schooling system where learners learn to be interdependent, there is likely to be harmony and cooperation; and both are necessary elements for peace.

This article explores how these and other concepts can manifest themselves in South African classrooms. At a time when there is apparent moral decay among learners (see the newspaper headlines cited above), many have argued that South African schools need to go back to the basics and teach morality; *Peace Education* can be a crucial concept in addressing some of the challenges experienced in schools. It encompasses some of the values necessary in education.

Values in Education: Do they Matter?

What needs to be taught in schools is usually contentious among stakeholders in education. For example, Labaree (1997) contended that the central problems with education are not pedagogical, organisational, social, or cultural in nature but are fundamentally political. Furthermore, he argued that it is not because people do not have solutions to educational problems, but that they are fighting among themselves about what goals schools should pursue. In a rather similar argument, DeLany (1998) argued that schools are continually scrambling for order in a rather disorderly world. DeLany also aptly referred to schools as “organised anarchies” because (among others), while providing opportunities for different choices of schools, educational changes open up the possibility of institutionalising collective turbulence. Societal expectations further enhance the turbulence in schools. Whenever there are problems, be they drug abuse, morality, the decline of economy or joblessness, it is frequently schools that are blamed for these societal ills. The society sometimes expects schools to achieve the most ambitious of goals; hence Labaree (1997) raises an argument that schools occupy an awkward position at the intersection between what people hope society will become and what they think it really is, between political ideals and economic realities.

The issue of values will then be very controversial because of the various views that stakeholders might have. *Peace Education* is about values and some of these are highlighted above. Ling and Stephenson (1998) cite Hill, who points out that people know what they want from education until they are asked to spell it out. Spelling out the goals of education can be daunting. The South African media today covers many sensational stories of incidents happening on school grounds daily. The following are some of the recent headlines from local newspapers:

SCARED AT SCHOOL: SEXUAL VIOLENCE AGAINST GIRLS IN SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS
PLAN TO STOP VIOLENCE AT SCHOOL
RAPE GAMES PLAYED AT SOUTH AFRICAN SCHOOLS
ALCOHOL ABUSES PLAGUES SCHOOLS
THERE'S LOT OF ANGER IN SA SCHOOLS

Many critics argue that the moral code is waning and that teachers have become impotent. Yet, “the responsibility of schools is acknowledged to be present in all societies and the school is traditionally seen as a tool in alleviating social problems” (Ling & Stephenson, 1998). Furthermore, these writers perceive formal schooling process as constituting the common vehicle for the development and reinforcement of basic social, moral, political and economic values; that it is pertinent that such examination of the internationalization of values begins at the schooling and teacher education level. Some have argued though that teaching values in schools can be detrimental because it is not objective. *Peace Education*, as highlighted above might also be contentious in that some may see it as value-laden. Indeed, Harris (1988) argues that *Peace Education*, like all curricula in schools contains certain values; values of non-violence and social justice. In a 2001 Manifesto on *Values, Education and Democracy* Conference hosted by the South African Ministry of Education, values were debated at length. The working group from this conference highlighted six qualities that the education in South Africa should actively promote: equity, tolerance, multilingualism, openness, accountability and social honour (DoE, 2001). The document also explains ideals and concepts of democracy, social justice, equality, non-racist and non-sexism, *ubuntu*, an open society, accountability, the rule of law, respect and reconciliation in a way that suggests how the Constitution can be taught as part of the curriculum. Furthermore, the DoE (2001: iv) document contends:

The *Manifesto* recognizes that values, which transcend language and culture, are the common currency that makes life meaningful, and the normative principles that ensure ease of life lived in common. Inculcating a sense of value at school is intended to help young people achieve higher levels of moral judgement. We also believe that education does not exist simply to serve the market, but to serve society, and that means instilling in pupils and students a broad sense of values that can emerge only from a balanced exposure to the humanities as well as the sciences enriching the individual in this way is, by extension, enriching the society too.

Peace as a Value in Education

Brenes-Castro (2004) writes about an *Integral Model of Peace Education* and states that it embraces certain principles that jointly express “a spirit of community”, a core value for peace. The *Integral Model Peace Education* (IMPE) is based on the postulation that there are universal values that shape a culture of peace (Brenes-Castro, 2004). This *Model* assumes a holistic vision of reality and perceives the universe as a dynamic totality characterised by diversity and interdependence between all beings. Furthermore, he states that ideal human community would be characterised by the following:

- Membership in such a community allows for the satisfaction of vital needs for all its members.
- There is commitment on the part of all its members towards the mutual protection, enhancement, and promotion of the common good of the community.
- The idiosyncrasy of each member is valued and her/his contributions are synergistically integrated within the diversity of the group.
- All members participate in the making of those decisions that affect the common well-being.

These are all crucial when one looks at the prominence and need for *Peace Education*

currently.

Pertinent to the arguments above is the nature of peace as a medium of ecological balance. As mentioned above, definitions of peace have been extended beyond the notion of negative peace that is absence of war (Wenden, 2004). Furthermore, Wenden (2004) points out that some definitions of peace include the notion of peace with Nature, for example ecological balance as one that should underpin any definition of peace. Wenden (2004) cites Sloan who avers that a peace that ignores ecological destruction is unsustainable. Wenden (2004) also cites Reardon and Nordland who state that ecological violence is part of the context and motivating force for *Peace Education* together with the violence of armed conflict and the structural violence of oppression and poverty. At a time when there is much violence happening in schools, peace research has become very crucial. Pulkkinen (1989) cites Helenius who points out that *Peace Education's* meaning can be sought by relating it to similar concepts such as education for international understanding and disarmament education. *Peace Education* embraces the teaching of basic human rights and familiarization with development problems (Pulkkinen 1989:88). Hinde and Parry (1983) concur when they point out that *Peace Education* has been interpreted in a narrow sense and they argue that education for peace needs to start in the home and should then move over to the classroom teaching as this is pivotal for people throughout life. In a country where conflicts lead to bitter battles there is a strong necessity to take *Peace Education* seriously. Education for peace must seek to influence the goals towards which pro-social and cooperative behaviour are directed and to expand social conscience beyond national frontiers (Hinde & Bateson 1989:13). Galtung (1982) also highlights the problems of peace can be divided into three: the depletion of raw materials, the pollution of nature and of ourselves and the population problem. *Peace Education* is seen by many as an aspect that is linked with other factors in life. Democracy, politics are some of the terms that can be linked to *Peace Education*. *Peace Education* cannot be only about peace; it has to be peace-day-to-day practice developing out of school reality, not only words that easily are covered with dust and equally easily forgotten (Galtung, 1982).

Peace Activists in South Africa

The history and heritage in South Africa has an endless list of people who developed their philosophies based on peace. The first Nobel peace prize winner and former President-General of the African National Congress, Chief Albert Luthuli condemned the apartheid legislation as degrading yet he preached non-violence and was optimistic that whites would one day accept a shared society. Luthuli dreamt and spoke of a unified Africa and in his Oslo speech where he accepted the peace prize he said, “our vision has always been that of a non-racial, democratic South Africa, which upholds the rights of all who live in our country to remain there as full citizens, with equal rights and responsibilities with all others” (Luthuli, 1980). Then there was Mahatma Gandhi who, although he was not born in South Africa, had great connection with the country. After settling in South Africa in 1893, he was to be exposed to ill-treatment from the white government for being an Indian. Gandhi was soon to develop a philosophy of non-violence and devotion to the truth; the *satyagraha*.

Gandhi had ambitions of bringing about world peace, and many saw him as a real fighter for justice. Martin Luther King Jr. was later to be quoted saying, “if humanity is to progress, Gandhi is inescapable. He lived, thought and inspired by the vision of humanity evolving toward a world of peace and harmony”. Patel (2009) online highlights Gandhi's 5 teachings to bring about world peace:

- Power is of two kinds. One is obtained by the fear of punishment and the other by acts of love. Power based on love is a thousand times more effective and permanent than the one derived from fear and punishment.

- Learning the power of non-violence. What difference does it make to the dead, the orphans and the homeless, whether the mad destruction is wrought under the name of totalitarianism or the holy name of liberty and democracy?
- The greatest noble cause is to display our desire to bring about peace in this world by our own sacrifice and not that of those who oppose our views.
- An eye for an eye will only make the world blind. Our cultural, religious and political differences should not provide the backbone to invoke conflicts that can only bring sorrow and destruction to our world.
- We must become the change we want to see in the world. We should not discriminate amongst ourselves based on faith, caste, creed or any other differences.

The “New” Human Rights Culture in South African Education

McQuoid-Mason, O’ Brien and Greene (1991) argue that the roots of human rights can be found in most of the world’s religions and philosophies. In some societies the individual is emphasized while in other societies communalism is valued more. Yet even despite these differences, human rights have become very important in the 21st century around the world. The agenda for human rights became more pronounced after the fall of apartheid in the 1990s. During apartheid human rights for black Africans in particular were curtailed by law. Yet the new Constitution of the Republic of South Africa emphasizes the human rights. McQuoid et al. (1991: 14) state that human rights are universal moral rights and they are also referred to as natural rights that belong to people simply because they are human; “they do not have to be earned, bought or inherited. People are equally entitled to them regardless of their sex, race colour, language, national origin, age, class or religious or political beliefs.”

Peace Education needs to be made part of the post-apartheid education policy, which was intent on ensuring that South African education policy is based on democratic values. The new human rights culture in South Africa needs to prepare the youth for peaceful future and political stability. The previous youth (pre-1994) experienced a no-peaceful atmosphere inside and outside the school, particularly black African learners who had none of the state privileges that their white counterparts enjoyed. The history in South Africa shows that children became assertive fighters for a just education and a democratic South Africa. Before the 1990s, the quality of education in the majority of black African schools was affected by the politics of the day as these schools “became key sites in the struggle against apartheid resulted in a deterioration in the quality of black education as school boycotts, strikes, and other forms of resistance took their toll on ‘normal’ schooling processes” (Pampallis, 2003).

Christie (1988:219) also writes:

June 1976 was a high point in the history of black resistance in South Africa. The opposition of these school students to Bantu Education and the apartheid system has become a landmark in South African history. It was also the beginning of a new era of resistance in education... There is in fact a long and continuing history of resistance by black people to the schooling system. 1976, 1980 and 1984 are part of a long process of boycotts, protest and opposition in schools.

Then in 1985 and 1986, a decade after the 1976 uprisings explained above, black learners were demanding “liberation before education”. More student activists were detained nationwide. As the soldiers occupied school yards, tension mounted in all black schools (Human Awareness Programme, 1990). Bantu Education for black South Africans had been a means of restricting the development of the learner by distorting school knowledge to ensure control over

the intellect of the learners and teachers, and promulgating state propaganda (Kallaway, 1988). Education for black South Africans was a way of maintaining the blacks in a permanent state of political and economic subordination. School children under apartheid became aware that the education system had been an obvious instrument of control to protect power and privilege. The resistance to apartheid education conscientised the black learners and made them to be aware of the need to strive for a better system of education. *Peace Education* will be relevant and very apt in redressing these past injustices. It can be a relevant tool in the creation of good and responsible citizenry.

We can see some propinquity between *Peace Education* and democracy; both of these are crucial in the making of a conscientious citizen, especially in a country that has a history of violence and injustices. Schoeman (2003) argues that learners, as citizens of the future have to be prepared for their future responsibilities as citizens of a democratic society. Furthermore, this writer adds that schools are not only needed for educational but also political reasons. Public schools function as cradles of democratic education.

The post-apartheid curriculum embraced in South Africa was supposed to lead to nation building. Wood (1998:193) asserts that the curriculum should be structured to embrace the values of democratic life. Furthermore, Wood avers that these include the essential values of equality, liberty and community. The Report of the Working Group on Values (2001) motions that there are two primary ways in which human rights culture can establish mutual respect between teachers and learners; the first has to do with what is taught and the second has to do with how this is taught. According to the UNESCO recommendation, *Peace Education* is a component of "education for international understanding", as are the teaching of basic human rights (Pulkkinen, 1989). Furthermore, Pulkkinen draws educational objectives, although he points out that *Peace Education* will stall in many countries because there is reluctance among teachers; many perceive it as a political propaganda.

Ubuntu and Peace Education

Among other calls for a new philosophy of education is a need for an African philosophy of education. Seepe (2004) contends that a radical restructuring of education in Africa, which makes education relevant to African challenges, cannot be complete without a serious consideration of the contribution of indigenous knowledge systems (IKSs). Furthermore, Seepe points out that IKS is about re-opening crucial files that were closed in the chaos and violence of colonialism in which the cultural, scientific and economic life of the colonized was subjugated and crushed. Msila (2008) writes about the need to use *ubuntu* in schools to bring about peace. He found that if learners were to be taught *ubuntu* ideals, they might be receptive to *Peace Education*.

Ubuntu way of life is concerned about the collective rather than the individual. Humanness, communalism, belonging are some of the concepts linked to an *ubuntu* way of life. Whenever people talk about an African experience of life, African philosophy, IKS, they are likely to shed light on *ubuntu*. Van Wyk and Higgs (2004:203) state:

According to Letseka (2000) the importance of community to traditional African life cannot be overemphasized. This is because community and belonging to a community of people constitute the very fabric of traditional African life. Unlike the Western liberal notion of the individual as some sort of entity that is capable of existing and flourishing on its own, unconnected to any community of other individuals, not bound by any biological relationships or socio-economic, political and cultural relationships, obligations, duties, responsibilities and conventions that frame and define any community of individuals.

Peace Education will be compatible to *ubuntu* because this African philosophy is about morality and concern for others. Sincere peace building is about these qualities. "I

cannot live, if you cannot live”, “I cannot eat alone when you have nothing on your plate”. No philosophy can be more amenable to real peace than this. This is the kind of humanism that learners in schools need to learn. In Africa, it was natural and spontaneous behavior of being human to display *ubuntu*. *Ubuntu* was a way of celebrating the life of a fellow human being; it celebrated the interdependence of humanity. However, colonialism destroyed this as African people soon learnt that they could compete for many things, including food, shelter and wealth. When this crept into their psyche, selfishness and wars started. The cultural bond and distinct communalism embedded in *Ubuntu* needs to be restored in African classrooms. This can enhance peace initiatives in society. Ntuli (1999) points out that the spirit of *ubuntu* has long disappeared and he states that it is for this reason that we need an African renaissance. Furthermore, Ntuli opines that in the face of the present cultural and moral collapse in South Africa, there is a need to strive for a rebirth. Yet, Dandala (1996) states that *ubuntu* requires a great deal of learning and sharing and institutions can achieve this through the training of people to practice greater interaction. Schools and the societies around them need to learn the values of *ubuntu*.

Concluding Remarks

Despite the complexities associated with *Peace Education* within the vast political arena, there is an immense and uncharted area suitable for study and practice of *Peace Education* (Gan, 2009). The South African education system will arguably not be complete without a clear, formal programme on *Peace Education*. The current hatred growing in the South African society against foreign nationals will soon teach the learners to be violent; to be more prone to conflict. School curriculum needs to consciously negate the hatred that saw Ernesto Alfabeto Nhamuave from Mozambique, burnt alive in the East Rand of Gauteng for being a non-South African. The same can be said about the current persecution of Somali traders in various parts of the country. South Africa defeated the evil of history in apartheid, and schools need to sustain this through meaningful *Peace Education*. Gan (2009:87) also contends that peace studies need to show that politics must be about process not outcome. Only principled nonviolence teaches that lesson. Educators should uphold nonviolentist’s principles; they need to model this life showing the learners qualities based on principled nonviolence. *Peace Education* can never be achieved without this belief and practice in principled nonviolence.

Peace Education can be one of the potent parts of the South African curriculum. Given the history of the country; arguably there are still people who have not outgrown the hatred of the past. In fact, some parents might still be instilling the past hatred, shattering the “rainbow nation’s ideal” of a diversity that lives in harmony. However, as Hinde and Bateson (1989) argue, education for peace must seek to influence the goals towards which prosocial and cooperative behavior are directed and to expand social conscience beyond national frontiers. Children need to be brought up in less aggressive ways. Xenophobia against Africans mainly from north and West Africa are worst examples any society can teach its children. In his Steve Biko Memorial Lecture in Cape Town (2006), the Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu, was quoted as saying that South Africa is in danger of losing its moral direction. Furthermore, he argued that the country has failed to sustain the idealism that ended the apartheid era (Tutu, 2006). Among other factors that are a challenge to *ubuntu*, are this xenophobia and the lack of respect that exists among people. In his lecture, Tutu maintained that South Africans need to fight and oppose xenophobia. The rise of xenophobia in society has exerted many challenges on the existence of *ubuntu*. Harris (2002) states that the shift in political power in South Africa has brought about a range of new discriminatory practices, and one such victim is “The Foreigner”. Some justify this by stating that resources are scarce and the foreigner is competing in an environment where the locals are also battling. However, some would argue that violence would not solve such

dilemmas; moreover, the society is setting bad examples for its young people. Yet, *ubuntu*, as discussed above, is still seen as a beacon of hope that will create a peaceful society. There is just a need to return to this ideal society. Maybe this is where the rebirth of society Ntuli argues about above becomes so necessary. It is within this broad context that this article supports the need to introduce a highly effective *Peace Education* programmes in South African schools.

School can instill the positive climate necessary in today's mostly negative society. Schools continue to be a microcosm of society and it is the picture of negativity that people need to change through *Peace Education*. Education for peace will not completely transform all ills of the society. Moreover, Chubb and Moe (1990) state that there are no panaceas in social policy. Plank and Boyd (1994:276) support the latter although they put it differently; they state that democratic governance is not a panacea for the problems of educational system. However, Plank and Boyd (1994) also recognise the importance of democracy's role. Education for peace is a brick in the building of democracy. It is apt to finally conclude this discussion by quoting Hinde and Bateson (1998: 16):

But it is important to emphasize that the aims of educating for peace must be more positive than mere removal of current threats. It must seek to build a world in which the causes of civilisation's discontents are minimized, and the potential of individuals to live fulfilled lives is more fully achieved.

References

- Brenes-Castro, A. (2004). An integral model of Peace Education. In A.L. Wenden. (Ed). *Educating for a culture of social and ecological peace*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Brock-Utne, B. (1989). *Feminist perspectives on peace and Peace Education*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Christie, P. (1988). *The right to learn: the struggle for education in South Africa*. Braamfontein: Ravan.
- Chubb, J., Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets & America's schools*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institutions.
- Dandala, H. M. (1996). Cows never die: Embracing African cosmology in the process of economic growth. In R. Lessem and B. Nassbaum (Eds). *Sawubona Africa: Embracing four worlds in South African management*. Sandton: Zebra.
- Department of Education (DoE) (2001). *Manifesto on values, education and democracy*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- DeLany, B. (1998). The micro-politics of school, teacher and student failure: Managing turbulence. *When children don't learn: student failure and the culture of teaching*. Columbia: Teachers College.
- Duczek, S. (1988). Peace Education: insights from peace research and experiences from practice. In J. Thacker (Ed). *Peace Education, Perspectives II*: 6-19.
- Gan, B. (2009). The relation of peace studies to nonviolence. In T.A. McElwee., B. Welling., J. Liechty and J. Garber (Eds). *Peace, justice and security studies: A curriculum guide*. London: Lynne Rienner.
- Harris, I. M. (1988). *Peace Education*. Jefferson: McFarland & Co.
- Hinde, R. A., Bateson, P. (1989). Some goals in education for peace. In R.A. Hinde and D.A. Parry. *Education for Peace*. Nottingham: Spokesman.

Hull, C. (2002). *Is competition in the classroom helpful for kids?* Retrieved from www.helium.com/.../968627-is-competition-in-the-classroom-helpful-for-kids. Accessed on 2011/01/16.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T. (1996). The role of cooperative learning in assessing and communicating student learning. In T.R. Gusky (Ed). *ASCD Yearbook: Communicating student learning*. Alexandria: ASCD.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T. (1989). *Leading the cooperative school*. Edina: Interaction.

Kallaway, P. (1988). *From Bantu education to Peoples Education*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.

Labaree, D. (1997). Public Goods, Private Goods: The American Struggle over Educational Goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34 (1): 39-81.

Ling, L., Stephenson, J. (1998). Introduction and theoretical perspectives. In J. Stephenson., L. Ling., E. Barman and M. Cooper (Eds). *Values in Education*: 3-19.

Luthuli, A. (1980). Nobel Peace Prize Acceptance Speech. In A.L. McLeod and M.B. McLeod (Eds). *Power Above Powers; Representative South African Speeches; the Rhetoric of race and Religion*. Mysore: University of Mysore.

Mail and Guardian (2008). March 11. *Racism 'alive and well in South Africa*: pg 3.

McQuoid-Mason, D., O'Brien, E. L., Greene, E. (1991). *Human Rights for all: Education towards as rights culture*. Claremont: David Phillip.

Msila, V. (2008). *Ubuntu and school leadership*. *Journal of Education* 44: 67-84.

Ntuli, P. (1999). The missing link between culture and education: are we still chasing Gods that are not our own? In M.W. Makgoba (Ed). *African Renaissance*. Cape Town: Mafube.

Pampallis, J. (2003). Education reform and school choice in South Africa. In D. Plank and G. Sykes (Eds). *Choosing choice: School choice in international perspectives*. New York: Teachers College.

Patel, S. (2010). *Mahatma Gandhi's 5 teachings to bring about world peace*. Retrieved from zenhabits.net/mahatma-gandhis-5teachings-to-bring-about-world-peace. Accessed on 2011/01/16.

Plank, D. N., Boyd, W. L. (1994). Antipolitics, education, and institutional choice: the flight from democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(2): 263-281.

Pulkkinen, L. (1989). Progress in Education for Peace in Finland. In R. Hinde and D. Parry. (Eds). *Education for Peace*. Nottingham: Spokesman.

Ramose, B. (2004). In search of African Philosophy of education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 18 (3): 138-160.

Rohrs, H. (1983). *Peace-an educational task. Ideas and reality in Peace Education*. Agenter Pendersen: Westermann.

Schoeman, S. (2003). Democracy's next generation-education for democratic citizenship in South African public schools. *Educare*, 32 (1&2):36-60.

Seepe, S. (2004). Editorial. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 18 (3): 9-16.

Tandon, Y. (1989). *Militarism and Peace Education in Africa*. Nairobi: AALAE.

Thacker, J. (1988). Editorial. In J. Thacker (Ed). *Perspectives II. Peace Education*. Exeter: University of Exeter.

Tutu, D. (2006). *Steve Bantu Biko Memorial Lecture*. Delivered at the University of Cape Town. September.

Van Wyk, B., Higgs, P. (2004). Towards and African philosophy of higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 18(3): 196-211.

Waghid, Y. (2004). African philosophy of education: Implications for teaching and learning. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 18 (3): 56-64.

Wood, G. H. (1998). Democracy and the curriculum. In L.E. Beyer and M.W. Apple. *The curriculum-Problems, Politics, and possibilities*. New York: State University of New York.

Advised by Rita Makarskaitė-Petkevičienė, Vilnius Pedagogical University, Lithuania

Received: *February 01, 2011*

Accepted: *March 10, 2011*

Vuyisile Msila

PhD, Associate Professor, University of Johannesburg, Auckland Park, 2006,
South Africa.

E-mail: vmsila@uj.ac.za

Website: <http://www.uj.ac.za/EN/Pages/home.aspx>