Southeastern University
FireScholars

Selected Honors Theses

4-2013

An Exploration of the Reconciliation Model at the Max Rayne School in Jerusalem, Israel; The Cycle of Victimization, Structural Discrimination and Nationalistic Abuse, Familial Socialization and Psychological Trauma of Children in Relationship to Israeli-Palestinian Context

Amelia A. Sampat
Southeastern University - Lakeland

Recommended Citation

An Exploration of the Reconciliation Model at the

Max Rayne School in Jerusalem, Israel;

The Cycle of Victimization, Structural Discrimination and

Nationalistic Abuse, Familial Socialization and

Psychological Trauma of Children in

Relationship to Israeli-Palestinian Context

by

Amelia Ann Sampat

A thesis submitted to the Honors Program Council

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for University Honors Scholars

Southeastern University

2013

ABSTRACT

The ongoing conflict between the Israeli and Palestinian people of present-day Israel has led to the development of reconciliation processes that influence the psyche of young Israeli and Palestinian children (Zembylas, 2007). A problem arises when these processes require a lengthy period of time. In doing so, the extended process can maintain the political status quo and thereby perpetuate a cycle of victimization, structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, in addition to familial socialization and psychological trauma. This study explores how the reconciliation methods of the Hand-in-Hand bilingual model at the Max Rayne School in Jerusalem, Israel either perpetuate or work through (1) the cycle of victimization, (2) structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, as well as (3) familial socialization and the psychological trauma of children in relation to the Israeli-Palestinian context. This study involves a qualitative approach utilizing an ethnographic field visit to the Max Rayne School in Jerusalem for open-ended interview sessions with representatives of the school. It was found that the model works through the cycle of victimization and familial socialization by providing open dialogue to students through an identity class. However, the model needs to include critical thinking processes to allow for psychological healing and the ability to move beyond collective thought. The reconciliation process requires a lengthy period of time and must be coupled with political and structural change in order to prevent the removal of Palestinian identity and the maintenance of Israeli-Jewish dominance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To express my gratitude in a few simple words would greatly understate the impact that several individuals have made on the development of this Honors Thesis.

Nonetheless, I am forever grateful to Dr. Velmarie Albertini for guiding the entire thesis-writing process. Despite your role as a social change agent deeply involved in community enhancement and research investigation, you willingly remained invested in the development of this thesis. Thank you for sacrificing your time, even if it meant late nights of editing, in order to pour into my personal growth. This thesis would not have tactfully come together as it did without you.

To Professor Irvin Zieman, I give my greatest appreciation for meticulously reading through the pages of this writing and genuinely caring for the success of this project. Dr. Gordon Miller, thank you for providing me with the opportunity to explore my passions and curiosities during the past four years as an Honors Student, and through the composition of this writing.

I am thankful to God, my father, who continuously guides my path and situates me in contexts where I can learn about His unprecedented design on this earth. Thank you for placing me in Israel-Palestine and revealing a unique expression of your beauty in every person that I encountered.

And if these words could not suffice to express my sincere appreciation, it would be in writing these next few sentences. I am forever grateful to the gracious Israeli and Palestinian families in the precious land of Israel-Palestine. Thank you for your willingness to move beyond welcoming me as a guest, but for inviting me into your homes as a part of the community. Thank you for providing hospitality and sharing your customs, joys, and heartaches. And most

importantly, thank you for providing me with some of the greatest memories that I will surely

never forget—for the rest of my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Israeli and Palestinian people of present-day Israel are engaged in ongoing violent conflict, deeply rooted in collective narratives of past atrocities that influence the identity of the two groups (Salomon & Nevo, 2002). As a result, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has led to several peace interventions ranging from the internationally recognized Oslo Accords, internal planned group contact, and developing educational integration models (Tucker, 2008; Moaz, 2011; Bekerman, Zembylas, & McGlynn, 2009). Specifically focusing on the educational methods for reconciliation, it has been found that intervention at the early stages of identity development can aid the reconciliation process by re-shaping the psyche of a new generation (Bekerman, 2009). Reconciliation curricula have therefore been integrated in several private schools within Israel to influence the Israeli and Palestinian students (Bekerman et. al., 2009). Despite these attempts, the conflict continues to unfold with three significant effects on both the Israeli and Palestinian people: (1) the cycle of victimization, (2) structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, (3) familial socialization and the psychological trauma of children (Cobb, 2006; Staub 1999; Opotow, 2001; Zembylas, 2007).

Statement of the Problem

It has been found that reconciliation models within the school system of Israel and Palestine fit the traditional definition of reconciliation by providing "a societal-cultural process in which new emotions and beliefs that encompass respect, coexistence, and peace are formed about an adversary" (Zembylas, 2007, p. 208). This process is necessary to influence the psyche of young Israeli and Palestinian students; however, a problem arises when this process requires a lengthy period of time. In doing so, the extended process can maintain the political status quo

and thereby perpetuate a cycle of victimization, structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, as well as familial socialization and psychological trauma.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore how the reconciliation methods of the Hand-in-Hand bilingual model at the Max Rayne School in Jerusalem, Israel either perpetuate or work through (1) the cycle of victimization, (2) structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, as well as (3) familial socialization and the psychological trauma of children in relation to the Israeli-Palestinian context.

It was determined that the nature of this study involves a qualitative approach. An ethnographic field visit to the Max Rayne School in Jerusalem would allow for greater insight into the Hand-in-Hand reconciliation model and its relation to the larger Israeli-Palestinian context. Prior to conducting this study, a number of books and peer-reviewed journal articles on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and history, peace education, and reconciliation practices in Israel-Palestine were reviewed to provide salient information. This thesis will offer a review of the literature, as well as the methodology, data analysis, and findings of an ethnographical study, followed by a discussion, in order to present an understanding of the reconciliation methods at the Max Rayne School in Jerusalem, Israel.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In order to present this study on the Hand-in-Hand bilingual model at the Max Rayne

School, a compilation of research on several factors that surround the topic of reconciliation in

the Israeli-Palestinian context will be provided (Al-Haj, 2002; Arar, 2012; Bekerman et al.,

2009; Moaz, 2011). The literature review is divided into three major sections. The first section

presents research on significant challenges to reconciliation based on the history of Israeli-

Palestinian conflict and the nature of the school system in Israel. In doing so, the literature

review examines the history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from the birth of Jewish and Arab

nationalism to the present-day situation, and recognizes Israel as an intractable conflict that

perpetuates three significant responses: (1) the cycle of victimization, (2) structural

discrimination and nationalistic abuse, and (3) familial socialization and psychological trauma

associated with children (Cobb, 2006; Staub, 1999; Opotow 2001; Bekerman et al., 2009;

Zembylas, 2007). Furthermore, the section covers the structure and history of the Israeli School

System as it perpetuates the cycle of victimization, structural discrimination and nationalistic

abuse, as well as familial socialization and psychological trauma associated with children. The

second section covers reconciliation models in Israel as a way to deal with such challenges.

Thereby, the literature review presents reconciliation methods in regions of intractable conflict in

addition to current models that have been applied in Israel involving history education,

coexistence, joint-projects, confrontational models, and storytelling methods. Moreover, the

section examines the each model as it perpetuates or works through the cycle of victimization,

structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, as well as and familial socialization and

psychological trauma associated with children. The third section examines the reconciliation

model of the Hand-in-Hand bilingual education at the Max Rayne School in Jerusalem. In doing so, the literature review presents a specific focus on the structure of the bilingual model at the Hand-in-Hand Max Rayne School. This is followed by key studies on bilingual and peace education in Israel that can be applied to the Hand-in-Hand model to work through the psychological trauma of children, familial socialization, and the cycle of victimization. Furthermore, this final section covers methods from other countries that can be applied to the Hand-in-Hand model to work through structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse.

Section One: Challenges to Reconciliation

This section of the literature presents specific challenges to the reconciliation process in Israel. In doing so, the section first examines the history of Israeli-Palestinian conflict from the birth of Jewish and Arab nationalism to the present-day context, followed by a discussion on the cycle of victimization, structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, and familial socialization and psychological trauma. Furthermore, the section covers the history of the Israeli School System as it perpetuates the cycle of victimization, structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, and familial socialization and psychological trauma.

The historical background of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The region of present-day Israel has experienced hundreds of years of conquest by several powers including Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, "Alexander the Great, the Seleucid Empire, the Romans, the Byzantines, the Abbasid caliphate, the Tartars, the Mongols, the Mamluks, the Ottoman Turks, and the British" (Tucker, 2008, p. 9). For the purpose of this literature review, the history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will begin with the emergence of nationalism in the late 19th century. Both Palestinian and Jewish nationalism approached a course of parallel

development involving the concepts of secular political ideologies, identity, nationhood, history, religion, culture, and self-determination (Schulze, 2008).

Origins of Jewish nationalism.

Jewish nationalism matured out of the Zionist movement presented by Theodore Herzl in 1897 at the First Zionist Congress in Basel, Switzerland (Schulze, 2008). Due to the effects of the Jewish Diaspora, Herzl recognized the need for the Jewish people to obtain independent statehood (Awad, 2001). With the ideology of Western nationalism spreading across the continents of Europe and Asia, Zionism was birthed as a secular ideology determined to obtain a homeland completely dedicated to a singular Jewish nation (Schulze, 2008). Earlier, countries such as Uganda and Argentina were considered as potential regions for the future nation (Awad, 2001).

During that time, the land of Palestine was under Ottoman rule (Schulze, 2008). Ottoman legislation was based on the Shari 'a law and included a population of mainly Muslim inhabitants. Christian and Jewish inhabitants represented the minority population and were allowed to follow their own religious laws under the Ottoman rule (Cohn-Sherbok & El-Alami, 2001). The Ottoman Empire held claim to a vast area of land, yet its power in the region was slowly diminishing (Cohn-Sherbok & El-Alami, 2001; Schulze, 2008). Recognizing the political instability of the region and the relation of the area to the Jewish historical homeland, the Zionist Congress of 1897 made the decision to obtain a homeland for Jewish people by focusing on "the promotion of Jewish immigration to Palestine and the acquisition of land" (Schulze, 2008, p. 4). Following this, large numbers of Jewish people began immigrating to Palestine. The first *Aliyah*, or Jewish immigration to Palestine, occurred from 1182 to 1903. By 1903, approximately 25,000 Jewish people arrived (Cohn-Sherbok & El-Alami, 2001). The numbers soared during

the second *Aliyah* from 1904 to 1913, and resulted in the immigration of 60,000 Jewish people from Russia and Eastern Europe as many escaped the Russian revolution (Schulze, 2008).

Origins of Arab nationalism.

Unlike Jewish nationalism, Arab nationalism developed with the objective of gaining independence from the Ottoman Empire (Schulze, 2008). With the onset of World War I (WWI), the British entered the war with footholds in the Arabian Peninsula and the Gulf (Cohn-Sherbok & El-Alami, 2001). During WWI, as the German railroad extended into the Persian Gulf, Britain found interest in resisting Germany's expansion (Cohn-Sherbok & El-Alami, 2001). As the Ottoman Turks aligned with Germany in the war, the British high commissioner in Cairo, Egypt, Sir Henry McMohan, negotiated for the support of the Hashemite leader, Sharif Hussein of Mecca, using the Hussein-McMahon Correspondence in 1915 (Schulze, 2008). The negotiations established that the Arab territory would be returned to the Arab Sovereignty if the Sharif maintained allegiance with the Allies in opposition to the Ottomans (Cohn-Sherbok & El-Alami, 2001). Thus, the Arab Palestinians have claimed that they were promised the land of Palestine (Schulze, 2008).

Conflicting promises of the British.

Prior to the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire in 1917, the European countries made plans to colonize, occupy, and impose special administrative zones in the Middle East (Gelvin, 2011). One of those plans involved the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement of May 1916 between Great Britain and France which aimed at preventing Russian influence in the region (Gelvin, 2011). This agreement mapped out the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire by dividing Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, and Palestine into various French and British-administered areas (Schulze,

2008). It is possible to see how these agreements conflicted with the pledges already given by the British to the Hashimite leader, Husayn ibn Ali, Sharif of Mecca (Schulze, 2008).

In addition to the Hussein-McMahon Correspondence and the Sikes-Picot Agreement, the British Foreign Secretary, Arthur James Balfour, sent the Balfour Declaration to Lord Rothschild, a leader of the Jewish community in Britain (Schulze, 2008). On November 2, 1917, the Balfour Declaration presented the following statement:

> His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a
> national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the
> achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which
> may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in
> Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.
> (Schulze, 2008, pp. 114-115).

It is important to recognize that neither the Balfour Declaration nor the Hussein-McMahon Correspondence specifically delineated the actual borders of the territory promised by the British. However, both Jewish and Arab Nationalists have argued that Palestine was rightly promised to them (Schulze, 2008). These competing nationalistic pursuits are at the center of the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Schulze, 2008).

British mandate: 1918 to 1947.

As the Ottoman Empire dissipated in 1917, the British obtained mandate over the land from 1918 to 1947 (Cohn-Sherbok & El-Alami, 2001). During this time, the British set up a military government in Palestine (Schulze, 2008). Because the British made several promises according to political interests, both Jewish and Arab nationalists were skeptical of British intentions (Schulze, 2008). Due to increased Jewish immigration, many Arabs speculated that

the British were planning to hold onto Palestine until there was an increase in the Jewish population in Palestine. The Jewish people similarly thought that Britain was secretly arming the Palestinian Arabs while restricting Jewish immigration. Therefore, the growing mistrust of British policies led to a series of civil disturbances from 1920 until 1936 (Schulze, 2008).

During this period, rising anti-Semitic ideology in Europe in combination with restricted immigration policies, (an example is U.S. President Roosevelt's restricted immigration policy from 1933 to 1938) left Palestine as the only open option for Jewish immigration (Schulze, 2008). From 1930 to 1936, the Jewish population rose from 164,000 to 370,000 (Schulze, 2008). Such increases in immigration were presented as a threat to Palestinian statehood and led to the Arab Revolt of 1936 (Tucker, 2008). In response to this revolt, the Peel Commission Partition Plan of 1937 was created to divide the land among the Jewish people and the Palestinians. Awad (2001) presents that in 1937, the Arabs of Palestine lived in over 94% of the land, while the Jewish people (native Palestinian Jews and recent immigrants together) lived in less than 6% of the land (Awad, 2001). He further states that approximately 395,836 (about 28 percent) of the 1,401,794 people living in Palestine at that time were Jewish (Awad, 2001). The Peel Commission suggested that the land would be partitioned to accommodate both Palestinians and Jewish nationalists (Schulze, 2008). Palestinians living in the land prior to Jewish immigration did not agree with the partition plan. Attempting to provide a better solution, the British government issued the "MacDonald White Paper" in 1939 (Cohn-Sherbok & El-Alami, 2001). In this document, the British rescinded the 1937 partition decision stating that the Balfour Declaration "could not have intended that Palestine should be converted into a Jewish State against the will of the Arab population of the country." The MacDonald White Paper furthermore moved in a pro-Arab direction by limiting Jewish immigration to 15,000 per year

until 1944 (Schulze, 2008). This restricted the passage of the Jewish people to Palestine during the period of the Holocaust from 1939 to 1944. To counter the restriction, 40,000 Jews immigrated illegally in 1940 despite the issuing of the MacDonald White Paper (Schulze, 2008).

With the coming of the Second World War in 1939, the British Empire was in decline, its economic situation was worsening, and it was becoming too costly to maintain the mandate over Palestine (Schulze, 2008). The pressures of anti-Semitism and the refusal of refugees into Palestine during the holocaust led to a full scale uprising of the Jewish people against the British in 1947, where Jewish militants "killed 147 British soldiers and wounded 133 others" (Schulze, 2008, p. 11). These factors led to the withdrawal of the British and placed the responsibility of Palestine into the hands of the United Nations (Tucker, 2008).

1947 UN Partition Plan.

On November 29, 1947, the UN developed a partition plan to allot 56% of the land to the Jewish people and 43% of the land to the Palestinians (Abu-Saad, 2006). The UN voted 33 to 13 in favor of a new partitioning of the land with 10 abstentions (Schulze, 2008). The UN's partition plan led to objections from both Jewish and Arab people; however, the Jewish Agency decided to accept the partition (Awad, 2001). The Palestinians, who still accounted for about 65% of the population, were being allotted 46% of the land while 35% of the Jewish population was being granted 54% of the land (Awad, 2001). Awad (2001) argues that the rationale for this partition includes guilt for anti-Semitism, restricting borders during the Holocaust for Jewish Immigration, and Europe's refugee problem of increased Jewish immigrants.

The 1948 War.

Despite the disapproval of the partition by the Palestinians, the Jewish Agency declared the territory allotted to them as the state of Israel on May 14, 1948 (Schulze, 2008). This led

Egyptian, Lebanese, Jordanian, Syrian, and Iraqi troops to attack the new Jewish state in order to liberate Palestine (Cohn-Sherbok & El-Alami, 2001). Despite the overarching aim of liberating Palestine, each Arab state pursued its own political and territorial interests. These Arab armies were poorly trained and lost their momentum for battle within a month of the campaign to liberate Palestine (Schulze, 2008). During this time, Zionist groups began evicting Palestinian families from the regions that were allotted to them in the Partition plan while other Palestinian families left the region with hopes to return soon after the area stabilized (Awad, 2001; Schulze, 2008). By June 11, 1948, a truce was declared by the UN between the warring Arab and Israeli forces (Cohn-Sherbok &El-Alami, 2001).

By the end of 1948, Israel increased its territory by 21 percent compared with resolution boundaries and approximately 500,000 to 800,000 Palestinian refugees were displaced (Schulze, 2008). Abu Musa (2008) states that the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948 led to the displacement of approximately three quarters of a million Palestinian refugees to areas under Egyptian control in the Gaza Strip and to areas under Jordanian control in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. Palestinians were either driven out of the land by militant forces or fled with hopes of returning after the 1948 war (Abu Musa, 2008). Statistics surrounding the number of Palestinian refugees are often debated. However, Schulze (2008) states that both sides can concur that approximately 150,000 Palestinians remained in the land.

Cohn-Sherbok & El-Alami (2001) state that the aftermath of the war led to 418 Palestinian towns and villages that were either destroyed or depopulated by Israeli forces to provide homes for Jewish families. Furthermore, Awad (2001) explains that Zionist forces surrounded Palestinian homes with weapons and forced the Palestinian people to leave. Awad (2001) concludes that the Jewish people in Europe were forced from their homes due to

pogroms, and similarly, Palestinians were forced to leave their homeland through a process called Zionist ethnic cleansing. Palestinians relocated to Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, and other surrounding states (Awad, 2001).

The 1956 Suez War and the 1967 War.

In 1956, Gamal Abdel Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal of Egypt (Tucker, 2008). The UK, France, and Israel then created a plan to invade the Sinai and reoccupy the canal (Schulze, 2008). Counter to these plans, U.S. concerns for soviet intervention led the UN to approve the decision to place pressure on the three nations in order to cease their attempts to attack the Suez Canal (Tucker, 2008). Although Nasser did not win the war, he emerged on the winning side because he was the only Arab leader to challenge the West and to expel the British, French, and Israel from the territory (Schulze, 2008). This led to great expectations for Nasser to obtain Palestine from Israel and furthermore instigated the 1967 Six Day War (Gelvin, 2011).

Nasser's decision to close the straits of Tiran, border tensions between surrounding countries and Israel, and the movement of Egyptian troops into the Sinai, posed as a possible threat to Israel (Schulze, 2008). In response to this threat, on June 5, 1967, Israel launched well-coordinated strikes on Egypt and Syria (Tucker, 2008). Israel, as the nation that intentionally launched the first attack, had much time to prepare in comparison to the un-unified countries of Syria, Jordan, and Egypt (Schulze, 2008). Israel claimed victory after a mere six days and the results of the war left the Sinai and Gaza of Egypt, the Golan Heights of Syria, and the West Bank annexed by Jordan, under the territorial possession of Israel (Cohn-Shernok & El-Alami, 2001).

1973 Yom Kippur War to present.

Syria attempted to seize the Golan Heights during the 1973 Middle East war (Gelvin, 2011). Israel and Syria agreed to sign an armistice in 1974 and the UN observer force began overseeing the ceasefire line from 1974 to this present-day (Gelvin, 2011). Following this, in September 1978, Israel agreed to return the Sinai to Egypt in adherence to the Camp David Peace Accords (Tucker, 2008). The West Bank and Gaza strip still remain under Israeli occupation to this present day. This has led to a series of Intifadas between 1987 and 2000 as well as further peace talks through the Oslo Accords of the 1990s (Schulze, 2008). Conflicts between Israeli and Palestinian nationalists over the right to the land remain as a stagnating factor of the peace process (Schulze, 2008).

Definition: Israeli and Palestinian.

It is important to explain the characteristics of Israeli-Jewish and Palestinian-Arabs over the course of the development of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Under the Ottoman period, the Turkic people in the land of present-day Israel lived amongst one another while practicing Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (Cohn-Sherbok & El-Alami, 2001). Under the British Mandate, the name Palestine was readopted and the people of the land—Jewish, Christian, and Muslim alike—were referred to as Palestinians living in the land of Palestine (Muslih, 1988).

With the waves of Jewish immigrants making *Aliyah* to the land, many Israeli-Jewish citizens in present-day Israel have European origins apart from the land of Palestine (Schulze, 2008). These Jewish inhabitants have a common factor of holding a Jewish identity due to their matriarchal lineage, yet range in religious practice from secular to Ashkenazi, and Hasidic (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). Jewish Palestinians who were inhabitants of the land before the Zionist movement and the increased waves of immigration, in addition to the Jewish people

emigrating from surrounding Arab countries have now integrated into the mainstream identity of speaking Hebrew and maintaining Jewish Nationalism (Awad, 2001).

The term *Palestinian* may refer to the Christians, Muslims, and Jewish people that lived in the region of present-day Israel and surrounding Arab countries prior to the increased Jewish immigration (Awad, 2001). Due to the mainstream Jewish nationalism, Palestinians are now referred to as Arabs living in the land of present-day Israel and in the surrounding Arab countries due to refugee displacement (Schulze, 2008). It is important to note that there are several Arab Israelis who have Israeli citizenship and live in the state of Israel and the occupied territories. These Palestinians are often referred to as Arabs although they hold Israeli citizenship ("Q&A: Israeli Arabs," 2009).

Significant cultural differences exist between the Israeli-Jewish people and the Arab Palestinians (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). These differences are important factors to consider when working to understand reconciliation models designed for the two groups. Israelis tend to operate along Western ideals involving the achievement of reconciliation in the shortest and fastest ways, promoting individualism, and seeking an equal distribution of power while Palestinians focus on collectivism and seek to establish personal acquaintance and trust with the other side (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). Bekerman and Nir (2006) present that Israelis tend to begin meetings by asserting their values while Palestinians inquire about the other group's opinions and are more attentive and less directive than the Israelis. Furthermore, Palestinians hold high respect for age and seniority (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). It is further important to note that many identity components of the Palestinian and Jewish people have formulated as each group's nationalistic identity has been in direct opposition to one another (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). Close attention must be paid to these factors when considering reconciliation models in Israel.

Israel as an intractable conflict: Three significant challenges to reconciliation.

The context of the Israeli-Palestinian history in addition to the identity of the Palestinian and Jewish people has led to the formation of an intractable conflict in Israel (Salomon & Nevo, 2002). Intractable conflict occurs in regions of tension between collectives rather than individuals; the conflict is deeply rooted in collective narratives of a painful shared memory of the past, and has marked inequalities between two groups (Azar, 1990). The conflict in Israel is presented as an intractable conflict by looking specifically at the following three responses in the literature: (1) the cycle of victimization, (2) structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, and (3) familial socialization and psychological factors associated with children. It is important to note that key factors should be considered when approaching reconciliation in the Israeli-Palestinian context.

The cycle of victimization: Key terms.

Prior to examining the cycle of victimization as a response to Israeli-Palestinian conflict, several key terms must be defined:

Key Term	Definition
Social Role	"A set of expectations of people who occupy a given social position or status" (Schaefer, 2004, p. 431).
Social Identity	The development of identity through fulfilling a social role in society (Berko & Edna, 2005).
Dehumanization	"A process by which people are viewed as less than human with negative emotions such as contempt, hatred, or fear toward the other" (Zembylas, 2007, p. 208).
The Other	A people group that has a marked ethnic and cultural distinctness from one's own identity (Volf, 1996).
Bystanders	External groups and nations or internal groups that encourage perpetrators by remaining idle in a dehumanizing situation. Bystanders are influenced by cultural preconditions and are socially learned to devalue victims (Staub, 1999).
Unhealed Group Trauma	This occurs "when a group has experienced great suffering due to persecution and violence at the hands of others, it is more likely to respond to renewed threat with violence" (Staub, 1999, p. 310).
Group Identity	"This formulates when difficult life conditions lead individuals to turn to the group for identity and connection" (Staub, 1999, p. 306).
Scapegoating	"Claiming that some other group is responsible for life's problems" leading to the "creation of ideologies" and ideal social arrangements (Staub, 1999, p. 306). These satisfy the need for identity.
Collective Guilt	When an in-group is accused of harming another group, two routes of collective guilt occur: (a) "Attempt to minimize or deny their group's responsibility for harm done to another group or (b) they can legitimize their group's harmful actions" (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008, p. 989).
Moral Exclusivism	Denial that excludes "the other" and leads to dehumanization (Opotow, 2001).
Rehumanization	Empathizing with "the other" to see him in human terms, imagining the perspective of the other and realizing that the other is similar to oneself; "finding commonality through identification with the 'enemy' is perhaps the most difficult and yet profound step in the rehumanisation of the Other" (Zembylas, 2007, p. 208).

The cycle of victimization.

In the literature, the cycle of victimization is explained as a response to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Berko & Edna, 2005). The primary factor to consider in the cycle of victimization is the social identity of an individual. In society, members will feel the need to fulfill a social role in order to develop their identity and to function (Berko & Edna, 2005).

These social roles will be limited to the norms and moral code that keeps the society functioning (Cobb, 2006). Cobb (2006) further argues that the cycle of victimization will begin if the victim(s) suffers from the actions of another intending to inflict harm. When these actions force the victim to participate in the violation of core moral standards in a public sphere, his/her suffering and forced-participation is witnessed by others (Cobb, 2006). If public humiliation is combined with stagnation from bystanders and directly contrasts with the moral code of society, it leads to the dehumanization of the victim. The dehumanization leaves the victim feeling debased and worthless. This creates a need for the fulfillment of a social role to obtain an identity and feel a sense of worth and belonging (Volf, 1996). At this point, the victim is willing to similarly abandon all social norms to fulfill his/her own identity needs (Cobb, 2006). As multiple members in society experience similar situations, the unhealed group trauma leads the victim to fulfill his/her social role through the development of a group identity. The victim can then justify bringing harm to others (i.e., through dying an honorable death to bring pride to family members in a collectivist society or scapegoating) by fulfilling his/her loyal role to the group (Berko & Edna, 2005). Collective guilt present in society legitimizes the promise that the moral injustice will be punished through counter-violence (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008). By reacting out of vengeance, the victim is able to regain pride while adopting a new social identity. Moral exclusivism leads the victim to dehumanize the victimizer (Opotow, 2001). Thus, the victim becomes the victimizer (Cobb, 2006).

Cycle of victimization: In relation to Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The following three issues are discussed in relation to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: mutual victimization on a national level, an example of the cycle of victimization in application to Palestinians, and an example of the cycle of victimization in application to Jewish Israelis.

Mutual victimization on a national level occurs when both Israeli and Palestinian nationalists strive to fulfill needs for identity, security, recognition, and justice (Staub, 1999). When the needs of Palestinian nationalists are not met due to failed recognition of their statehood or when the needs of Jewish Nationalists are not met due to threats to their security, there is a debasing of national identity and security that contributes to escalating the conflict (Staub, 1999). For example, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) refused to discuss the peace process with Israel until Israel stopped viewing the PLO as having intentions of destroying Israel and the international community recognized the Palestinian Liberation Organization's identity (Bar-Tal, 2004). This demonstrates the need for a fulfillment of identity and self-determination in order to decrease the aggressive response in the cycle of victimization. In regards to Israel, the U.S. as a bystander perpetuates this cycle by constantly vetoing attempts to end Israeli occupation ("U.S. vetoes U.N.," 2011). This failed recognition creates shame for the Palestinian nationalists. In the Israeli-Palestinian case, both groups experience mutual victimization and claim that their actions have been defensive. This makes it difficult for each group to recognize its wrongdoing and continually perpetuates repeated violence toward one another (Opotow, 2001)

In terms of the cycle of victimization in relation to the Palestinian people, there is a moral code in Palestinian culture that includes respect for elders and a strong avoidance of public shame ("Not only," 2001). That moral code is violated daily when Palestinians pass through the various checkpoints between the occupied territories and Israel. Several of these checkpoints are controlled by Israeli soldiers (Derfner, 2007). When an older Muslim Palestinian woman passes through the checkpoint and is forced to publicly remove her hijab in front of a crowd of people or and elder Palestinian man is being yelled at by a young 18 year-old Jewish man in front of his children, this creates a direct violation of moral code through humiliation (Berko & Edna, 2005).

The Palestinian can then become dehumanized by the public humiliation at the checkpoint passages, and he can seek to redeem his pride through any means—even to the point of dying an honorable death in commitment to his family as a suicide bomber (Berko & Edna, 2005). In this case, the collective guilt related to the Palestinian claims of being victimized further justifies the actions of violence and can continually perpetuate the cycle (Berko & Edna, 2005).

An application of this cycle is seen in the Palestine-Israel Journal (2001) through a discussion with a young child at the Boy's school in Qalandia refugee camp:

What would you like to be when you grow up? The answer from every single child was that he would like to become a martyr. This is not brainwashing. This is a reflection of the despair and the lack of hope these children have for the future. If children of thirteen, fourteen years old have so little hope that their only aim in life is to be killed, I think this is a terrible reflection of the whole situation. It's one of the saddest things I have ever heard. And as I said, it's not that anyone has told them this is how you become a hero. This is what they see and hear. They can't envision any jobs for themselves, or any form of life that they consider worth living with human dignity. ("Not only," 2001, p. 73).

This statement shows how dehumanization can fuel the cycle of victimization in the Palestinian people.

The cycle of victimization was also evident when Jewish people were once victimized by the Nazi Holocaust (Wohl & Branscombe, 2006). Jewish-Israelis do not wish to have their security further threatened by the nationalist pursuits of Palestinian statehood. Evidence supporting that claim is presented as Staub (1999) states that perpetrators often carry feelings of prior victimization and victimization deeply affects the quality of life of victimized people such

as Holocaust survivors that experience pain, distress, and emotional problems later in life. In an experiment on collective victimization conducted by Wohl and Branscombe, (2006) "Jewish Canadians who were reminded of the Holocaust accepted less collective guilt for their group's harmful actions toward the Palestinians than those not reminded of their in-groups' past victimization" (p. 988). Remembering the in-group's past therefore affects the responses to the out-group in the present. Furthermore, Staub (1999) states that although Israelis have a far superior military, the Israeli-Jewish people are still concerned with a potential military threat from Palestinian revolutionaries. The collective memory causes Israelis to think that they are subject to a similar threat (Staub, 1999). The Palestine-Israel Journal (2001) connects the victimized Israeli as the victimizer by presenting that abused Palestinian children become abusers as the Jewish people have been abused in the past and are now abusing another nation ("Not only," 2001).

Structural discrimination.

The intractable nature of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict furthermore presents structural discrimination within Israel (Staub, 1999). Opotow (2001) offers that structural discrimination refers to inequalities structured into society where some individuals have access to social resources with high quality education, healthcare, social status, wealth, and comfortable and adequate housing while others do not. Structural discrimination does not blame one person, but rather the blame is unclear, causing those harmed to perceive themselves as responsible for their own debilitation (Opotow, 2001). There are several key terms to be considered in relation to structural violence:

Key Term	Definition
Intractable Conflict	A conflict that continues for many years and takes place in areas of ongoing violent conflict between actual adversaries about tangible resources sustained by ethnic, national, tribal, religious narratives describing "us versus them" (Salomon & Nevo, 2002, p. 156). Narratives contain memories of past atrocities, present-day victimhood, and moral superiority over the other (Salomon & Nevo, 2002).
Tractable Conflict	A conflict that is short lived and solved by institutionalized means (Bar-Tal, 2004).
Asymmetric Power Relations	Occurs when two groups are engaged in a power struggle over scarce resources (Moaz, 2011).
Impunity	"The exemption from accountability, penalty, punishment, or legal sanction for perpetrators of illegal acts" (Opoptow, 2001, p. 149). Impunity can only thrive on silence or a special agreement for an illegal act (Opotow, 2001).
Bystanders	External groups and nations or internal groups that encourage perpetrators by remaining idle in a dehumanizing situation. Bystanders are influenced by cultural preconditions and are socially learned to devalue victims (Staub, 1999).
Political and Social Mobilization	To resist oppression and injustice to promote social and political change in society (Abu-Nimer, 2000); movement of individuals or groups from one position of a society's stratification system to another (Schaefer, 2004, p. 431).

The Israeli-Palestinian situation is an intractable conflict stemming from ongoing

violence and competition for scarce resources (Salomon & Nevo, 2002). Following the onset of

the occupation in 1967, Palestinian social structure underwent substantial change (Schulze,

2008). Traditional labor intensive agriculture declined by a third, leading to a decline in

employment between 1970 and 1991 (Brynen, 2000). This decrease in employment

opportunities was accompanied by an increase in natural population growth rates. By the start of

the peace process in 1991, the West Bank and Gaza Strip were comprised of two million

refugees with exceedingly high natural growth rates of 4 percent per year with 46 percent of the

population under the age of fourteen. By the early 1990s, approximately 60% of the West Bank

and Gaza Strip's territory was seized by Israel and by 1992, 144 Israeli settlements led to economic constraints on the land (Arnon & Weinblatt, 2001). Settlements placed limitations on the natural resource usage and restricted Palestinian exploitation of local water supplies (Chenowith & Wehrmeyer, 2006). These changes reduced the availability of productive inputs needed for growth and development for key productive branches of the Palestinian economy in agriculture, manufacturing, and services (Arnon & Weinblatt, 2001).

From this, Egger (2005) states that the Palestinian economy is dependent on the Israeli economy and the "conditions for sustained economic growth are unlikely to emerge" in the West Bank and Gaza Strip (p. 53). It is argued that a new economic course is needed to bring new economic policies that focus on promoting Palestinian exports to the world market (Whittall, 2009). That is an example of how asymmetric power relations have impeded the social and political mobilization among the Palestinians (Opotow, 2001).

Furthermore, asymmetric power relations can lead to structural discrimination (Opotow, 2001). Awad (2001) states that the Oslo Accords were signed under the Labor Party of the Israeli Parliament to consolidate a Declaration of Peace in 1993. However, once "Israeli leaders signed the peace agreements with Palestinians, they often did so without approval of the Knesset, the Israeli parliament" (Awad, 2001, p. 45). This failure on behalf of Israel's parliamentary system allowed for differing political parties to arise and to abstain from complying with the policies entailed within the Oslo negotiation process (Awad, 2001). As an example, the Likud party has been characterized by stringent nationalistic goals and less peacemaking inclinations. Awad (2001) further argues that once the Labor party was defeated in 1996 by the Likud party, the process of returning land to the Palestinians was thus hindered by the Likud abstinence to land negotiation. The dominance of the right wing political party in current Israeli-Palestinian

context continues to present structural discrimination as Netanyahu's principles underlie more stringent strongholds on the occupied territories (Awad, 2001).

Furthermore, Opotow (2001) states that illegal acts of impunity and idle external bystanders additionally stagnate the ability of Palestinians to achieve statehood and valuable resources. This is depicted in the Fourth Geneva Convention, as international law prohibits an occupying power from transferring citizens from its own territory to the occupied territory ("Land Expropriation," 2011). Despite these claims, right-wing Zionists continue to partake in the expansion of illegal settlements, causing structural discrimination toward the Palestinian people ("Land Expropriation," 2011).

Gelvin (2011) argues that the stagnation of international bystanders causes skepticism among the Palestinian people. Western influence has birthed a new era of colonialism through the expansion of Jewish settlements. Despite Western claims to reject the practice of territorial colonialism, it is interesting to note how the expansion of Jewish settlements into the occupied territories can symbolize a presence of Western colonialism still dominant in the region (Gelvin, 2011). As the earlier leader, Sharif of Mecca deemed Western promises as unreliable, so present-day Palestinians can approach the Western claim of anti-colonialism with the same skepticism (Gelvin, 2011). This skepticism has furthermore hindered attempts at reconciliation as Palestinians view the West's inability to freeze Israeli settlement expansion as the presence of Western colonialism (Gelvin, 2011).

Structural discrimination is perpetuated by the relationship between Israeli politics and the external influence of the United States (Gelvin, 2011). With the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the United States emerged as the prominent super-power eligible to prevent Communist domination in the Middle East (Gelvin, 2011). From this, the bond between Israelis and the

United States has been strengthened as "Israelis have presented their case well in the United States, portraying Israel as the sole democracy and repository of American values in the region" (Gelvin, 2011, p. 183). In fear of losing the support of a democratic foothold in the region, the United States has repeatedly vetoed all efforts to curtail Israeli expansion that have been presented before the United Nations from 1983 to the present ("U.S. vetoes U.N.," 2011). These vetoes have reduced criticism of Israeli settlement expansion and the halt of the Gaza operations (Gelvin, 2011). Gelvin (2011) further presents how the U.S. role as a member of the quartet with dominant influence upon International law has skewed international backing away from Palestinian support and hinders Palestinian attempts for statehood.

Nationalistic abuse.

In addition to structural discrimination, nationalistic abuse is a characteristic of the intractable nature of Israel (Salomon & Nevo, 2002). Staub (1999) defines nationalistic abuse as an extreme form of patriotism characterized by feelings of superiority over another group. The following key terms should be considered when defining nationalistic abuse as a response to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict:

Key Terms	Definition
Ideologies	Presented in many variations; some are positive; in response to difficult life situations the ideologies are created to identify enemies and are then destructive, e.g., Communism: holds a "claim to improve the welfare of all human beings". *Nationalistic Ideology*: comes in two forms- positive "desire to create one's own nation" and can be reasonable and constructive but then can create conflict and pursue in negative means (Staub, 1999, p. 306).
Collective Violence	Violence between groups based on discrepancies between ethnopolitical orientation and differing collective identities among group members (Staub, 1999).
Intergroup Conflict	A conflict arising from differing group interests or goals (Bar-Tal, 2004).
Collective Guilt	When an in-group is accused of harming another group, two routes of collective guilt occur: (a) "Attempt to minimize or deny their group's responsibility for harm done to another group or (b) they can legitimize their group's harmful actions" (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008, p. 989).

Nationalistic abuse develops as a group's nationalistic ideology takes form. This can occur in response to difficult life situations and can cause the nationalist to pursue negative means of identifying the enemy (Staub, 1999). When nationalism is present, a group considers its nationalistic identity to be of superior importance over another group (Staub, 1999). In relation to the Israeli-Palestinian case, Israeli Nationalism was birthed out of the secular ideology of Zionism and is validated by the dire need for the Jewish people to have a secure homeland (Schulze, 2008). Simultaneously, Palestinians lived in the land prior to the Jewish immigration waves and feel the need to obtain statehood and restore their land. This leads to collective violence and intergroup conflict as identities and ethnopolitical orientation differ (Bar-Tal, 2004).

Al-Haj (2002) states that national division between Israel and Palestine causes hegemony based on the "democratic character of the state, the Jewish Zionist nature of the state, and security considerations" (p. 172). The nationalistic power of Israel is supported by collective

memory and collective emotional orientation that justifies the abuse of power (Bar-Tal, 2004). Al-Haj (2002) demonstrates the nationalism of Israel in the "collective and formal identity of the state, institutional structure, allocation of resources, spatial policies, and determination of national priorities" (p. 173). Furthermore, the collective guilt of Israeli nationalists causes Israelis to legitimize their nationalistic actions by perceiving Palestinian relations with the surrounding Arab countries as a hostile security threat (Al-Haj, 2002). Despite the superiority of the Israeli army over the Palestinian people, this potential security risk has legitimized the control over the Palestinians (Al-Haj, 2002).

Overall, structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse can work together to stagnate the access of resources for Palestinians. In doing so, structural discrimination can cause the lesser nationalistic identity to be abused by the failure to allocate resources (Opotow, 2001). As bystanders remain idle throughout nationalistic abuse, the powerful nationalistic identity can justify their actions with collective guilt (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008). Nationalistic abuse and structural discrimination identify the situation in Israel as an intractable conflict that brings challenges to reconciliation efforts.

Familial socialization and psychological trauma of children.

Two components that developed as a result of the intractable nature of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict include the psychological trauma of children and the effect of familial socialization (Zembylas, 2007; Bekerman et al., 2009). These factors should be considered in reconciliation methods that are aimed at addressing the psychological and social responses of the children in the Israeli school system (Zembylas, 2007). In addressing these responses, the following terms must first be examined:

Key Terms	Definition
Familial Socialization	"An ongoing process whereby an individual acquires a personal identity and learns the norms, values, behavior, and social skills appropriate to his or her social position" as learned by family generations (Bar-Tal, 2004, p. 259).
Collective Memory	Situations of conflict in the past that have affected a group and are passed on to the next generation of group members through social norms and oral tradition, thus aiding constant remembrance (Berko & Edna, 2005).
Chosen Trauma	"The collective memory of a calamity that once befell a group's ancestors; a shared mental representation of the event including realistic information as well as fantasied expectations" (Zembylas, 2007, pp. 210-211).
Unhealed Group Trauma	This occurs "when a group has experienced great suffering due to persecution and violence at the hands of others, it is more likely to respond to renewed threat with violence" (Staub, 1999, p. 310).

Bekerman et al. (2009) present familial socialization as allowing for a biased remembrance of the conflict to be continually expressed through generations. Studies in identity development by Erikson show that children develop their identity when differentiating themselves from parents (Bekerman et al., 2009). It is further argued that children are aware of gender and racial differences as early as four to six years old. As children can recognize discrimination at an early age, they can mirror negative feelings toward members of an ethnic or racial group other than their own—as demonstrated by their family and peers. Therefore, prejudice appears to be learned and explained through behavioral and environmental exposure (Bekerman et al. 2009). Bekerman et al. (2009) further argue that learned socialization therefore encourages a connection of individual identities with a group identity. This can cause repeated familial generalizations, forming familial socialization (Bekerman et al., 2009). That familial socialization creates a collective memory where individual identities are rooted in ethnic, religious and national conflicts and are transferred from one generation to the next (Zembylas, 2007).

Relating this familial socialization to the psychological development of trauma within an Israeli or Palestinian child, an aspect of leading child psychology shows that "one thing that is almost guaranteed to produce racism and stereotyping is when a child sees its parents humiliated" ("Not only," 2001, p. 72). This journal further presents that a crucial need of an infant is self-esteem. When that self-esteem is inhibited due to humiliation, the child cannot relate to people in a normal way ("Not only," 2001). Furthermore, when "a people has its self-esteem systematically crushed, or its rights systematically denied," the children will psychologically respond as abusers—unable to relate in a natural way ("Not only," 2001, p. 72). As the child experiences or sees the humiliation of his/her parents and experiences systematic abuse, the basic psychological needs are hampered due to trauma and the child will feel deprived (Staub, 1999).

Furthermore, Staub (1999) presents that the frustration of basic needs will lead to psychological and social processes in individuals and groups that cause harm to members of other groups. Zembylas (2007) states that unhealed group trauma can cause the mind to reconstruct its memories under the pressures of society and formulate a chosen trauma. Traumatic narratives are therefore chosen to fit a coherent story of victimization and group identity. In this case, the identity of a person is usually deeply rooted in their groups' identity, causing even those members of a group who are not personally victimized to be deeply affected. Hatred in one generation can "pass to succeeding generations in the form of a *psychological DNA*" due to the inability to mourn the trauma (Zembylas, 2007, p. 211). Zembylas (2007) further states how the inability to mourn a trauma creates an evolution of defense mechanisms and influences. "The social and political ideologies of a traumatized group may result in a new generation embracing an ideology of revenge"—cycle of victimization (Zembylas, 2007, p. 211).

Youth therefore may be assigned the task of avenging the honor of their ancestors. Trauma is kept alive as past historical events work in the present to construct children's emotional expressions (Zembylas, 2007).

Structure and history of the Israeli school system: Israeli Minister of Education.

The centralized structure of the Israeli Educational System and the control of the Minister of Education present further challenges to the reconciliation process as both have greatly influenced the implementation of a peace education model in Israel (Bekerman & Nir, 2006).

The Israeli educational system is controlled by a centralized bureaucracy, directed by the Minster of Education (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). Such a bureaucracy requires operating the educational system and enacting educational laws on both a political and judicial level while the Israeli Minister of Education sets national educational goals, controls budget allocation, uses national performance evaluation tests for the school system, determines the national curriculum, hires teachers, and constructs new schools (Bekerman & Nir, 2006).

Bekerman and Nir (2006) further state that the Israel Compulsory Education Law currently permits parents to educate their children according to their own religious views. He continues to present that there are three different categories under which the schools are classified. First, there are official schools that are maintained by the government and local authority. The second category relates to schools that are supervised and supported by the government. The third category refers to exempt schools that are not under government supervision or support and are subject to nongovernmental control (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). The state-schools serve the nonreligious sector while the religious state-schools provide a greater prevalence of religion-based curriculum to the religious sector (Bekerman & Nir, 2006).

The development of the Israeli Educational System was based off Zionist principles (Abu-Saad, 2006; Al-Haj, 2002; Bar-Tal, 2002; Bekerman & Nir, 2006). The pre-state period from 1900 to 1948 emphasized the exclusive rights of the Jewish people to have ownership of the lands that were neglected by Palestinians (Abu-Saad, 2006; Bar-Tal, 2001). Thereby, the Zionist curriculum was formulated for students prior to the establishment of the Israeli state in 1948 (Abu-Saad, 2006). Abu-Saad (2006) argues that during the State of Israel's first twenty years of education, the national goals to develop as a new nation took precedence over educational goals. This was supported by the development of the 1953 Law of State Education. This law based the primary objectives for the educational system on "values of Jewish culture and the achievements of science, on the love of the homeland and loyalty to the state and Jewish people" (Abu-Saad, 2006, p. 710).

Al-Haj (2002) contends that Zionist-centered textbooks continued to develop in the 1950s and the 1960s under the military occupation of Israel with an emphasis on the Jewish loyalty to the state (Al-Haj, 2002). Those textbooks explained the grandeur of the Jewish past including the period of exile and the return to the homeland through the Zionist movement, yet disregarded the displacement of Arab refugees in 1948 (Al-Haj, 2002).

Al-Haj (2002) further states that in 1961, the Ministry of Education began to formulate the Arabic version of history textbooks. In doing so, history textbooks were translated from Hebrew to Arabic, verbatim. The main difference between the Hebrew and Arabic textbooks was the addition of a chapter on the history of Arabs. This chapter however, was not present in Hebrew textbooks (Al-Haj, 2002). Furthermore, as the Six Day War concluded in 1967, the "schools in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, followed the Jordanian curriculum and used Jordanian textbooks, while schools in the Gaza strip followed the Egyptian curricula and

used Egyptian textbooks" (Rihan, 2001, p. 21). Rihan (2001) argues that despite the use of the curriculum from the surrounding Arab regions, Israel did not allow for the application of improvements to the Palestinian curriculum when the Egyptian and Jordanian textbooks developed over time. This extended to the point where Libya was still presented as a Kingdom in Palestinian textbooks, years after it was officially established as a Republic (Rihan, 2001).

Al-Haj (2002) states that the deputy minister of the Ministry of Education, Aharon Yadlin, created a committee to plan a set of objectives for Arab education in 1971. However, this committee did not include an Arab representative and inevitably led to controversy. Therefore, another committee formed which considered Arab representatives for the first time and founded Arab education on "Arab culture; the achievements of science; the aspiration for peace between Israel and its neighbors; and love for the land that is shared by all citizen, and loyalty to the state of Israel (Al-Haj, 2002, p. 176). However, in 1976, the Ministry of Education removed the words "shared by all its citizens," but kept the objective to have a "love for the land." Despite making these revisions to the Arab education, the Jewish education had no such revision. Al-Haj (2002) assumes that the Arab people, despite Israeli citizenship, are not to be regarded as full citizens, yet they must remain loyal to the Israeli land.

As Al-Haj (2002) presents leading expertise in this area, he furthermore mentions that the revised Arab high school curriculum perpetuated an allegiance to the status quo of Jewish-Israeli dominance. The curriculum emphasized Jewish-Arab coexistence and the appreciation of Jewish culture. Jewish schools, however, did not include coexistence courses. Additionally, Arabs were not required to take Arab-Israeli conflict courses, yet they were required to learn about Jewish History. Al-Haj (2002) moreover contends that the Jewish people alternatively did not learn about Arab history but took nationalism courses and learned about the conflict. This shows that

Arab people are essentially not being educated on the conflict, yet are forced to maintain the current Jewish political dominance by learning about coexistence. Jewish people, on the other hand, strengthen nationalism (Al-Haj, 2002).

In the 1970s, Bar-Tal (2001) presents that the Ministry of Education developed a new policy that attempted to diverge from the primary focus on national objectives to more scholastic and psychological objectives in the school curriculum. This policy removed the portrayal of the Arab people as resistant, acknowledged Palestinian nationalism, and presented a more balanced picture of the origins of the Palestinian refugee problem (Bar-Tal, 2001). Furthermore in 1979, Al-Haj (2002) contends that the Ministry of Education published the first school textbook, "The Arab-Israeli conflict for History and Civil Studies." This textbook included Arab documents, speeches by Palestinian leaders, and material about Palestinian national aspirations (Al-Haj, 2002). Bar-Tal (2002) states that by the late 1970s, the Minister of Education published two new books, one of which described neighboring countries in peacemaking tones and openly presented issues related to the Arab minority. In doing so, the Minister of Education took a great step forward in changing negative stereotypes of Arab citizens in Israel to advance positive coexistence between the two groups (Bar-Tal, 2001).

Furthermore, from 1980 to 1983, education for coexistence began formulating through a committee that examined the relations between Jewish and Arab people (Bar-Tal, 2004). Bar-Tal (2004) argues that the plans of this committee came to fruition in 1984, when principles for a new educational policy of coexistence between Arab and Jewish people in Israel were outlined (Bar-Tal, 2004). Thus, new textbooks were created throughout the 1980s, and trainings for teachers in education for coexistence were implemented followed by an attempt to extend Arabic language instruction and the Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) management of programs

for coexistence in schools systems (Bar-Tal, 2004). However, the Intifada at the end of 1987 brought violent confrontation and the support for the policy dwindled. By 1990, the new Minister of Education had new policies that supported mainly Zionist and Jewish values (Bar-Tal, 2004).

In the 1990s, Bar-Tal (2002) states that direct discrimination against Arabs was still present in 30% of the elementary school books, 20% of junior high textbooks, 20% of secular history books, in a few geography books and in one civic studies book. The elementary textbooks hardly mentioned Arab people yet when it did, the Arab people were mainly presented with aggressive behaviors and were rarely portrayed as hospitable and friendly (Bar-Tal, 2001). Moreover, in the geography and secular history books, the Arab people were portrayed negatively as a mob which threatens, assaults, destroys, eradicates, burns, and riots the Israeli-Jewish people (Bar-Tal, 2001).

In 1994, a United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) workshop led to the decision of creating the Palestinian Curriculum Development Center in 1995 (Rihan, 2001). In 1996, this center proposed a new curriculum despite the constant postponement due to unavailable resources. Furthermore, Rihan (2001) states that the Palestinian Curriculum Development Center created a five-year educational development plan for the 2000-2001 school year. This developed under the supervision of the Ministry of Education for all subjects and grades. The curriculum defined Israel as foreign to the Middle East and utilized maps to show the division of Palestine under the British mandate (Rihan, 2001).

By the end of the 1990s, the Jewish Israeli school curriculum slowly began introducing the Arab people as possible victims of the 1948 refugee displacement (Bar-Tal, 2001). The textbooks still failed to present geographic maps showing pre-1948 Arab settlements. Instead,

there are only Jewish settlements shown (Bar-Tal, 2001). Bar-Tal (2001) argues that the country

is therefore portrayed as a land that has been promised to the Jewish people rather than a cultural

and geographical region where Jewish colonization transpired. Nearing the end of the 20th

century, Abu-Saad (2006) presents a 17-year old Jewish student that describes the Jewish school

system in 1999:

> Our books basically tell us that everything the Jews do is fine and legitimate and Arabs
>
> are wrong and violent and are trying to exterminate us … They teach us that Israel
>
> became a state in 1948 and that the Arabs started a war. They don't mention what
>
> happened to the Arabs—they never mention anything about refugees or Arabs having to
>
> leave their towns and homes. (p. 714).

Despite efforts to improve the Arab image in the Israeli School system, Jewish students still held

a negative view of the Arab people (Abu-Saad, 2006).

In June 2001, the Minister of Education, Limor Livnat, stated that she would like to see

that "there is not a single child in Israel who doesn't learn the basics of Jewish and Zionist

knowledge and values" (Abu-Saad, 2006, p. 710). These goals were endorsed by programs such

as the "100 basic concepts" curriculum unit where a third of the concepts in the curriculum were

devoted to Jewish heritage (Abu-Saad, 2006). Furthermore, the Jewish school system utilized a

list entitled "Concepts in Jewish heritage," whereas the Arab schools utilized a list entitled,

"Concepts in Arab heritage for the Arabic sector." This denotes that the Arab heritage should

not extend into any other sector of Israeli society (Abu-Saad, 2006). Abu-Saad (2006) further

presents that the "100 basic concepts" show how the 1953 policy has been renewed and

reaffirmed as Palestinians have no say in the formulation of their educational policy to determine

its aims, goals and curriculum (Abu-Saad, 2006). This is further depicted as the Arab school

system maintains a separate curriculum yet it is directed by the Israeli ministry of education

(Abu-Saad, 2006). In this sense, the Arab educators cannot obtain any form of decision-making

authority. Golan-Agnon (2005) supports this in the following quote by a Jewish administrator:

> The Arab head of the Arab education system has no authority or budget; he never even
>
> says anything at the meetings. Between us, we call him 'the plant.' His deputy, a Jewish
>
> man appointed but the security service, actually runs the department. (p. 207).

The history of the Israeli School System has developed overtime based on Jewish principles and

has led to significant challenges for the integration of reconciliation models integrated into the

school system (Abu-Saad, 2006).

Three significant challenges to reconciliation in the Israeli-school system.

Cycle of victimization.

After detailing the development of the Israeli school system, it is possible to see how the

Israeli state-sponsored curriculum in Arab schools promotes the cycle of victimization. The

cycle of victimization occurs when a member experiences dehumanization through perpetuated

injustices, leading to the fulfillment of a social-role created out of vengeance (Cobb, 2006). The

Israeli curriculum is aimed at suppressing the Palestinians' collective memory by teaching

coexistence courses while removing courses on the Arab-Israeli conflict (Abu-Saad, 2006). By

suppressing the collective memory without providing proper compensation, the education system

fosters bitterness and creates resistance (Abu-Saad, 2006). Furthermore, research by the

Israel/Palestine Center for Research and Information (2012) presents Palestinian and Israeli

textbooks in 2004 as omitting "the other" account of the conflict. Both textbook accounts

address the suffering of the corresponding group as a victim but omit the suffering of the other

side. This presentation of the victim in combination with the bitterness of suppressed collective

memory in Palestinian textbooks can perpetuate the cycle of victimization (Israeli-Palestine Center, 2012). The Israeli school system presents negative effects on the victim-victimizer relationship (Abu-Saad, 2006).

Structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse.

Abu-Saad (2006) presents that structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse is encouraged through the centralized nature of the educational system in Israel. This system grants the Ministry of Education to authority to create the guidelines for the curriculum and approve school textbooks. Because of this, the school textbooks influence what the students learn and are used as a mechanism of social control (Abu-Saad, 2006). Bar-Tal (2001) states that school textbooks do not present knowledge that is politically neutral but rather, the information constructs a specific nationalistic social reality that is selected based on a political process. Furthermore, Al-Haj (2002) demonstrates how the curriculum reflects the power system that exists in the wider society. These factors show how the education system is a mechanism of control and a tool for perpetuating structural discrimination and supporting the dominant ideology.

Structural discrimination is further present as the educational system perpetuates an unequal distribution of resources to the Arab sector (Arar, 2012; Bekerman, 2009; Cobb, 2006). The discrimination in resource allocation has led to poorer educational outcomes and lower matriculation rates for Arab students (Abu-Saad, 2006). Furthermore, the Arab educational system is controlled by the Israeli Minister of Education and does not allow Palestinians to maintain power in the decision making process for educational policies (Arar, 2012). Therefore, educational policies serve as a mechanism of control by securing Jewish hegemony while maintaining the inferiority of Palestinian students (Abu-Nimber, 2000; Bekerman, 2006).

Familial socialization and psychological trauma.

Zembylas (2007) presents familial socialization as occurring when an individual identifies with the prevalent social norms and retells these perceptions to the next generation. Abu-Saad (2006) contends that the Israeli school system perpetuates this generational thought by emphasizing the Jewish identity in the curriculum over the span of sixty years while failing to recognize Arab national identity. Bekerman and Nir (2006) present national identity issues as being reinforced by the school system through the recognition of national holidays. Furthermore, the Ministry of Education memorializes the 1948 Independence Day yet encourages a separate ceremony for the Palestinian people in commemoration of the Nakba (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). National identification with the Palestinian authority in the school system is recognized as denying Israel the right to a Jewish state and is not permitted (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). This, combined with the centralized Israeli Public Education Policy curriculum in Jewish Israeli schools, has led to the explicit and implicit construction of racist and threatening stereotypes. This creates a one-sided historical narrative that encourages the Jewish Israeli psyche to maintain a deeply divided society (Abu-Saad, 2006).

Section Two: Reconciliation Methods in the Israeli-Palestinian Context

This section of the literature presents reconciliation methods that have been applied in Israel. The first segment details the most fitting reconciliation methods applicable to regions of intractable conflict. Afterward, the section presents the following reconciliation models that have been implemented in Israel: history education, coexistence models, joint-projects model, confrontational model, and storytelling. Following this, the section argues the nature of each

reconciliation model and its implications for perpetuating or working through the cycle of victimization, structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, and familial socialization and the psychological trauma of children.

Reconciliation methods in regions of intractable conflict.

Based on the history of Israeli-Palestinian relations previously discussed, the intractable conflict in Israel contains social, emotional, political and psychological components that interweave together to influence conflicting groups (Salomon & Nevo, 2002). Because of the interlaced nature of this conflict, there is no one-size-fits-all blueprint for reconciliation. Opotow (2001) presents that every society has its own circumstances and each conflict has particular characteristics that need to be taken into account as a society proceeds toward reconciliation. A particular reconciliation model will vary depending on the situation prior to the conflict, how large a portion of the population experienced human rights violations, whether or not human rights violations were committed by both parties, how much time has passed, and whether the regime presiding over reconciliation is responsible for the violence (Opotow, 2001). Furthermore, it is important to note that forgiveness in the context of an intractable conflict is an important characteristic of reconciliation because it promotes better well-being and self-esteem (Staub, 1999; Zembylas, 2007).

Development of reconciliation models in Israel.

The development of reconciliation in the Israeli educational system began sporadically with planned encounters in Israel in the 1950s and continued through the 1960s and 1970s (Moaz, 2011). Pettigrew (1998) presents Allport's Contact Hypothesis as the first model for planned contact between groups. This model was first implemented in Israel by Yehuda Amir, yet much of the theory referred to conditions under optimal solutions (Moaz, 2011). Moaz (2011) argues that these conditions were not conducive to the intractable nature of the Israeli-

Palestinian conflict. In the 1980s however, planned encounters between Jewish and Palestinian citizens of Israel had unprecedented growth and reconstructed its primary objectives (Moaz, 2011). Moaz (2011) attributes the development to growing the right-wing extremism, increased anti-democracy, and anti-Arab tendencies among Israeli Jews. These events led to severe concern among Jewish educators for the expansion of planned contact intervention (Moaz, 2011). Furthermore, Bekerman (2007) contends that the initiation of coexistence methods were necessary to combat the growing fears that the racist ideology of the Kach party would cause Israel would reject its democratic nature. These fears arose due to the publication of a survey that disclosed anti-democratic attitudes among Jewish Israeli youth towards the Palestinian minority (Bekerman, 2007). The coexistence sector therefore developed to focus on the creation of formal and informal educational dialogue activities (Bekerman, 2007). Thus, "intergroup encounters, designed to overcome distrust and hostility and contribute to co-existence, were initiated" (Bekerman, 2007, p. 23).

Moaz (2011) supports the claim that multiple encounter programs expanded in the 1980s involving one-time encounters, long-term meetings, diverse demographic groups, and university students, professors, and other professionals. The planned encounters generally encouraged eight to twelve participants of Jewish and Palestinian backgrounds and were facilitated by Jewish and Arab facilitators (Moaz, 2011). Moaz (2011) a leading researcher in coexistence studies, further presents that these efforts were strengthened in the early 1990s due to the Oslo Accords, but then recently suffered a setback due to the intifada. Moaz (2011) claims that educational objectives reflect the political mood—they were strengthened with Oslo Accords but retreated when there was a failure to secure peace. Furthermore, Bekerman (2007) contends a prevailing argument that Jewish-Israelis seek to maintain the political status quo by helping Palestinian-

Israelis through education rather than providing significant political-structural change. Education in the midst of reconciliation therefore has been criticized as a method to perpetuate structural discrimination (Bekerman, 2007). However, " just as education can be used as a tool to promote division and heighten inter-group hatred, it can also be an essential component in the cultivation of peace, democracy, tolerance and the rebuilding of social relations" (Hodgkin, 2006, p. 202). The reconciliation process within the Israeli educational system is presented in the following section.

Reconciliation models in Israel.

Historical educational approach.

The historical educational approach is not fully developed in Israel (Abu-Saad, 2006). The information in this section serves as content that can enhance the history education model in Israel. Pingel (2008) presents history education as a model to combat the cycle of victimization and familial socialization through two primary roles: to explain why the conflict happened and to deliver a new narrative that consolidates rifts from the past. Yogev (2010) affirms this by contending that the creation of a new historical narrative that reconciles the past historical account will free Israeli and Palestinian students from identifying themselves as the victim. This is done through utilizing history as a critical literacy to develop critical and independent historical thinkers (Yogev, 2010).

Yogev (2010) explains that history as critical literacy can portray how historical knowledge was created, how historians handle it, the conceptual lenses of Palestinian and Israeli accounts, and how it affects others. Pingel (2008) argues that this can be dangerous in practice because the open dialogue of historical accounts that explain the origins of violence can be overpowered by remembrance narratives. Despite this, Yogev (2010) contends that children can

be challenged to move beyond this frustration and learn how to critically analyze the past account. Consequently, the purpose of teaching history in a democracy is not to instill rigid ideology but to foster education for independent thinking. These efforts will significantly lower the rifts of animosity between the two groups (Yogev, 2010).

Salomon & Nevo (2002) furthermore, recognize that history education needs to address the reason behind why wars are created, why lives are destroyed, and why others are devalued. This will allow students to recognize why they are more prone to follow those who lead them into ethnocentrism, hatred, and bigotry (Salomon & Nevo, 2002). Furthermore, Salomon & Nevo (2002) present that the historical approach should provide pedagogy of justice by attributing the bitterness and violent actions of a group to repressed frustrations that are rooted in deprivation of dignity. In doing so, the individual's own advantages will be confronted rather than blaming the disadvantaged or oppressed (Salomon & Nevo, 2002).

As leading researchers in peace education, Salomon & Nevo (2002) further argue that history education in a war-centered society needs to include narratives that are as fascinating as the epics of war yet demonstrate why war-waging is an expression of aggression that originates from cowardice. The model needs to reduce positive war culture by showing stories of Egyptian, Israeli, and Jordanian men crippled for life next to the positive war victory maps in the historical account of the 1967 war. It is the responsibility of the winning side to head the efforts of peacemaking and to compensate victims of war in order to start a healing process of both sides (Salomon & Nevo, 2002).

Coexistence model.

Coexistence: a condition that serves as a fundamental prerequisite for the evolvement of advanced harmonious intergroup relations through recognizing the other group, living peacefully

with the other, accepting the other as an equal partner, and resolving violence in nonviolent ways (Bar-Tal, 2004).

The coexistence model creates a space for acceptance of the other through planned contact and recognition of the cycle of violence, yet it perpetuates continual structural discrimination. Focusing foremost on the perpetuation of structural discrimination, Moaz (2011) presents that the coexistence model was adopted from the U.S. in the 1980s as the first model of planned contact and remains the dominant model in Israel. The model promotes mutual understanding and tolerance between Jewish and Arab people, addresses stereotypes, and fosters positive intergroup attitudes (Moaz, 2011). Additionally, Moaz (2011) argues that the model emphasizes the cultural and language commonalities of each group that fail to confront issues on the conflict.

Despite the ability to allow for contact between Israeli and Palestinian students, the model perpetuates structural discrimination by supporting the status quo of existing structural relations rather than seeking social and political change (Moaz, 2011). For example, the apolitical nature of the model presents noncontroversial commonalities, yet avoids painful disagreements. By focusing on individual-level change yet failing to address collective and institutionalized discrimination, Moaz (2011) contends that this type of model can be viewed as immoral by intentionally perpetuating asymmetrical power relations. It is also important to note that the coexistence model is generally utilized by organizations that display high Jewish dominance in hierarchy while maintaining a low representation of Palestinians in the distribution of resources (Moaz, 2011). This coexistence model is the prevailing model in the field of reconciliation, yet preserves Jewish dominance and encourages Arab submissiveness (Moaz, 2011).

Furthermore, Bar-Tal (2004) states that the coexistence model can work through the cycle of victimization. The coexistence model initiates reconciliation by first creating an awareness of the group's role in rationalizing the goals that led to the conflict, devaluing the opponent by discriminating terms, making the opponent responsible for the conflict, and focusing on the violent acts of the group (Bar-Tal, 2004). Bar-Tal (2004) presents this process as providing each individual with the opportunity to view his/her own group as the enemy. This can then lead to the reconstruction of a positive self-image of morality and humanity. This process allows for a micro-level group focus on the collective memory supported by laws and the norms of society (Bar-Tal, 2004).

Bar-Tal (2004) demonstrates the application of the coexistence model in the school system as the greatest power of influence. That is because the model reaches the breadth of young children as the upcoming generation of society (Bar-Tal, 2004). Despite the inability to have maximum control over what is being taught, the model ensures that students will at least be exposed to planned contact. Furthermore, Bar-Tal (2004) presents the coexistence model in the school system to allow children to form values, motivations, beliefs, and attitudes within a developed curricula and written textbooks (Bar-Tal, 2004).

Joint projects, dialogue and problem-solving model.

Joint Projects, Dialogue, and Problem-Solving can either allow students to work through familial socialization on a micro-level and perpetuate structural discrimination, or the model can work through familial socialization while extending into the broader community to affect nationalistic and political discrimination (Moaz, 2011; Staub, 1999).

Moaz (2011) identifies the Joint Projects model as allowing students to work through familial socialization, yet perpetuating structural discrimination. This model is closely related to

the coexistence model as it allows students to work toward a common subordinate goal with one another. This reduces intergroup hostilities, increases cooperation, and focuses on common identities to counter the effects of familial socialization (Moaz, 2011). The emphasis on commonalities however, does not directly deal with separate national identities, political conflict or discrimination, and therefore preserves the status quo. Abu-Nimer (2000) presents that the joint projects model stands with the coexistence model as one of the dominant models in the field, yet encourages Jewish hegemony and Arab submission.

Staub (1999) however illustrates how Joint projects, Dialogue and Problem-Solving can resolve political solutions and lead to solutions for practical problems on a broader scale. Staub (1999) states that creating contact, engagement under equal conditions, and joint goals can overcome negative stereotypes perpetuated by familial socialization. He argues that dialogue groups can support this by expressing pain and creating sympathy. Furthermore, macro-level problem-solving workshops can work through structural discrimination by addressing real life practical and political issues that must be worked through in order for reconciliation to occur (Staub, 1999). These projects that extend service projects into a larger community can represent cooperation of both Palestinians and Israelis working together to deal with political issues of demolishing homes (Staub, 1999). Furthermore the projects can work to fulfill needs for security, identity, justice and self-determination (Staub, 1999).

Confrontational model.

Moaz (2011) contends that the confrontational model emerged in the early 1990s by Palestinian-Arab facilitators in response to the inability for the coexistence and joint projects models to emphasize political dominance. Jewish colleagues dissatisfied with the dominant coexistence model additionally showed interest in the development of this model (Moaz, 2011).

As a result, the confrontational model is more politically focused and accentuates greater awareness of asymmetrical relations among Jewish participants by recognizing Jewish power as the dominant and oppressive group (Moaz, 2011).

Moaz (2011) argues the key factors of this model. The structure of this model primarily works through nationalistic abuse and structural discrimination in addition to familial socialization, yet perpetuates the cycle of victimization. Nationalism and structural discrimination are faced by increasing the power of the Arab minorities. In doing so, Arab minorities are allowed to question Jewish intentions through open dialogue on national identities, political goals, and discrimination (Moaz, 2011). Moaz (2011) further presents the confrontational model as egalitarian in structure and is maintained by Jewish and Arab representatives in all hierarchies and in higher management (Moaz, 2011). Moaz (2011) argues that the confrontational model developed from social identity theory to work through group-based rather than individual-based issues. This can work through familial socialization. Discussing pressing political and structural issues in a group setting can foster an overall change in group thought and transform intergroup perceptions (Moaz, 2011). Negative characteristics of this model can perpetuate the cycle of violence by fostering destructive intergroup communication through direct confrontation. In doing so, the opposing group can experience a delegitimization of its account and distrust can be fostered between Jewish and Arab people due to the verbal abuse (Moaz, 2011).

Storytelling model.

Moaz (2011) presents that the storytelling model developed toward the end of the 1990s as an integration of the coexistence and confrontational models. This model was identified by Daniel Bar-On and allows for storytelling to rehumanize the victimized groups in addition to

sharing personal and collective narratives, suffering, and power relations (Bar-On & Kassem, 2004; Moaz, 2011). The storytelling process works through the effects of the cycle of victimization and familial socialization (Moaz, 2011).

Bar-On and Kassem (2004) demonstrate that groups engaged in intractable conflict must work through unhealed group trauma through reconciliation encounters. This requires a laborious psychological process to confront repressed childhood experiences (Bar-On & Kassem, 2004; Moaz, 2011; "Not only," 2001). Bar-Tal (2004) further argues that without this process, the repressed psychological content will continually affect the group's behavior. A significant shortcoming to this model involves the disregard of narrative accounts—denying the validity of the other narrative can bring more harm in the healing process (Bar-On & Kassem, 2004).

A study of the storytelling model was developed by practitioners with experience working with victims and victimizers in South Africa, Northern Ireland, and Israel-Palestine (Bar-On & Kassem, 2004). The study was conducted through a seminar at Ben-Gurion University during the 2000-2001 school year. Students participated in a course facilitated by a Jewish-Israeli and Palestinian instructor from the Neve Shalom bilingual and coexistence models. These students were asked to interview members of their parents' and grandparents' generations, present the findings in class, and then work with a member from the opposite group to write a final joint paper (Bar-On & Kassem, 2004; Ferreira & Janks, 2007). Results of the study show the student's perceptions as highly influenced by family stories (Bar-On & Kassem, 2004). Israeli students on the university level stated that they learned the Palestinian narrative for the first time through the course. This demonstrates how the model aims to combat the deep effects of familial socialization in Israeli society (Bar-On & Kassem, 2004). Furthermore, the study presented limitations to the storytelling model. Bar-On and Kassem (2004) reveal that the

storytelling model was found to change the perception of the individual towards another individual of the opposite group through discussions; however, it does not allow for the implementation of behavioral change. Furthermore, the storytelling model was sensitive to the surrounding external events. When new outbreaks of violence occurred, the reconciliation process often regressed in its movement forward (Bar-On & Kassem, 2004).

Section Three: The Bilingual Hand-in-Hand Model of the Max Rayne School in Jerusalem

This section covers studies on bilingual integrated education from its commencement to the present-day context (Al-Haj, 1996; Bekerman & Nir, 2006; Bekerman, 2009; Bekerman et al., 2009). The development of bilingual education and the structure of the Hand-in-Hand model through bilingual education are examined first. This examination is followed by the presentation of a series of studies on the bilingual model and peace education that probe further implications for the development of the Hand-in-Hand model to counter familial socialization, psychological trauma, and familial socialization. Implications for the bilingual model to counter discrimination and nationalistic abuse are further examined through the exploration of reconciliation models in regions of intractable conflict.

The development and structure of the bilingual model.

Bekerman et al. (2009) contends that the first integrated school was established in 1984 in Neve Shalom, a small Palestinian-Jewish settlement in Jerusalem. Following this, in 1998, the Center for Bilingual Education in Israel founded two integrated schools as a model of the Hand-in-Hand. The first is the Max Rayne School, established in Jerusalem, and the second is located in Upper Galilee ("Hand-in-Hand," 2012). Bekerman et al. (2009) state that six years after this establishment, two schools were opened—in 2004 in the Palestinian village of Kfar Karah and in 2007 in Beer Sheva. These schools are identified and supported as nonreligious schools and

follow the standard curriculum for state nonreligious schools by the Israeli Minister of Education (Bekerman, et al., 2009). Bekerman et al. (2009) present that the only exception is the use of both Hebrew and Arabic in the curriculum as well as co-principals of Jewish and Arab backgrounds.

Hand-in-Hand is a center for Jewish-Arab Education that promotes coexistence between Jewish and Arab people through bilingual education and an equal representation of Jewish and Arab students in each of the four schools ("Hand-in-Hand," 2012). Each school is directed by a Jewish and Arab principal and each classroom is co-taught by a Jewish and an Arab teacher ("Hand-in-Hand," 2012). The goal of this center is to create an educational environment that allows Jewish and Palestinian students to integrate with one another, their parents, and the rest of the community (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). In doing so, a cooperative framework that is structured on the basis of equality and mutual respect will be created while sustaining separate identities (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). The bilingual model is implemented in mixed residential and urban areas to promulgate the vision of full equality for its community members (Bekerman & Nir, 2006).

Bekerman and Nir (2006) contend that the bilingual education model supports decentralization and mainly enrolls middle and middle upper-class students. Parents' fees are used to supplement the funding from the Minister of Education because the school is funded under the classification as a regular segregated school. These funds cannot maintain a complete bilingual curriculum (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). The model is found to promote social mobility aspirations for Palestinian Arab children and utilizes culture and religion to bridge the gaps that maintain the division in Israeli society (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). The Max Rayne School in

Jerusalem had approximately 1,000 students enrolled into the program in the 2007/2008 school year ("2007-2008 Annual report," 2012). As of July 2012, there were approximately 600 – 700 students enrolled ("Hand-in-Hand," 2012).

Studies on the bilingual model and peace education.

This section covers specific studies done on the bilingual reconciliation model and further implications from peace education to show methods that work through the psychological trauma associated with children and familial socialization, and the cycle of victimization within the Hand-in-Hand bilingual model (Bekerman, 2009; Bekerman et al., 2009; Cobb, 2006; Staub, 1999).

Psychological trauma and familial socialization.

Studies on the effects of psychological trauma in children present the idea of *altruism born of suffering* (Staub, 1999). This concept takes the suffering that an individual faces and allows for healing to occur by creating an altruistic concern for *the other's* welfare. The genuine concern for *the other* can expand beyond the boundaries of the individual's group. From this, children can become citizens that seek to counter persecution and develop a moral concern for advocating for *the other* (Staub, 1999). Inclusive caring can develop through schools providing experiences and engaging in actions that benefit others such as community participation and responsibility for decision-making (Staub, 1999). Staub (1999) further argues that *altruism born of suffering* can foster a commitment to human welfare and lead to a constructive understanding of situations rather than blind allegiance to the group socialization. It is important to note that information about the parents' suffering has to take into account the children's age and capacity to process intense emotional information (Staub, 1999).

Following this, children are in developmental stages where they are not yet fully socialized into the group identities that are prevalent in society; however, parents and teachers that have their identities already formulated can indirectly affect the children's identities (Bekerman, 2006). In an observation done at a bilingual school by Zvi Bekerman—described as a primary researcher of the bilingual reconciliation approach within his Curriculum Vitae document—the children seemed to organize themselves according to gender and felt free to joke and play with their identities (Bekerman & Nir, 2006). The awareness of group identities was not at the root of any disagreements. As the children moved into higher grades, they were more aware of how their identities and ethnic and religious differences affected their interaction; however, this did not cause conflict. For example, when a nine-year-old boy decided to fast during Ramadan, the children accepted his decision. It is interesting to note that the teachers singled him out, saying, "You too, Hayim." This marked the fact that there is an exception to the unsaid rule against crossing identity borders (Bekerman &Nir, 2006). Furthermore, in one bilingual school, the students attend separate ceremonies for Independence Day and al-Nakbha (Bekerman et al., 2009). One child protested this and his parents were shocked. The adults were found to be more concerned with the child's awareness of his/her own identity whereas children are not completely socialized into the overall group thought. These children do not recognize identity as a boundary marker that isolates the extent of their social interaction with the other group (Bekerman et al., 2009).

Therefore, it seems as though the model needs to find a positive way to promote reconciliation before the children are fully socialized and provide a method that allows children to be aware of how family and society socializes them as they develop into mature thinkers (Bekerman, 2009). Bekerman (2009) argues that children should be encouraged to uncover ways

that societies are organized to have the skills to envision alternative designs (Bekerman, 2009).

Bekerman (2009) contends that the key way to develop this is through critical thinking. This

includes questions that probe: How are we thinking about the other group? What categories are

they placed in? Are there common categories between us and others? In doing so, the student

must be critically reflective by first becoming aware of his/her own held memories and the

deeply embedded emotional traces that continue to structure how they see themselves (Bekerman

et al., 2009). Bekerman et al. (2009) argue that these students need to connect these memories to

a cognitive map that enables them to understand how their particular lives reflect larger social,

cultural, and historical forms of relationships. This helps students to understand the social

construction of identity as influenced by culture and how it is infused within their emotional

being. Yet, it also allows them to place their ideas within a larger context for critical

understanding (Bekerman et al., 2009).

Cycle of victimization.

 Zembylas (2007) presents that "the emotional effects of group conflict and trauma on

individuals and large groups and the prospects of healing are significant concerns for peace

education in conflict-ridden societies" (p. 208). Reconciliation defines particular perspectives,

attitudes, emotions, and beliefs such as pride, hatred, and unwillingness that must change among

intergroup relations in order for reconciliation to occur (Zembylas, 2007). He continues to argue

that the emotional trauma portion of reconciliation has been generally disregarded in peace

education. *Critical Emotional Literacy* is a method to work through the cycle of victimization by

analyzing and critiquing the ways in which trauma encourages certain emotions and ideologies

while prohibiting others (Zembylas, 2007). This gives the ability to identify how this trauma can

serve as hegemony and limit one's own understanding (Zembylas, 2007). It allows members to

come to terms with the traumatic events of the groups' history, mourn but not be consumed with the past, subvert the victimization and change their disposition, and deepen the awareness by teaching students how trauma stories can be used to teach fear, mistrust, and hate (Zembylas, 2007).

Zembylas (2007) continues to identify how telling positive stories will help rehumanize *the other* through empathy by not just accepting the others' narrative as legitimate but understanding on an emotional level. That doesn't mean there is complete agreement but rather there is the critical and analytical ability to accept the other side and recognize that the side is deeply motivated to overcome past traumas (Zembylas, 2007). However, it can be argued that it is impossible to truly identify with the victim. This needs to be better addressed in peace education to in order to properly analyze how trauma affects *the other* (Zembylas, 2007).

Reconciliation methods from countries in intractable conflict.

Reconciliation models within Israel fail to recognize the significance of structural change through political means of reconciliation (Moaz, 2011). South Africa and Rwanda have been identified as nations in intractable conflict (Salomon & Nevo, 2002). These nations take into account political means of reconciliation to allow for structural change (Salomon & Nevo, 2002). Conflict resolution models practiced on a political level include international war crimes tribunals, national crime or civil proceedings, lustration, truth commissions, public apology, compensation for families who have been damaged, public monuments for victims, social stigmatism, and amnesty (Opotow, 2001).

Opotow (2001) argues that the model in South Africa involves the promise of amnesty to advance truth-finding on a nationwide political level. In doing so, victims can work through a healing process due to the formal acknowledgement of a painful, silenced past. Despite this, the

applications of these models have limitations. In the case of South Africa, extreme violence can be normalized. A psychological numbing from a repeated public ritual of violence, remorse, and forgiveness can perpetuate growing anger and reopen old wounds, while giving little support afterward (Opotow, 2001). The victims in this case expected pensions and medical attention, yet failed to receive adequate support. At the same time, dozens who were responsible for murder and torture were set free by the commission (Opotow, 2001).

Possible reactions to this issue can allow a post-conflict society to explore the past wrongdoings through social reconstruction over the course of time. Without this, the long-term mental health of victims will be compromised (Opotow, 2001). Staub (1999) argues that this approach recognizes that reconciling people is the ultimate goal but it is not the place to begin. Rather, reconciliation after traumatic conflict needs to address what happened in the past, and who was responsible on a national level. The parties need to present the bare facts of who did what to whom and when, articulate a range of interpretations about those events, and then agree on some subset of accounts that allows them each to accommodate what happened into their ongoing narratives (Staub, 1999). Staub (1999) contends that following this approach requires being mutually tolerant of a limited set of interpretations rather than settling on a single interpretation.

Furthermore, Staub (1999) argues that bystanders and the media can also aid the improvement of nationwide proceedings. Bystanders may perpetuate the conflict by remaining idle when victims are being devalued (Cobb, 2006). To counter this, external bystanders can come to the point of acknowledgement through U.N. and psychological intervention to prevent group violence (Staub, 1999). Effective U.N. policy should allow for humiliation narratives to be told (Cobb, 2006). Cobb (2006) presents a possible alteration that allows the Truth and

Reconciliation Commission to tell stories of humiliation in a public place that is not framed as a legal forum that merely collects facts. Rather, it will be framed as a social-cultural forum for discovering complex histories (Cobb, 2006). Cobb (2006) further argues that there should be accounts in different categories to multiply each interpretation. For example, community members, representatives from NGOs, schools, churches, elected officials, and government representatives would all be represented in the proceedings (Cobb, 2006). Additionally, Staub (1999) states that intervention from psychologists and other social scientists can provide professional skills to prevent group violence and recognize the basic psychological needs that should be met by each group. This requires morally committed and active bystanders that will set aside political interests (Staub, 1999). Each situation has important psychological dimensions—psychologists need to devise and execute methods of intervention (Staub, 1999).

Currently, external nations respond to conflict according to political interest (Staub, 1999). States will traditionally act to further their view as national interests in power, wealth, or influence. These nations can also withhold support needed by the UN to deal with human rights issues (Staub, 1999). Humanitarian intervention needs to counter this by requiring states to work against an ally or business partner that is identified as a perpetrator nation. This can allow the nations to assume some of the burdens of intervention (Staub, 1999). Staub (1999) further argues that early intervention is needed to improve the criteria to differentiate between imperial self-serving interventions and humanitarian interventions. A principle needs to be established for effective intervention for human rights and to develop institutions whose job is to activate early responses (Staub, 1999). Condemnation of policies and practices that harm the victim

group should be set into place. At the same time, there needs to be wisdom and background knowledge of the culture to make sure that the political goals are being viewed correctly (Staub, 1999).

Impetus for a Qualitative Study

Overall, of the reconciliation models presented in Israel, three out of five of the models work through the cycle of victimization, one model perpetuates the cycle of victimization, and one model does nothing to work through the cycle. In regards to structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, one model works through structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, two models perpetuate these factors, and two models do nothing to address the factors. Familial socialization and the psychological trauma of children are worked through by all five of the models.

It is important to note that the majority of the reconciliation models present in Israel either perpetuate or do not deal with structural discrimination. The literature review presents the Hand-in-Hand model of bilingual education as a model that recognizes the need for change extending beyond the school system into the community for structural change. The first established Hand-in-Hand school, the Max Rayne School in Jerusalem, will therefore require a qualitative study to recognize how the structural discrimination and nationalistic abuse, in addition to the cycle of victimization and psychological trauma and familial socialization, are either perpetuated or worked through.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

After analyzing several approaches to understanding reconciliation models presented in

the literature, the researcher determined that the method of researching reconciliation models

should involve a qualitative inquiry. Patton (2002) describes qualitative inquiry as "going into

the field—into the real world of programs, organizations, neighborhoods, street corners—and

getting close enough to people and circumstances to capture what is happening" (p. 48).

Focusing specifically on the use of the Hand-in-Hand reconciliation model at the Max Rayne

School in Jerusalem, Israel, the researcher decided that an ethnographic field visit would allow

for greater insight into the reconciliation model and its relation to the larger Israeli-Palestinian

context as described in the literature. Ethnography is an approach to qualitative inquiry that

attempts to make sense of a group or place in relation to the entire social setting and the

complexity of the social relationships. This is accomplished by representing a culture both

implicitly and explicitly, identifying patterns, and contextualizing findings in wider contexts of

the government, policies, and society (Parthasarathy, 2008). The purpose of this Israel-based

ethnographic study is to explore how the cycle of victimization, nationalism and structural

discrimination, in addition to psychological trauma and familial socialization, are perpetuated or

worked through within the reconciliation model of bilingual education used at the Hand-in-Hand

Max Rayne School in relation to the context of Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Ethnographical research allows for data collection techniques that support a variety of

methods appropriate to the particular situation being studied (Parthasarathy, 2008). This study

involves the use of observations and semi-structured interview questions to gather data. The use

of this technique required spending time with both Israeli and Palestinian families within the City

of Jerusalem and visiting homes in Bethlehem, Abood, and Ramallah of the West Bank.

Furthermore, organizations known for extensive research on reconciliation models were visited

including the Israel Palestine Center for Research and Information (IPCRI), the Holy Land Trust,

and Tantur Ecumenical Institute. Interviews were conducted with three representatives of the

Max Rayne School in Jerusalem. In conducting the interviews, the researcher remained

immersed within the Israeli-Palestinian community while constantly maintaining the reflective

role of an ethnographer. This ensured an analytical interpretation of the case, relationships,

observations, and conversations.

Procedure

In reviewing a wide range of the literature and many documents related to the study of

reconciliation models, the researcher came across the 2007-2008 Annual Report on the Hand-in-

Hand Organization. In this report, the first lady of the United States, Mrs. Laura Bush, chose the

Max Rayne School in Jerusalem as one of only two projects, non-tourist related, to visit in Israel.

Mrs. Bush was one among many other influential leaders to visit the school including then

British Foreign Minister David Miliband. Mrs. Bush's comments served as part of the impetus

behind the decision to send an e-mail to the Hand-in-Hand organization in order to inquire about

an opportunity to visit Jerusalem and conduct ethnographic interviews with representatives of the

Max Rayne Bilingual School. The initial e-mail led to a contact with the Director of Donor

Relations, Mr. Ira Kerem, who was instrumental in identifying two teachers to be interviewed at

the school. An ethnographic approach allowed for key participants in the field to provide

information concerning the Hand-in-Hand reconciliation model.

Prior to visiting Israel and interviewing the representatives of the Max Rayne School, the

researcher obtained an exemption for research on human subjects from the Institutional Review

Board (IRB) at Southeastern University. The approval process involved the completion of an online training and certificate on Protecting Human Research Participants offered by the National Institute of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research. The IRB permitted an exploration of the Hand-in-Hand reconciliation models within the school systems of Israel and Palestine. The study involved interviewing and observing directors, teachers, researchers, and principals of the school and research institutes. A director and two teachers of the Max Rayne School were then contacted to participate in the study.

In preparation for the interview process with the three representatives of the reconciliation model at the Max Rayne School, the researcher developed a questionnaire consisting of 25 items useful for exploring pertinent reconciliation themes. The questionnaire allowed for the exploration of the following 15 themes: (1) teaching methods and classroom structure of the model, (2) methods for handling disagreements between Israeli and Palestinian students in the classroom, (3) the process for handling disagreements between Israeli and Palestinian teachers in front of students and how such processes affect child behavior and perspectives, (4) origins of the disagreements between teachers and students, (5) the process for teaching about national holidays and the events of 1948 referred to as Independence day by Israelis and al-Nakba by Palestinians, (6) the level of agreement between teachers on historical accounts of 1948 prior to teaching together, (7) the perceptions of the model in terms of promoting or inhibiting political and structural change, (8) the effects of external events on the model and dialogue in the classroom, (9) tangible community projects to reinforce the model outside of the educational institution context, (10) how the model combats familial socialization and dominant perspectives of Jewish and Arab groups respectively, (11) the Hand-in-Hand policies or protocol for dealing with conflict, (12) obligations of the school required by the

Israeli Minister of Education and reconciliation classes offered that specific to the Bilingual Model, (13) structures and policies followed specific to Hand-in-Hand, (14) the proportion of Jewish to Arab students, as well as (15) policies for proportions of Jewish to Arab students by Hand-in-Hand and the number of students that have been denied acceptance to the school in order to control equality.

In order to explore the reconciliation model in the Max Rayne School of Jerusalem, the researcher conducted the interviews using the problem-centered method of biographical action research (Witzel, 2000). Biographical action research is specific to content analysis due to its "concern with action modes in specific societal areas or how individuals respond to certain problems" (Zinn, 2004). In the problem-centered interview, a set of controlled questions are asked to understand the interviewee's perceptions on a specific social problem or topic (Zinn, 2004). Twenty-five qualitative interview questions related to the reconciliation themes were asked to interviewees. Three face-to-face interviews were completed using a semi-structured, open-question format. The first interview actually began upon entering the car of the first participant. Our dialogue unfolded as we journeyed through the gentle slopes of the city while watching Israeli-Jewish and Palestinian families bustle through the neighborhoods. The interview continued in the setting of a Kindergarten classroom at the Max Rayne School and led to another interview within the same classroom. The final interview was conducted at a nearby park during a scheduled Project Harmony summer camp and community event associated with the Max Rayne School. The interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder and were later transcribed verbatim. Careful attention was given to the language barriers when using a translator to conduct the second interview.

Responses from the interviews were then transcribed and analyzed for common themes using the standard thematic data-analysis procedure of content analysis (Patton, 2002). Patton (2002) describes content analysis as the process of analyzing a particular text for recurring words or themes within interview transcripts, diaries or documents other than observation-based field notes. In this study, an inductive analysis approach was utilized in order to discover patterns, themes, and categories in the data specific to reconciliation.

Participants

Participants in the study were selected based on the type of purposeful sampling where "people, cultures, events, organizations, and communities are selected for insight about a phenomenon" (Patton, 2002, p. 40). The purpose of this study was to analyze the structures of the specific Hand-in-Hand model as an approach to reconciliation at the Max Rayne School in Jerusalem. Teachers were carefully selected from both ethnic groups in order to present differing sides of the issue: A Jewish-Israeli teacher and an Arab-Israeli teacher were chosen. A director was also selected to present insight on the administration of the school. In doing so, purposeful sampling was used to intentionally choose participants for the ethnographical study by "selecting information-rich cases that will illuminate the questions under study" (Patton, 2002, p. 46).

Mr. Ira Kerem, the Jewish-Israeli Director of Donor Relations for Hand-in-Hand, played a key role in connecting the researcher to the key teachers who were interviewed and provided a tour of the Max Rayne school classrooms. Mrs. Dina Alyan, an Arab-Israeli living in Beit Safafa, was the second participant to be interviewed. She teaches art for the kindergarten students at the Max Rayne School. Mrs. Efrat Meyer, a Jewish-Israeli and former fourth grade

teacher at the Max Rayne Hand-in-Hand School, was the last to be interviewed. She is currently

involved in the Project Harmony summer program for students of the Max Rayne School.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

In efforts to analyze the data, the researcher utilized a content analysis method to discover patterns and themes within the collective responses of the participants. From the analysis, fifteen themes concerning the bilingual model of the Max Rayne School emerged. The researcher then developed a manageable coding scheme by assigning each theme to a particular color. This was necessary in order to differentiate the themes. Once the themes were assigned a color, the researcher analyzed the responses and color-coded the individual themes that were presented.

Inter-rater reliability is ensured when the "information being collected is being collected in a consistent manner" (Keyton et al., 2004). For this study, a second coder was employed to assist in the coding procedure for the interview transcript. This ensured inter-rater reliability by producing results that were 86% consistent (13 out of 15 themes) with the researcher's coding system. The second coder was, at the time, a master's level academic tutor of the International College Reading and Learning Association at the Academic Center for Enrichment of Southeastern University. The coder was trained on the qualitative coding methods during the completion of a Research Methods course. Furthermore, the coder was intentionally selected because her minimal knowledge about Israeli-Palestinian conflict would prevent personal bias. The coder was initially given two pages to color-code. The responses were compared to the researcher's responses to determine whether the coder could adequately identify themes. Once this was affirmatively determined, the coder was permitted to color-code the rest of the document.

CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS

Many who study the Israeli-Palestinian state of affairs have attempted to capture the effects of reconciliation models that have emerged in the last few decades of Israeli-Palestinian history (Bekerman, 2009; Maoz, 2011; Zembylas, 2007). The Max Rayne School provides a unique expression of a dynamic bilingual model developed with the goal of influencing the community. This model goes beyond traditional short-term coexistence projects and extends to provide long-term effects on the sociocultural and psychological factors affecting Israeli and Palestinian children in the community.

The Day Finally Arrived

It was a warm July afternoon and I was anxious to visit the Max Rayne School. Standing on the busy street corner near Beit Safafa, I found myself frustrated as I attempted to coordinate the routes of the bus system to the village of Pat. The last thing I wanted was to miss the interview with Mr. Ira Kerem—and miss out on the entire purpose of my trip to Israel— simply because I couldn't navigate my way through the busy crowds of people and the hectic mid-day traffic of Jerusalem. With some setbacks and little hope of making it to the school on time, I decided to give Mr. Ira Kerem a call. Within seconds, he assured me that he would be on his way and began driving the distance to pick me up and take me to the school. My experience with Mr. Kerem's generosity led me to believe that I was witnessing direct exposure to Middle Eastern hospitality just as it was written on the Hand-in-Hand website (Hand-in-Hand, 2012).

The Max Rayne School lies at the heart of Southern Jerusalem, situated in the densely populated capital of Israel among a diverse people that practice three ancient religions. Located at the center of Jewish and Arab culture, the Max Rayne School bridges the Jewish quarter of Pat

with the Arab neighborhood of Beit Safafa. The diverse community is home to Armenians, Christians, Jewish people of European descent, Muslims, ultra-orthodox, and secular families. Walking around the city, one cannot help but notice the Hasidic Jewish men crossing the street with their black coats, tall hats and curly peyos. Just on the other side of the street is another world completely, marked by the Arab culture. Muslim women dressed in modest garments and matching hijabs can be seen walking through the neighborhoods. Each people group lives in close proximity to each other, yet they rarely seem to make direct contact.

As I entered the corridors of the Max Rayne School, it was as if I had gained entrance into a different realm entirely. Arriving late in the afternoon, I could imagine what the corridors might have looked like earlier in the morning when children shuffled across the hallway. As we neared the entrance, I observed within the classroom vibrant young Arab and Jewish children laughing, running, and playing together. The children ran in circles and fell on top of each other, laughing loudly. They sang songs and clapped their hands. Unlike the scenes outside of the school where Arab and Jewish Israelis barely made contact, the children of these two communities now merged to create a dynamic environment. The environment was unique in that the Israeli and Arab children appeared to interact with one another freely with respect and acceptance regardless of their ethnic differences.

Reminiscing back to the drive between Beit Safafa and the Max Rayne School, I remembered that Mr. Ira Kerem was the first representative of the Max Rayne School that I encountered. He is of Jewish-Israeli background and I noted that he began engaging in ongoing conversations from the moment that I met him until we arrived at our destination. He serves as one of eight staff members in the Israel National Office as the Director of Donor Relations for the Hand-in-Hand Organization. Operating in such a key position for the organization, Mr.

Kerem shared a unique perspective on the importance of living in the community with respect and acceptance of others. Despite his many obligations, he kindly offered to participate in the interview and to connect me with two exemplary teachers at the school.

When I first saw Mrs. Dina Alyan at the school, she was speaking with a Jewish father who was preparing to take his daughter home. As the time neared for the little girl to leave, she sprinted with excitement towards her teacher, Mrs. Alyan, and jumped into her arms to say "good-bye." I immediately sensed a connection between the teacher and the child which seemed to go beyond the duties of an educator. Mrs. Alyan appeared to genuinely care about her students. Mrs. Alyan is a short Palestinian woman with Israeli citizenship, living in Beit Safafa. She teaches Art to both Jewish and Arab Kindergarten students at the Hand-in-Hand Max Rayne School. As Mrs. Alyan and I became acquainted with one another, we walked toward the center of the classroom and were seated at a circular table. From here, I began asking Mrs. Alyan a series of interview questions.

In addition to meeting Mrs. Alyan, I had the opportunity to meet Mrs. Efrat Meyer. While standing in front of the school, I noticed when a bus filled with students pulled up to the curb and Mrs. Meyer walked out, surrounded by the children. The students were excitedly returning from a trip to the local pool, sponsored by the Project Harmony summer program. From the bus, they were getting ready to walk over to a nearby park. Mrs. Meyer invited me to join their event and I was quickly enthralled by the context of our meeting place. Israeli-Jewish and Arab students were working with international visitors to perform an outreach event for the Ethiopian families in the neighborhood. The event included a nearby basketball court and a DJ playing music while children ran around the court throwing water balloons at one another. I found myself learning much about the practice of respect and acceptance that the Hand-in-Hand

model seeks to foster while actually immersing myself in the midst of an outreach event for the diverse Israeli-Jewish community. I sat together with Mrs. Alyan beneath a tree overlooking the event when our interview session began to unfold.

As the last interview ended and I prepared for my journey back to the hotel, Mr. Kerem directed my route and ensured that I arrived back safely. I was interested in analyzing the many themes that emerged from the responses of the participants.

Presentation of Themes

From a review of transcribed conversations with Mr. Ira Kerem, the Hand-in-Hand school director, Mrs. Efrat Meyer, the Israeli-Jewish teacher, and Mrs. Dina Alyan, the Palestinian teacher, fifteen themes emerged that represent factors surrounding the reconciliation model at the Max Rayne School. The researcher used the manageable coding scheme to assign each theme to a particular color. Each theme presented in the transcript was then color-coded to identify recurring themes according to the most prevalent color presented. Once the transcripts were color-coded, a tallying process was used to determine the prevalence of each theme. Important elements to consider in these findings are the themes that appear more frequently than others as well as several themes that overlap with others in the transcribed document. The frequency of each theme was recorded to yield the upcoming results. Each theme will be presented from greatest to least prevalence by verbatim responses of the interviewees in the findings below:

Handling disagreements.

This theme refers to the process used by the teachers of handling disagreements in the classroom based on the bilingual reconciliation model. This includes the teacher's procedures for handling disagreements in the classroom between students and other students, between

students and teachers, and between other teachers. The theme of handling disagreements appeared with a significantly greater prevalence than any of the other themes. Regardless of the nature of the research question, this theme appeared independently and often overlapped with seven other themes. The overlapping themes that surfaced were related to (1) the structure of the school, (2) the teacher's process for communicating with one another, (3) national holidays and the events of 1948, (4) effects of external factors on classroom discussions, (5) child reactions and behaviors when faced with disagreements, (5) the model's ability to promote structural and political change, and (7) nationalism. The prevalence of the handling disagreements theme suggests that discussions on disagreements frequently arise around a range of topics in the classroom and teachers must develop ways to deal with disputes between students and teachers when such disagreements occur.

The responses of the interviewers showed that the priority for handling disagreements revolved around the respect of others regardless of the ethnic differences. As reported by the Director of Donor Relations, Mr. Ira Kerem, "The basic thing is respect for the other person. You can't make it personal. You can't call the other person names like, 'you dirty Jew,' or 'you dirty Arab.' You don't talk like that… You can't. You have to respect the other person. Respect the other opinion even if you think it is wrong" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012). When discussing disagreements that arise in the classroom between students and other students, Mrs. Dina Alyan reported that respect takes precedence over agreement:

> "In the school you don't have to agree. You don't have to agree with each other. You don't have to agree with teachers or parents. We don't say this, but that is what happens. You have to listen and you have to respect and you have to try to understand what the other side says," (D. Alyan, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The responses suggested methods for handling disagreements that surfaced between students when the teacher agrees with one student over the other. The model allows students to

hold differing views; however, the authority figure in the classroom may express his/her opinion as well:

> **Question:** What if there is a student that believes a certain statistic and another that believes a certain statistic, and then they ask the teachers, 'Well who is right and who is wrong?'
> **Director:** 'The teacher will say who she thinks is right from her basic knowledge.'

The responses suggest that when approaching disagreements between teachers in the classroom, there are disputes between teachers that can arise in front of the students. The responses revealed that teachers might get frustrated while teaching Israeli and Palestinian students in the same classroom, leading the teachers to decide not to work with one another any longer. One participant explains the difficulty of disagreements between teachers and emphasizes a focus on commonality and the well-being of the students:

> "Sometimes it gets to the point that the teachers don't want to teach together anymore. Even one time it happened that way and it's very very difficult. It's very difficult. Like there are no rules. Like what happens if you don't get along with someone in your work? It's just very very hard and you try to talk about it and you try to understand where the difficulty is and most of the time there is nothing you can do about it. But you're not so busy only with this. You try to focus on other things. You try and focus on the things that you do have in common, focus on the process of teaching and the well-being of the students" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Structure of the school.

This theme refers to the structure of the bilingual reconciliation model in the school. This theme occurred with the second greatest frequency and appeared as an overlapping theme with handling disagreements. The responses reveal that the Hand-in-Hand model requires one Arab teacher and one Jewish teacher to teach together in each classroom. The teachers teach in Arabic and Hebrew respectively for the students in Kindergarten to sixth grade. In seventh grade through 12th grade, students have one teacher for each subject:

"Kindergarten definitely, in first through sixth grade they have two teachers but not for every subject. The math teacher might be an Arab, the science teacher might be a Jew. When they talk about things like history or current events, like the home room, they have both teachers in the class, but not for every subject. They do a lot of work in groups as well" (D. Alyan, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The Hand-in-Hand organization requires each school to have two principals, one Jewish and one Palestinian. However, the Max Rayne School has only one Jewish principal:

"For seventh grade going on, there is only one teacher. There is only one Jewish principal here but the other Hand-in-Hand schools have an Arab and a Jewish principal" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Based on the details of the discussion, it appears that the model might indicate that the teachers do not emphasize the conflict as the main focus of the model. In fact, teachers do not even use the word "reconciliation" because they seek to make integration a normal part of daily life by teaching their classes together in two languages:

"We don't put conflict in the center of the education. We talk about other things. We talk about identity and about communities and about differences. We don't call it conflict. We don't just put the conflict and that's the big thing about us. We are proactive but we want the kids to learn other things so each one builds up" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The interviewees report that in order to promote identity awareness among the students, the Max Rayne School offers an identity curriculum that is specific to the Hand-in-Hand Bilingual Model's requirements. The identity class is offered two hours a week to each grade level:

"We have this identity curriculum where each one talks about their identity on different levels. Every year they talk about different aspects of their identity and that's a way to understand other sides and learn about other people. The Hand-in-Hand community developed their own class, Identity. I think there is a democracy class but that is part of a citizenship you have to take and identity—two hours a week of this topic" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Teacher's process for communication with one another.

This theme presents the agreement between teachers on historical accounts of Israeli-Palestinian history prior to teaching together and during the teaching process in front of the students. This theme appeared with the third greatest frequency and overlapped with the discussion of handling disagreements.

The responses revealed that the bilingual model allows teachers to disagree on historical accounts. The process of communicating information in the classroom does not require agreement on historical information prior to teaching with one another in the classroom:

> "To argue with the facts is very difficult because each side has their own facts" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

> **Question:** Do all of the teachers agree on one historical account?
> **Mr. Kerem:** No, not at all. No.

The responses present that agreeing on facts is a process for teachers. One teacher mentioned that there are basic facts about the conflict that everyone can agree on. The teacher expressed hopes that all of the teachers will eventually get to a point where they can agree on basic facts of the conflict:

> "We do talk about that there are some facts that we definitely know and it's something that we have to agree on but even agreeing on facts is a process. But we do deal with it. We do talk about the perspectives and ideas that people have on facts. That point is very difficult because I didn't count the deaths in any event. Everything I know, even if I agree that this is a fact of something, I got it from somewhere. We do want to get to a point that we agree on the basic fact of the meaningful numbers of the conflict" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Discussions on the agreement between teachers seemed to stretch beyond differences of ethnicity to matters concerning the various opinions of Jewish and Palestinian people living in a complex, postmodern world. For instance, a Jewish person can have a very different perspective

69

on the conflict from another Jewish person and a Palestinian person can have differing

perspectives on the conflict in comparison to another Palestinian person:

> "Even within the narrative you don't agree about everything. So you can find arguments between the Jewish teachers and the Arab teachers. It's a very very postmodern way of holding opinions. You really have to accept other opinions. Sometimes it threatens your life also. Like you feel that if someone wants to have I don't know a million refugees coming back to Israel people feel threatened. And the Jews don't always understand that every act that they do is very aggressive to the Palestinians who were here before so yea there is no organized solutions to that, no two narratives that we have to agree to. Basically there are two narratives. Within those narratives, there are many other opinions" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Reportedly, the model at the Max Rayne School does not require teachers to share a level

of agreement before teaching together. Teachers can teach according to their own styles. Some

may choose to avoid the discussion of politics and focus more on daily interactions with one

another as a method to change perspectives:

> "There is no system. You can't force a teacher to teach in this way or that way to bring up topics that he doesn't want to. And not all teachers agree that we have to talk about politics. Sometimes only by knowing Jews you change your mind about Jews not by talking to Jews about the conflict. We have different opinions about that" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Children's reactions and behaviors in the classroom.

This theme presents the teacher's perception of child reactions and behaviors when the

children are faced with disagreement. This relates to the reactions that a student expresses when

another student disagrees with the first student or when a student witnesses teachers disagreeing

with one another in the classroom. This theme further presents the teacher's perception of the

student's reaction when a teacher agrees with one student but disagrees with another. This theme

was presented with the fourth greatest frequency and overlapped with the discussion of handling

disagreements.

The response of one participant reports that the students seem as though they are capable of dealing with the reality of the conflict. Seeing the teachers and other students in disagreements with one another is something that the students can understand and will not be heavily affected by:

> "The conflict is very real to them. The fact that they go to an Arab Jewish school means they understand that there is a conflict; otherwise, they would be in a regular school. The kids are not stupid. They know exactly what's going on. They don't always want to make it the center of their life" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Based on the discussion, it seems as though the students have the ability to see some truth in the differing perspectives. This causes the children to react to others with respect and acceptance despite the disagreements. Regardless of differences, the children can learn how to accept parts of the other student's story:

> "I think pretty much both sides can see some truth in the other side. I think the Jewish students can see how the Arab families suffered and how they lost their homes, how they lost the property, how some of them were killed. They see that. And I think most Arabs, I'm not sure if all the Arabs, can see that yea there was a war and the Jews fought and the Jews won and maybe the Palestinians, maybe, I'm not sure if it's so strong, I'm not sure if they would recognize that the Palestinians could've ever agreed to a partition being a solution" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Reportedly, the impact of children witnessing disagreements between teachers was perceived by teachers to be insignificant. Children were perceived to be less concerned with the conflict whereas the staff will primarily struggle with disagreements:

> "It mostly affects the teachers not the students. The students live their life. They play football; they want to hang out they make fun of everything. They laugh about everything. It is really difficult to be the staff here. That's where the conflict exists" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Based on the details of the discussion, children were not perceived to be greatly affected by disagreements between themselves and with teachers. If a teacher agrees with one student

over another a student, the teacher does not perceive that student as taking the situation

personally:

> "You can disagree and you don't feel like that person has done you wrong. You don't feel that the other child, that the teachers, have done something wrong to you. Okay, I don't agree. I think you're wrong. It's not a personal thing" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The teachers present that children in Kindergarten are not greatly affected by teachers

disagreeing with their perspective or agreeing with one child over another:

> **Question:** If the teacher agrees with a statement that goes against the belief of a child, how do you see this affecting the child?
> **Mr. Kerem:** I don't know because this is not the best example because this is Kindergarten.

Perceptions of the reconciliation model as promoting change.

This theme revealed that the teachers perceive the Bilingual Reconciliation Model as a promoter

of political change and a promoter of structural change. Neither of the teachers seemed to

perceive the model as an inhibitor to political or structural change; however, they recognize that

there are parents that do not see the model as a positive step towards change. This theme

appeared with the same frequency as the following theme: classroom structure and process for

teaching about national holidays and the events of 1948. The theme, furthermore, overlapped

with discussion of handling disagreements, social mobility, and the ability of the model to build

lasting effects for children. It is important to note that the overlap between this theme and the

ability of the model to build lasting affects after graduation appeared twice and was supported by

two different participants, the Palestinian teacher and the Israeli Jewish teacher.

Reportedly, the parents that do not advocate the Bilingual Model as a positive step

towards change do not allow their children to be a part of the model. The parents that agree with

the capability of the model toward endorsing change will send their children to the Max Rayne

School:

> "So there are parents on both sides Jews and Arabs that don't believe this is the way to go. Definitely, but those parents don't send their kids here. The parents that send their kids here believe that this is one step toward making things better. One step ahead. You used the word reconciliation" (D. Alyan, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Reportedly, the Hand-in-Hand model promotes political and structural change by

handling political conversation with respect. This level of discourse differs from the public

discourse in the media and in the Knesset. Instead of shouting at one another with the perception

that the other person is a traitor, the children can have disagreements without thinking that the

other person has personally wronged them. This appears to be promoting a different way of

thinking contrary to political methods for dealing with disagreements:

> "You have to listen and you have to respect and you have to try to understand what the other side says. And that already in Israel is a big difference. Because public discourse in Israel is based on: you're a collaborator, you're a traitor. Look in the Knesset. They shout at each other. There are different things they shout out when they talk about issues about the conflict. I've heard other teachers say at different schools, kids are shouting at one another. Quiet! This is not the Knesset: you can't speak like that. The level of the Knesset is basic public discourse on radios and TV and such that you know you disagree with them. You're a traitor. You're a collaborator. And here it's different. You can disagree and you don't feel like that person has done you wrong. That the other child, that the teachers have done something wrong to you. Okay I don't agree, I think you're wrong; it's not a personal thing" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The participant reports that the model is championed by supporters of the left wing

political party. Those that perceive the left wing as the method for political change in turn

support the model:

> "If you come to the Hand-in-Hand school it means that their parents are lefties and want the kids to hang out with Arabs, if it's Jews. For Arabs, if the parents usually hold the same ideas as the school; otherwise, the parents wouldn't pay so much money for their kids to go to that school" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Classroom structure and process for teaching about national holidays.

This theme relates directly to the structure of the classroom when there is teaching about national holidays. The theme presents the process of teaching about national holidays and the events of 1948 to the students. This theme occurred with the same frequency as the perceptions of reconciliation model to promote change, furthermore, it overlapped with themes of handling disagreements and nationalism.

Reportedly, when students are learning about National Holidays, they are taught by both the Israeli Jewish and Palestinian teachers together, regardless of the differences between the teachers:

> "So first of all they learn about all the religious holidays together. So they tell all the kids, 'Okay, we're going to talk about the calendar, we're going to talk about the Jewish holiday, talk all about it, learn songs about it. For Passover everyone celebrates it. For Christmas there is a Christmas tree, everybody celebrates all the holidays" (D. Alyan, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The responses suggest that when teaching the events of 1948, the students are presented with both the Israeli narrative and the Palestinian narrative. The students learn the history of the events together:

> "So, they tell the stories for Nakbha about a family that the child had to be taken before the house was destroyed things like that. They tell the stories of things that happened and the Jews also tell the stories. The kids, they hear both sides. They hear both narratives. Then there is the Memorial Day for the fallen soldiers. They have an alarm where you stand for two minutes in silence. So those that want to stand, stand. Those who don't, don't. For Kindergarten they don't know that much the significance of anything but they learn" (D. Alyan, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The discussions present that the teaching process allows each teacher, Arab and Jewish respectively, to share the two narratives. The children are then open to discuss their personal narratives together as a class:

"So let's say the Arab teacher will talk about it and then they have the Jewish written narrative and the Arab narrative. One teacher will share both. And afterwards you talk. I agree, I don't agree" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Nationalism.

This theme presents Pro-Israeli and Pro-Palestinian threads that surfaced in the Bilingual Model. Perceptions about rights for Israelis and Palestinians and the influence of Israeli and Palestinian rights in society were presented through this theme. It is important to note that questions about nationalism were not asked in the interview; however, this theme appeared in conversations with two of the three participants. This theme appeared with the same frequency as the following theme: the influence of the Israeli minister of education on the reconciliation model. The theme of nationalism overlapped with the themes of handling disagreements between teachers, social mobility, and the structure and process for teaching about national holidays and the events of 1948. Israeli Nationalism is not presented by forcing students to salute an Israeli flag. The flag is not present in the school:

"We don't have an Israeli flag here. They don't have it. The schools don't force people to salute the flag" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

One participant holds the view that Israel is not influencing dominance over the

Palestinians but rather, the Palestinians have access to basic human rights:

"Even Palestinians that don't have citizenship here, they still get to go to hospitals here. They still get treatment. They're still, it's not like it's, it's not like the situation in Rwanda where one side is massacring the other side, you know? There's a difference. There's definitely a difference between the two sides. It's not like one side is being a pacifist" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Palestinians were presented as being victims of the injustice of the Nakba caused by

Israeli power:

"The Arab teachers, of course, feel as more victims of the Nakba and I think most of them pretty much feel the lines of we were innocent and our house was taken away and our property was taken from us and people were killed and people were slaughtered and it wasn't right and it was a tremendous injustice" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

When discussing topics on handling disagreements between teachers, the thread of nationalism seemed to emerge. The teacher expressed how the Jewish people feel threatened by a great number of Arab refugees returning to Israel. At the same time, the teacher expressed how the Jewish people do not recognize the dominance of their actions towards Palestinians as the Palestinians were the original inhabitants of the land:

"You really have to accept other opinions. Sometimes it threatens your life also. Like you feel that if someone wants to have I don't know a million refugees coming back to Israel people feel threatened. And the Jews don't always understand that every act that they do is very aggressive to the Palestinians who were here before" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Influence of Israeli Minister of Education on reconciliation model.

The theme presents the influence of the Israeli Minister of Education on the educational policies for the bilingual model. The theme presents the policies that are specific to the Hand-in-Hand program. Furthermore, this theme presents policies about the classroom code of conduct. The theme arose with the same frequency as the theme of nationalism. The Israeli Minister of Education requires that the school allots required hours to teach a specific curriculum:

"There is a ministry of education that demands a certain amount of hours to a certain amount of topics and a certain curriculum and that's the center of education" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The Max Rayne School is endorsed as a private school under the Hand-in-Hand organization:

"It's not a community school. It's a private school. It's a private school that supports a community that enjoys a community that creates a community" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The responses reported that the Hand-in-Hand bilingual model has a specific class that was developed as part of the reconciliation model. This is an identity class that is offered exclusively to Hand-in-Hand and is separate from the Israeli Minister of Education's policies:

> **Question:** What is the class called?
> **Mrs. Meyer:** Identity. The school developed it. The Hand-in-Hand community developed their own.
> **Question:** And this is specific to Hand-in-Hand and not to other schools?
> **Mrs. Meyer:** No, not to other schools at all.

Based on the details of the discussion, the Max Rayne School furthermore has a requirement to translate each hand-out and e-mail in both Hebrew and Arabic as part of the bilingual reconciliation model:

> **Question:** Are there any policies specific to Hand-in-Hand?
> **Mrs. Meyer:** Two teachers, two languages. All paperwork that we give the kids has to be translated to both languages. If we give the kid a slip about going to an event, it needs to be bilingual. Every email, most of the emails, are bilingual. We try to keep everything bilingual. If you want to put outcomes of the things that the children did on the board, you have to put it in two languages.

When inquiring about handling disputes in the classroom, the bilingual model's policy on civilian killing was presented. This policy reports that students can freely speak their opinions; however, the school's official policy does not allow for the killing of civilians to be justified:

> "The policy of the school, the official policy, is that certainly civilian killing is wrong. Civilians should not be killed. Soldiers and terrorists, maybe. But you can't ever justify the killing of civilians. For either side. Right?" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Reportedly, Hand-in-Hand seeks to have an equal representation of Jewish and Arab students and an equal representation of male and female students. The focus is to make the classes as equal as possible. Adhering to this policy, students have been denied admission to the school in order to maintain equality:

Mrs. Meyer: We want to have half Arabs and have Jews. Half girls, half boys, and we also have a lot of Christian kids, mixed kids. We try to make classes equal as much as we can.

Question: Has there ever been a situation where you have to turn down students because the statistics are not equal?

Mrs. Meyer: Yeah. There is a limited amount and there is a waiting list for this school.

Effect of external factors on child learning process of the reconciliation model.

This theme demonstrates the effect of external factors including the family, society, media, and political unrest on the process of the bilingual reconciliation model in the classroom. The theme presents how the model is able to influence the child's perceptions to move towards reconciliation when there are changes in political decisions, violence, bombings and discrimination in society.

This theme appears with the same frequency as the themes of dealing with external factors in the classroom, social mobility, ethnicity and gender requirements of the model, and the ability for the model to build lasting effects on children after graduation. The theme overlapped with discussion of handling disagreements.

One participant reports that the perception of a child will be shaped by the exposure to the conflict in the media and interactions with family and society. Therefore, the Bilingual Model does not avoid the discussion of external events in the classroom. Rather, the teachers allow the students to bring the external events into the classroom to learn from the other perceptions while approaching each other with respect:

> "There are lots of opinions that people have even in this school that they get from not from the teachers I'm sure but they get from hearing things on the radio or TV or from reading things maybe even from the parents and that are not factually correct. The basic thing is respect for the other person. You can't make it personal you can't call the other person names like you dirty Jew or you dirty Arab. You don't talk like that you can't. You have to respect the other person. Respect the other opinion even if you think it's wrong" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Based on the discussion, when external events arise, the children may openly speak about the events by approaching the topic with respect for one another. The director of Hand-in-Hand states that this is contrary to the approach that the Knesset takes when dealing with political unrest. Mr. Kerem reports that the media portrays that approach as being skeptical about the other person due to deceitful intentions. The bilingual model allows students to discuss what they hear externally. This can allow students to link the external events with the process of reconciliation that they are learning in the school:

> "Because public discourse in Israel is based on: you're a collaborator you're a traitor and that's basically what happens you know you look in the Knesset they shout at each other there's different things they shout out when they talk about issues about the conflict and I've heard other teachers say at different schools, kids are shouting at one another. Quiet. This is not the Knesset, you can't speak like that. The level of the Knesset is basic public discourse on radios and TV and such that you know you disagree with them. You're a traitor. You're a collaborator. And here it's different. You can disagree and you don't feel like that person has done you wrong. That the other child, that the teachers have done something wrong to you. Okay I don't agree, I think you're wrong, it's not a personal thing" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Based on the discussion, children do not see the model as maintaining the status quo and cannot relate the success of the model to situations in the external political process. However, the director reports that the model is able to change the thinking process of a child enough to hopefully alter external events and guide the child as a future leader:

> "I don't think they know the implication of you know you are either going to make peace or you're going to study in the school. They see it as what they do every day with each other is a way to make peace. Realize that in their context that kind of question is not a choice between this or that because they're not the heads of the government that could make a lead to peace. Maybe one day. If any of these kids run for a political party I'll vote for that political party because they will look at things much differently" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Dealing with external factors in the classroom.

This theme presents the way that teachers deal with the external factors of political unrest, societal and familial perceptions, familial historical accounts, and the media in the

classroom. This theme appears with the same frequency as the following themes: the effect of

external factors on the child's learning process of the reconciliation model, social mobility,

ethnicity and gender requirements of the model, and the ability for the model to build lasting

effects on children after graduation. Based on the discussion, one participant reports that

students sit in a circle and discuss what occurs when external bombings and conflict arises in

society. This allows the children to learn from one another and see justice on both sides:

> "The teachers open the day. They say, were going to talk about the war. I think the Jews probably said let this happen. What are we supposed to do when missiles are falling on people? We have to defend people. And the Arabs would say okay well yea yea but you're killing civilians and the Jews would say but yea they're hiding in the mosque. You know everyone could justify their own position it's very easy because there's some justice on both sides." (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The discussion would suggest that teachers deal with the multiple perspectives that

students hold about external factors by challenging the students' opinions:

> "I think the best way to deal with it is to question the sources of information and talk about the different sources of information we have and not come to conclusions because none of us really know the numbers" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Reportedly, the Hand-in-Hand model does not have a system for handling external

conflict that arises in the classroom. Some teachers will argue points with other teachers. This

can lead to arguments with the other teacher. Some will choose to respect the other person's

belief system and empathize with facts rather than challenging the validity of the argument.

There is no system for handling external events in the bilingual model:

"Let's say we have a big war and you want to talk about the war. The kids can talk about their different perspectives. One kid says oh the army just killed 5,000 people. Well we can say that this is not true but if this kid thinks that's true, you can't say that's not true and this is it. You have to challenge and ask him where did he get this information and who told him that you know just some things that are agreeable you know but usually we are like we know that that amount of people who died in the holocaust. There are a lot of people that think that that is a wrong number well there is not much I can do about it. I haven't been there I didn't count the people this is my belief system. You have to respect the other people's belief system rather than arguing with it. That is what we teach to be able to empathize with the other side but not argue over facts that's not going to work but there are teachers who will do that. That's my perspective and if they do that they might have very difficult positions in class and might get into arguments with the other teacher. But there's no system for doing that" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Ethnicity and gender requirements of the model.

This theme presents the Hand-in-Hand requirements for equality in the bilingual model. It also presents the current level of gender and ethnic equality in addition to the methods used to maintain this level of equality. This theme appears with the same frequency as the following themes: the effect of external factors on the child's learning process of the reconciliation model, dealing with external factors in the classroom, social mobility, and the ability for the model to build lasting effects on children after graduation. Reportedly, the policies of the Hand-in-Hand bilingual model require an equal amount of Jewish to Arab students as well as an equal ratio of male to female students. The intent is to make classes as equal as possible:

> **Question:** Are there policies of Hand-in-Hand that require an equal amount of Jewish and Arab students?
> **Mrs. Meyer:** Yes, and also 50/50 gender-wise. We want to have half Arabs and half Jews, half girls and half boys. And we also have a lot of Christian kids, mixed kids. We try to make classes equal as much as we can.

The discussion presents that regardless of being required to maintain equality by a Hand-in-Hand policy, the teachers prefer this equality. In some cases, the ethnic equality is not maintained. Currently there are more Arab than Jewish students:

Question: Are you required to have exactly the same number of Arab and Jewish students in each classroom?
Mrs. Meyer: We don't have to, we want to. But it usually doesn't happen. Sometimes there are classes with more Jews and sometimes there are classes with more Arabs. Usually lately there are more Arabs. Like there are some grades with more Arabs.

The responses suggest that there is a great demand for participating in the bilingual model at the Max Rayne School. There are students that are denied acceptance to the school in order to maintain a level of ethnic equality:

Question: Has there ever been a situation where you have to turn down students because the statistics are not equal?
Mrs. Meyer: Yeah. There is a limited amount and there is a waiting list for this school.

Social mobility.

This theme refers to the ability of the bilingual model to promote social mobility for Palestinians. This refers to job opportunities that arise from the school for both Israelis and Palestinians as well as opportunities for higher education. The theme appears with the same frequency as the following themes: effect of external factors on the child's learning process of the reconciliation model, dealing with external factors in the classroom, ethnicity and gender requirements of the model, and the ability for the model to build lasting effects on children after graduation. It is important to note that this theme overlapped with discussion of the ability of the model to build lasting effects on children after graduation, the perceptions of the model inhibiting or promoting structural and political change, and nationalism.

Based on the discussion, the situation in Israel between Israeli Jewish and Palestinian people is presented as one that gives services to Palestinians who do or do not have citizenship:

"Even Palestinians that don't have citizenship here, they still get to go to hospitals here they still get treatment. They're still, it's not like it's, it's not like the situation in Rwanda where one side is massacring the other side you know there's a difference there's definitely a difference between the two sides it's not like one side is being a pacifist" (I. Kerem, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The responses portray the bilingual model as a step towards bringing equality for the Palestinian and Jewish people. Palestinians can achieve social mobility through education and increased opportunities:

> "One step in making a better, more equal society. So all sides can have more opportunities especially for Arabs that believe that this can help them get to a better place in equality certainty educationally and in other ways too" (D. Alyan, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Ability for the model to build lasting effects on children after graduation.

This theme presents the teachers' perception on how likely the model will influence the actions of students after they complete the bilingual model at the Max Rayne School. This theme includes the ability of the model to build a foundation that can withstand the differing perspectives of the dominant familial and social norms. This theme appears with the same frequency as the following themes: the effect of the external factors on the child's learning process of the reconciliation model, dealing with external factors in the classroom, ethnicity and gender requirements of the model, and social mobility. It is interesting to note that this theme surfaced with discussion of social mobility and the perceptions of the model inhibiting or promoting structural and political change. Furthermore, the overlap between this theme and the perceptions of the model inhibiting or promoting structural and political change appeared twice by two different participants, the Palestinian teacher and the Israeli Jewish teacher.

The bilingual model is presented as having enough influence to move towards creating an equal society. This equality is exemplified by allowing for increased opportunities for the Israeli and Palestinian people:

The parents that send their kids here believe that this is one step toward making things better. One step ahead. You used the word reconciliation. One step in making a better, more equal society. So all sides can have more opportunities especially for Arabs that believe that this can help them get to a better place in equality certainty educationally and in other ways too" (D. Alyan, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

The responses suggest that children who graduate from the Hand-in-Hand school will have a dominant perspective that is shaped by their culture. Hand-in-Hand however, is presented as being able to create open-minded perspectives for the children and families. This occurs as a community is created by interacting with one another rather than being an isolated community. This can help students to understand different perspectives about other people and cultures as well:

"The kids will always have a dominant perspective like for their own culture. Hand-in-Hand is not going to change it but Hand-in-Hand will change the fact that they do have Jewish friends and they've been to Jewish homes. So if they are free thinkers they will always be able to think a little bit different from other people who have never met a Jew. And, for both communities. And also I think the school changes the parents also. The parents meet Jews and Arabs so it's not like the kids are isolated from the school. It's a community. The whole family is a little bit changed. Also, they speak the other language. They understand about the different perspectives about other people, not only Arabs and Jews, but for other communities" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012).

Application of the reconciliation model through community-based application.

This theme presents the opportunity for students to connect the bilingual model of reconciliation that they are learning in the classroom with tangible application in the community. This theme occurred with the least possible frequency.

The response shows that the bilingual model does not require and does not have many opportunities for students to connect the information learned in the classroom to tangible community projects. These community-based application projects are dependent on whether or not the teacher wants to initiate an event in the community:

Question: Are there any tangible projects that the students do to reinforce what they are learning in the classroom by working together in the community?

Mrs. Meyer: We do some volunteer work here and there but it's not organized. Like if there is a teacher that promotes that, it happens. But only if the teachers want to do something in the community.

Effects of the traditional educational institution design on the reconciliation model.

This theme addresses the effects of the traditional educational institutional design on the reconciliation model. This involves the educational system's traditional goals for compartmentalizing in preparation for a future vocation versus the reconciliation model of holistic living. The researcher recognized this theme initially due to previous knowledge of the question being asked. When analyzing the results of the second coder, the researcher determined that this theme did not emerge.

Overview of the Greatest Prevalence and the Overlapping Themes

The themes that occurred with the greatest prevalence were clearly presented without sharing the frequency of another theme. These four themes included (1) handling disagreements, (2) the structure of the school, (3) teachers' process for communicating with one another, and (4) children's reactions and behaviors in the classroom. Each theme after these four appeared with a frequency similar to other themes. The theme of handling disagreements occurred with the greatest frequency and had the most overlap with seven other themes including the discussion about the structure of the school, the teacher's process for communicating with one another, national holidays and the events of 1948, effects of external factors on classroom discussions, child reactions and behaviors when faced with disagreements, the model's ability to promote structural and political change, and nationalism.

The theme of nationalism was not specifically addressed in any of the research questions but was presented in the responses. It is also important to note that discussion of social mobility

overlapped with perceptions of reconciliation model inhibiting or promoting structural and political change, and the ability of the model to build lasting effects on children after graduation. Furthermore, the ability of the model to bring lasting affects after graduation and the perceptions of the reconciliation model inhibiting or promoting structural and political change overlapped twice by two different respondents, an Israeli Jewish teacher and Palestinian teacher.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

The Hand-in-Hand bilingual model, at the Max Rayne School in Jerusalem, can adopt methods for dealing with familial socialization, the cycle of victimization, the psychological trauma of children, structural discrimination, and nationalistic abuse. In relation to the larger Israeli-Palestinian context, reconciliation needs to combine long-term psychological interventions with adequate structural change to maintain the status quo.

Familial Socialization

Familial socialization occurs as the child is aware of his/her group identity within the larger society and maintains a collective memory that is passed down from one generation to the next. Bekerman (2009) argues that teachers have already formulated their identities and can influence children who are not yet fully socialized into the historical realities that gave birth to the conflict. This causes educators to affect the perception of a child by promoting an awareness of identity differences (Bekerman, 2009). In parallel, the findings of the ethnographical study on the Hand-in-Hand model report that disagreements are most prevalent between the teachers, whereas children are more accepting of one another. That is depicted in the following statement, "It mostly affects the teachers, not the students. The students live their life. They play football, they want to hang out, they make fun of everything. They laugh about everything. It is really difficult to be the staff here. That's where the conflict exists" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July 3, 2012). These disagreements between Israeli-Jewish and Arab teachers can surface in front of the students within the classroom. Thereby, children are more aware of the differing perceptions rooted in the identity of the teachers.

Furthermore, the findings of the ethnographical study present that teachers determine which student is correct when two students are disagreeing on historical facts or the events of an external conflict in society. The teachers at the Max Rayne School do not see this as offensive because the children have learned that it is okay to disagree. However, the open disagreement of teachers in front of students and the recognition of one child's viewpoint over another supports Bekerman's (2009) statement that teachers within the model can perpetuate identity as a boundary marker that restricts the child's range of social contact prior to the age of socialization.

Counter to this, the Hand-in-Hand model recognizes that children will be exposed to identity boundaries within the larger social context regardless of the reconciliation process in the classroom. Therefore, the model allows the children to witness disagreements between others in order to learn the proper ways to handle the disagreements rather than trying to isolate the children from the external factors in society. That is achieved through emphasizing respect and acceptance. Additionally, Hand-in-Hand requires students to take an identity class for two hours each week. The class is specific to the Hand-in-Hand reconciliation model and works through familial socialization by encouraging dialogue about the child's identity in relation to the larger society.

Cycle of Victimization

As identity is a key component of familial socialization, it is also a primary element in the cycle of victimization. A child's identity can be rooted in the understanding that he/she is the victim in the overall Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Repeated exposure to historical accounts and present-day external events can strengthen this identity and perpetuate the cycle of victimization. The Hand-in-Hand reconciliation model at the Max Rayne School works through the cycle of victimization by encouraging students to share their perceptions on the historical account of the

1948 War as well as examining the external factors in the larger society. In doing so, students learn about the account of the other side to prevent one group from assuming that it is the sole victim in the victim-victimizer relationship.

Furthermore, Bar-On & Kassem (2004) state that the storytelling model can face regression in the reconciliation process due to external events in the larger society. Counter to this, the Hand-in-Hand reconciliation model allows students to work through the cycle of victimization by providing proper ways to handle disagreements between the differing ethnic groups. These methods run counter to the violent ways that disagreements are handled in the external environment. In doing so, respect for the other person is characterized. It is important to note that teachers are not required to agree with one another prior to teaching together. Some may argue that this can foster disagreements in the classroom; however, the external factors in the larger society create disagreements between others in a live, raw setting. In the same way, teachers discuss differing perceptions in the classroom in a live format, yet provide respectful skills necessary to handle the argument.

Furthermore, Zembylas (2007) states that the individuals' identity is strongly linked with the group identity, so the prevalent concept of *the other* as a fixed category increases the tendency to dehumanize the other ethnic identity. He further states, peace education has to reverse this process by learning how to rehumanize the other (Zembylas, 2007). The identity course in the Hand-in-Hand model allows students to talk through commonalities and build awareness of the other identity. However, rehumanizing *the other* requires a deeply-rooted psychological change for students. If the Hand-in-Hand model allows students to speak about their identities and discuss external events, yet fails to provide psychological healing for

rehumanization, the students will not be equipped with the ability to think through perceptions within the broader society when placed in an external environment.

A psychological component can be adopted by the Hand-in-Hand model to allow for rehumanization that penetrates beyond an awareness of the other identity. In doing so, familial socialization, the cycle of victimization and psychological trauma can be worked through. The following section will examine the psychological component of the reconciliation process.

Psychological Trauma

The findings of the study present that the Hand-in-Hand model attempts to change the thinking process of students through the identity course and an open, respectful, discussion about disagreements. That is supported in the statement of one participant, "so if they are free thinkers they will always be able to think a little bit more differently from other people" (E. Meyer, personal communication, July, 3, 2012). In addition to this, the emotional elements of trauma must be accounted for; otherwise, the students may feel as though they have shared much about their identity, yet healing through a reevaluation of the psyche has not occurred. That can perpetuate the cycle of victimization and the existing conflict. Critical Emotional Literacy can be used to critique and analyze the way trauma and ideologies can limit an individual's understanding (Zembylas, 2007). This can allows members to come to terms with the traumatic events of the groups' history by teaching students how trauma stories can be used to teach fear, mistrust, and hate (Zembylas, 2007). If this does not occur, psychological trauma can be perpetuated as the inability to mourn trauma creates an evolution of new defense mechanisms and can lead to a new generation embracing an ideology of revenge.

Furthermore, studies on the effects of psychological trauma in children present *altruism born of suffering* as a method to work simultaneously with critical emotional literacy (Staub,

1999). Altruism born of suffering supports the idea that past trauma combined with healing experiences can lead to an altruistic concern for the others' welfare that can expand beyond the boundaries of the group. From this, children can seek to counter injustice and develop moral courage to speak out and act against policies and practices in their group (Staub, 1999).

Critical Thinking as a Method for Reconciliation in an Intractable Conflict

The literature review presents Israeli-Palestinian conflict as an intractable conflict. In this manner, the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict contains social, emotional, political and psychological components that overlap together to influence conflicting groups (Salomon & Nevo, 2002). The Hand-in-Hand model should continue to allow each student to regard his/her unique identity as valuable, rather than completely denying it. However, because each group's nationalistic identity was formulated in direct opposition to *the other*, the child needs to work through a negative identification of collective memory that perpetuates ongoing conflict. Bekerman et al. (2009) present critical thinking as a primary tool to teach children about the perceptions that have shaped the nationalistic identities of their teachers, family members, and the broader society. Utilizing critical thinking will allow children to think through a situation and learn how to respond based on humanitarian concern, rather than allegiance to national identity and familial thought. These critical thinking elements can provide change by probing children to discover how identities are formed and how to value other accounts despite their own cultural identity. Without this, the model will be unable to work through psychological trauma and the cycle of victimization in children once they are in an external context.

Structural Discrimination

The theme of social mobility emerged in the interviews at the Hand-in-Hand Max Rayne School as a method to combat structural discrimination. Mrs. Alyan, a Palestinian Kindergarten

Teacher, states that the model is "one step in making a better, more equal society so all sides can have more opportunities, especially for Arabs that believe that this can help them get to a better place in equality, certainly educationally and in other ways too" (D. Alyan, personal communication, July, 3, 2012). This presents that the model is linked with the ability for Palestinians to combat the structural hegemony of the Israeli school system and move up the social ladder. Bekerman and Nir (2006) support this idea by stating that the model is found to promote social mobility aspirations for Palestinian-Arab children and utilizes culture and religion to bridge the gaps that maintain the division in Israeli society. It is important to recognize that although this component of the model allows students to work through structural discrimination, it can only apply to those Palestinians that can actually afford the costs of the education.

Additionally, this can maintain the status quo as the Hand-in-Hand model is a private educational option that requires student tuition to provide the means for Palestinians to move up the social ladder. Because many students cannot excel on a university level without fluency in Hebrew, many Palestinians are choosing to send their students to integrated schools to pursue an opportunity for social mobility. The findings show that the ability for a Palestinian to obtain lasting change in society is tied closely with social mobility. For example, the theme of *social mobility* at the Max Rayne School overlaps with the theme of *the perceptions of the reconciliation model to inhibit or promote structural and political change* in addition to the theme of *the ability of the model to build lasting effects on children after graduation*. The findings further present that when the participants were asked a question about social mobility, two participants—an Israeli-Jewish and a Palestinian teacher—had responses with the same exact overlapping of themes: the theme of *the ability of the model to bring lasting affects after graduation* and the theme of *the perceptions of the reconciliation model inhibiting or promoting*

structural and political change. That shows that the ability for change to create lasting effects is linked closely with the concept of social mobility for Palestinians. This opportunity however, is not available for all other Palestinians in the country.

For example, in the 2007-2008 Hand-in-Hand annual report, there were approximately 1000 students enrolled in the Max Rayne School and the number of enrollment was expected to increase (2007-2008 annual report, 2012). However, when visiting the school in July of 2012, numbers decreased as approximately 600 – 700 students at the school and a participant stated that there are waiting lists for students to enroll. Furthermore, a participant mentioned that the Arab students show growing interest in this model and maintain the greater representation of the two ethnic groups. One can assume that Arab students have more of an incentive to enroll into this school due to an opportunity for social mobility in comparison to Jewish-Israeli students. Therefore, if fewer Jewish students seek enrollment from the school, then fewer Palestinians will have a chance at working toward social mobility. This is because Hand-in-Hand's policy to maintain an equal representation of both ethnic groups will regulate a 50/50 ratio and cause fewer Palestinians to receive enrollment into the school. This can prevent the school from growing and providing more opportunities to combat structural discrimination for the Palestinian students. Therefore, Israelis can maintain national dominance by providing a model that gives social mobility to Palestinians without altering political power.

Additionally, the model perpetuates structural discrimination through the organization of the leadership in the Max Rayne School. The responses from the participants of the Hand-in-Hand model, in combination with the literature, presents that Hand-in-Hand is required to have a Jewish and an Arab principal at each bilingual school. Despite this, the Hand-in-Hand Max

Rayne School has only one principal, who is Jewish, that directs the school. In doing so, Jewish hegemony is evident in the leadership of the school rather than offering a balanced perspective.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the teachers were unable to recognize the characteristics of the traditional educational design that could inhibit the reconciliation process. This involves the educational system's traditional goals for compartmentalizing each subject in order to prepare for a future vocation versus the concept of holistic living that should be integrated in a reconciliation model for regions of intractable conflict. That can thereby cause students to compartmentalize what they are taught at home versus what they learn in school. Despite being asked about the structure of the educational design's effects on the model, the theme of the ability for the model to promote structural change emerged in the responses. It seems as though the teachers report that the model combats the educational institution's design because everyone in the community of Hand-in-Hand supports this model. Although the responses present the model as providing structural change, it is important to recognize that the Arab community is not at an equal place in society with the Jewish community. The teacher's unwillingness to recognize these problematic factors can further preserve structural discrimination. To combat this compartmentalization, joint community projects can be adopted to link the reconciliation process in the classroom to the external community. These practical projects allow students to work together in the community to work through the structural discrimination.

Nationalism

Teachers at the Max Rayne School do not perceive the model as inhibitor of political change. This is because the students are learning how to handle the conflict with methods of respect that differ from the confrontational nature of the Knesset. Despite this, is important to

note that the questionnaire did not include any direct questions about nationalism, yet that theme emerged in two out of three of the participants' responses. Teachers need to recognize that nationalism is influencing the model through their mindset and identity. With Arab nationalism being unrecognized in the broader society, the model needs to be able to provide an element that combats the dominance of Jewish nationalism.

Salient Themes

When analyzing the responses of the participants, the theme of handling disagreements surfaced as most prevalent. All three of the participants emphasized that disagreements should be handled with respect for the other person. Despite this emphasis, handling disagreements through teaching respect for the other person is a long-term process. Without proper structural change, the current inequality in the larger society is maintained. Furthermore, the literature review presents the perpetuation of structural discrimination as the most prevalent theme in the majority of the reconciliation models in Israel. Working through structural discrimination is the focus of the next section.

Working through Structural Discrimination: Political Change

Opotow (2001) argues that reconciliation requires an exploration of past wrongdoings through social reconstruction over the course of time. Without this, the long-term mental health of victims will be compromised (Opotow, 2001). This long term process needs to combine with structural change on a political level. An example of this is presented in South Africa through the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. This allows for a national address of situations in the past and individuals that were responsible for the claims. The parties need to present historical facts of what occurred through a range of interpretations. An agreement on a subset of accounts and an attitude of mutual tolerance for a limited set of interpretations rather than settling on a

single interpretation should be sought. It is also important to prevent a psychological numbing from a repeated public ritual of violence, remorse, and forgiveness that reopens old wounds yet gives little support afterward.

Implications for Working through Structural Discrimination in Israel

Factors in the larger Israeli-Palestinian context influence the reconciliation process and therefore must be considered when working through reconciliation. The failure to distribute resources equally, the loss of hope in suicide bombers, and the lineage of generational thought, promote structural discrimination, the cycle of victimization, and familial socialization in Israel respectively. Currently, Israel claims to represent a democratic nation yet the history textbooks present biased historical accounts that promote Jewish hegemony (Yogev, 2010). Furthermore, bystanders including the U.S. readily support Israel as a democratic nation yet fail to realize how the school system perpetuates structural discrimination. Therefore, the U.S. indirectly allows for international victimization on the reconciliation process. These factors will continue to have a greater influence on children unless the Israeli educational system combines the long term process of reconciliation with a larger movement toward political change. Bekerman (2009) states that education alone cannot bring an end to the conflict, but rather structural change must occur: the immediate halt of state practiced systematic discrimination in all areas including land dispossession and allocation, housing, economics, culture, political participation and education. Until this occurs, peace educators are stagnated.

From this, many would argue that reconciliation education cannot significantly allow for structural change. Even within the structure of the school system, the Israeli Minister of Defense serves as a mechanism of control where educational policies are designed to support the Zionist ethos and inferiority of its Palestinian citizens (Bekerman et al., 2009). Currently, reconciliation

models in the school system are integrated in several schools, yet the majority of the schools in the Israeli school system, the West Bank, and Gaza Strip, are not included in these processes. This in turn fosters Israeli dominance by providing reconciliation attempts that do not extend to the greater Palestinian population. Aside from these schools, the additional schools in the broader society are segregated and are not included in reconciliation efforts.

Structural change therefore needs to begin with the Israeli Minister of Education. This can occur by including both narrative accounts in Israeli textbooks and courses that support joint projects in the broader society and political dialogue between students. The Israeli Minister of Education can furthermore redistribute resources equally between Jewish and Arab schools and foster integration between the two to allow for a better quality of education for Arab students. Ultimately, serious attempts for reconciliation methods in the Israeli school system will depend on the Minister in power and the political climate. To counter this, the development of a new policy that fosters critical thinking in the school systems in addition to an incorporation of both historical accounts can allow for change to occur beyond the political climate.

If the current status is maintained, the long term affects will create even greater problems than there are presently. If Palestinians make attempts to reconcile with hopes that there will be serious change in their future yet they are still faced with structural discrimination, then greater violence can be propagated through the cycle of victimization. If this continues, the Israeli section will cover Palestinian identity and eventually Palestinians will be integrated into the Jewish state of Israel rather than receiving recognition through honest reconciliation efforts.

CHAPTER SEVEN

REFERENCES

2007-2008 annual report. (2012). Retrieved from

http://www.handinhandk12.org/sites/handinhand.tumblehome.com/files/pdfs/annual_repo

rt_07-08.pdf

(2008). S. C. Tucker (Ed.), *Arab-Israeli Conflict: A Political, Social, and Military History*. Santa

Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc.

(2011, February 19). U.S. vetoes U.N. draft against Israeli settlements. *Middle East Reporter*

(Weekly Edition). p.1.

Abu Musa, J. M. (2008). *UNRWA's area staff satisfaction on performance appraisal system and*

its incentives in the Gaza field office. Unpublished manuscript, College of Commerce,

The Islamic University of Gaza, Gaza Strip, Palestine.

Abu-Nimer, M. (2000). Peace building in postsettlement: Challenges for Israeli and Palestinian

peace educators. *Journal of Peace Psychology*, *6*(1), 1-21.

Abu-Saad, I. (2006). State educational policy and curriculum: The case of Palestinian Arabs in

Israel. *International Education Journal*, *7*, 709-720.

Al-Haj, M. (2002). Multiculturalism in deeply divided societies: The Israeli case. *International*

Journal of Intercultural Relations, *26*, 169-183.

Arar, K. (2012). Israeli education policy since 1948 and the state of Arab education in Israel.

Italian Journal of Sociology of Education, *1*, 113-145.

Arnon, A. & Weinblatt, J. (2001). Sovereignty and economic development: The case of Israel

and Palestine. *The Economic Journal*, *111*, 291-308.

Awad, A. (2001). *Through the eyes of victims: The story of the Arab-Israeli conflict*. Bethlehem: Bethlehem Bible College.

Azar, E. E. (1990). The learning case. In E. E. Azar & J.W. Burton (Eds.), The management of protracted social conflict: Theory and practice (pp. 126–140). Brighton, UK: Wheatsheaf.

Bar-On, D. & Fatma K. (2004). Story telling as a way to work through intractable conflicts: The German-Jewish experience and its relevance to the Palestinian-Israeli context. *Journal of Social Issues*, *60*, 289-306.

Bar-Tal, D. (2001). The Arab Image in Hebrew School Textbooks. *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics & Culture*, *8*, 5-18.

Bar-Tal, D. (2004) Nature, rationale, and effectiveness of education for coexistence. *Journal of Social Issues*, *60*, 253-271.

Bekerman, Z. (2007). Rethinking intergroup encounters: Rescuing praxis from theory, activity from education, and peace/co-existence from identity and culture. *Journal of Peace Education*, *4*, 21-37.

Bekerman, Z. (2009). Identity versus peace: Identity wins. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*, 74-83.

Bekerman, Z., & Nir, A. (2006). Opportunities and challenges of integrated education in conflict-ridden societies: The case of Palestinian-Jewish schools in Israel. *Childhood Education*, *82*, 327-333.

Bekerman, Z., Zembylas, M., & McGlynn, C. (2009). Working toward the de-essentialization of identity categories in conflict and postconflict societies: Israel, Cyprus, and Northern Ireland. *Comparative Education Review*, *53*, 213-234.

Berko, A. & Edna, E. (2005). "Ordinary people" and "death work": Palestinian suicide bombers as victimizers and victims. *Violence and Victims*, *20*, 603-623.

Brynen, R. (2000). *A very political economy: Peace building and foreign aid in the West Bank and Gaza.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Institute for Peace Press

Chenoweth, J. L., Wehrmeyer, W. (2006). Scenario development for 2050 for the Israeli/Palestinian water sector. *Population Environment*, *27*, 245-261. doi:10.1007/s11111-006-0021-6.

Cobb, S. (2006). *"Humiliation" as positions in narratives: Implications for policy development.* Unpublished manuscript, Institute for Conflict Anlaysis and Resolution, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.

Cohn-Sherbok, D., & El-Alami, D. (2001). *The Palestine-Israeli conflict: A beginner's guide.* Oxford: Oneworld Publications.

Derfner, L. (2007). For Palestinians, everyday hardship at the checkpoints. *U.S. News & World Report*, *143*(10), p. 40.

Egger, P. (2005). The economics of peace: Trends and prospects of the Palestinian economy and labour market. *International Labour Review*, *144*, 31-54.

Ferreira, A. & Janks, H. (2007). Reconciliation pedagogy, identity and community funds of knowledge: Borderwork in South Africa. *English Academy Review*, *24*, 71-84. doi:10.1080/10131750701452311

Gallagher, T. (2010). *Building a shared future from a divided past: Promoting peace through education in Northern Ireland*. New York, NY US: Psychology Press.

Gelvin, J. L. (2011). *The modern Middle East: A history*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Golan-Agnon, D. (2005). Inequality in education and discriminiation against Palestinian Arab

  students in Israel. In D. Champagne and Abu-Saad, I. (eds.) *Indigenous and Minority*

  Education: International Perspectives on Empowerment. Beer Sheva: Negev Center for

  Regional Development, Ben-Gurion University of Negev, pp.201-214.

Hand-in-Hand center for Jewish-Arab education in Israel. (2012). Retrieved from

  http://www.handinhandk12.org/

Hodgkin, M. (2006). Reconciliation in Rwanda: Education, history and the state. *Journal Of*

  International Affairs, *60*, 199-210.

Israeli-Palestine Center for Research and Information. (2012). *Peace education text books for*

  Israelis and Palestinian schools grades 1-12. Retrieved from

  http://www.ipcri.org/files/textbooks.pdf

Keyton, J., King, T., Mabachi, N. M., Manning, J., Leonard, L. L., & Schill, D. (2004).

  Content analysis procedure book. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.

Land expropriation and settlements. (2011, January 1). *B'Tselem - The Israeli Information*

  Center for Human Rights in the Occupied Territories. Retrieved from

  http://www.btselem.org/settlements

Maoz, I. (2004). Coexistence is in the eye of the beholder: Evaluating intergroup encounter

  interventions between Jews and Arabs in Israel. *Journal of Social Issues*, *60*, 437-452.

Maoz, I. (2011). Does contact work in protracted asymmetrical conflict? Appraising 20 years of

  reconciliation-aimed encounters between Israeli Jews and Palestinians. *Journal* of *Peace*

  Research, *48*, 115-125. doi:10.1177/0022343310389506

Muslih, M. Y., (1988). *The origins of Palestinian nationalism*. New York: Columbia University

  Press.

Not only at school: Education, occupation, activism and dialogue. (2001). *Palestine-Israeli*
    Journal of Politics, Economics & Culture, *8*(2), 70.

Opotow, S. (2001). Reconciliation in times of impunity: Challenges for social justice. *Social*
    Justice Research, *14*, 149-170.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. London, UK: Sage
    Publications.

Parthasarathy, B. (2008, July 28). *The global impact study: The ethnographic case study*
    approach. Retrieved from http://www.globalimpactstudy.org/2008/07/the-ethnographic-
    case-study-approach/

Pettigrew, T. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*, 65-85.

Pingel, F. (2008). Can truth be negotiated? History textbook revision as a means to
    reconciliation. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *617*,
    181-198.

Q&A: Israeli Arabs. (2009, 07 23). *BBC News*. Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-
    /2/hi/middle_east/8165338.stm

Riccardo, F., Khader, A. & Sabatinelli, G. (2011). Low infant mortality among Palestine
    refugees despite the odds. *Bull World Health Organ*, *89*, 309-311.
    doi:10.2471/BLT.10.082743

Rihan, R. A. (2001). The Palestinian educational development plan: Promise for the future.
    Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics & Culture, *8*(2), 19-33.

Salomon, G., & Nevo, B. (2002). *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices*
    around the world. Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schaefer, R. (2004). *Sociology: A brief introduction*. (5 ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schulze, K. E. (2008). *The Arab-Israeli conflict*. New York: Pearson Longman Inc.

Staub, E. (1999). The origins and prevention of genocide, mass killing, and other collective violence. Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 5, 303-336.

Tucker, S. (2008). The encyclopedia of the Arab-Israeli conflict: A political, social, and military history. Santa Barbara, Calif: ABC-CLIO.

Volf, M. (1996). Exclusion and embrace: A theological exploration of identity, otherness, and reconciliation. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Whittall, J. (2009). 'It's like talking to a brick wall': Humanitarian diplomacy in the occupied Palestinian territory. *Progress in Development Studies*, *9*, 37-53.

Witzel, A. (2000). The Problem-centered Interview. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschun/Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 1*(1). Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1132/2521

Wohl, M. J. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2008). Remembering historical victimization: Collective guilt for current ingroup transgressions. *Journal of Peace and Social Psychology*, *94*, 988-1006.

Zembylas, M. (2007). The politics of trauma; empathy, reconciliation and peace education. *Journal of Peace Education*, *4*, 207-224.

Zinn, J. O. (2004). *Introduction to biographical research*. Informally published manuscript, School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research, University of Kent, Canterbury, Canterbury, UK. Retrieved from http://www.kent.ac.uk/scarr/papers/Introduction biographical research. WP 4.04doc.pdf

Yogev, E. (2010). A crossroads: History textbooks and curricula in Israel. *Journal of Peace Education*, *7*(1), 1-14.