

understandings of the conflict and government-controlled narratives on the past. As a result, ‘The *gacaca* process created a mass of *hidden death* and unexpressed grievances under the surface of daily life. As a self-fulfilling prophecy it might have perpetuated what it was supposedly eradicating – ethnic subcultures’ (p. 212). The strength of his analysis lies in its empirical basis, which draws on 30 months of field research between 2005 and 2012. In a context in which wider debates and positions on Rwanda are highly fraught, it provides a powerful contribution to this discussion and creates a strong platform for understanding ongoing tensions not only within Rwanda but also in the broader region.

Ingelaere’s findings therefore encapsulate many of the strengths of the book, which demonstrate the dangers inherent in an exclusive focus on genocide as a criminal act without taking into consideration the broader cultural, social, and political context in which it takes place. Furthermore, freed from the constraints of analysing genocide within a primarily legal paradigm, the book asks us to question not only why genocide takes place, but why it does not.

*International Refugee Rights Initiative*

LUCY HOVIL

lucy@hovil.co.uk

doi: 10.1093/afraf/adu071

Advance Access Publication 25 November 2014

**From classrooms to conflict in Rwanda**, by Elisabeth King. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2014. v + 212 pp. \$90.00 (hardback). ISBN 978 1 10703 933 9. \$72.00 (e-book). ISBN 978 1 10744 028 9.

This book is one of the few published works that discusses how education may not always promote peace building in post-conflict situations, such as Rwanda. In addition, it is the first book to offer a comprehensive, longitudinal analysis of education in Rwanda, an issue of continuing importance. While this is King’s first book on Rwanda, she has published many articles and book chapters on Africa, and specifically Rwanda, and is a former fellow of the Africa Initiative.

As the author states (p. 1), ‘Schooling plays a key role in the country’s transformation. The Rwandan government is currently investing significantly in schools and placing tremendous faith in the power of education as a tool of unity and reconciliation.’ According to King, this assumption of unity and reconciliation must be examined. While other authors have looked at post-conflict education in Rwanda, analysis has focused solely on secondary education, without an examination of historical trends in the education system. Other works have examined how ethnicity and education interact, but have not focused on a specific case. Overall, King’s book is a successful presentation of the ways in which the role of education in peace building is often overlooked and simply regarded as a ‘good thing’ (p. 163), without examining the ways in which education can also foster inter-ethnic conflict.

The volume is presented as a timeline along which historical analyses are offered of three periods: colonial Rwanda (1919–62), the Rwandan Republics (1962–94), and post-genocide Rwanda (1994–present). Within these analyses, the author presents an assessment of formal education that explores factors such as access to education, language barriers, classroom practices, and history teaching. In order to gain

insight into these periods, King conducted 70 interviews in 2006 with Rwandans who taught at or attended primary school in Rwanda, as well as interviews with former Belgian administrators. According to King, the structure of the education system since 1919 and the policies behind the system helped to reinforce societal differences and conditions that led to violent conflict. These included unequal opportunities for schooling dependent upon ethnicity, as well as the content taught to students which categorized and stigmatized certain ethnic groups. King does not argue that education was the *only* factor leading to violent conflict, but that the education system helped facilitate conditions which made conflict possible. In the post-genocide period, there has been an increase in access to primary schooling that does not discriminate against people on the grounds of ethnicity. However, as King argues, 'ethnic trends in access to post-primary education are worrisome and mirror past trends in how they differentiate, collective [sic], and stigmatize Rwandans with new identities (survivor, perpetrator) that parallel their former ethnic groups' (pp. 147–8). This is evidenced through interviews, an assessment of the secondary school curriculum, and by examining financial access to the education system, such as the non-affordability of school fees or uniforms for the poor.

King concludes that education did contribute to incidences of violence and the education system did not encourage peace building in some areas, as assumed by the 'add education and stir' (p. 162) approach, championed by some government officials, international actors, and non-governmental organizations. She describes how a lack of education is often a contributory factor in violent conflict, and that 'education is neither necessary nor sufficient for either violent conflict or sustainable peace' (p. 164).

While King offers many convincing and well-evidenced arguments, the book does contain shortcomings, which the author acknowledges. Many of the weaknesses surround ethnicity and interview processes. For example, in Rwanda 'public ethnic identification' (p. 10) is against the law, and because of this King was unable to ask interviewees their ethnicity; she had to speculate. In addition, the interviews were conducted in English and French, and hence interviewees typically had a higher education level than other citizens. King also acknowledges that some interviewees may have engaged in 'selective reporting' or 'self-censorship' (p. 11). Furthermore, one must consider the likelihood that informants reproduced 'group narratives' and drew on social memory, because they may have told stories of experiences that happened to members of their ethnic group, but not personally to themselves. As King notes, the time from 1994 to 2006 when the interviews took place is a short period, in political and societal terms, to draw definitive conclusions about what has happened to the education system since 1994.

Overall, despite the above shortcomings and obstacles, King presents convincing arguments of how the education system in post-conflict societies may have led, and continues to promote, an environment in which inter-ethnic conflict can take place. The book illuminates how schooling can be a factor in how students develop their own identity, as well as creating 'views of the other' (p. 14). King draws parallels between Rwanda and other post-conflict and conflict societies such as Burundi, Northern Ireland, South Africa, Macedonia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, and Malaysia, and describes how recent schooling initiatives have helped to relieve certain ethnic tensions. She suggests how Rwanda can follow suit in some areas, such as through

alleviating the repression of ethnicity. To conclude, King rejects the notion that recommending more education will necessarily bring about positive change, and instead advocates greater understanding of what kinds of education may nurture peace or foster conflict.

*University of Westminster*

ASHLEY D. KITCHEN

A.Kitchen@my.westminster.ac.uk

doi: 10.1093/afraf/adu072

Advance Access Publication 4 December 2014

**Peaceland: Conflict resolution and the everyday politics of international intervention**, by Séverine Autesserre. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2014. xiii + 329 pp. £19.99 (paperback). ISBN 978 1 10763 204 2. £55.00 (hardback). ISBN 978 1 10705 210 9. \$24.00 (e-book). ISBN 978 1 13995 056 5.

Readers of *African Affairs* have already had an excellent introduction to Séverine Autesserre's latest book through her prize-winning article 'Dangerous tales: Dominant narratives on the Congo and their unintended consequences' (2012). The article masterfully analysed the unintended and detrimental side-effects of the use of simplified narratives about conflict causes, consequences, and solutions by international peace builders. *Peaceland* has a lot more to offer: it is a sharp and compelling analysis of the organizational and social-psychological dimensions of international intervention, made highly accessible by numerous on-the-ground examples.

The failure of international peace-building efforts has been thoroughly debated and researched. Several authors have attributed failures to top-down planning inherent in 'liberal peace building' or to the lack of local ownership (see, for example, the work of Oliver Richmond). Autesserre adds another, crucial dimension: the everyday practices and routines of international interveners. In her analysis, effective peace-building initiatives are seen as those 'projects or programs that, during interviews or informal discussions, both implementers ... and intended beneficiaries ... presented as having promoted peace' (p. 23). Contrary to some policy makers and researchers, Autesserre works explicitly on the sub-national, local level. Therefore countries in general are not identified as failures (Congo, for example) or successes (Timor-Leste, for example).

Building on participant observation, interviews, and past experience in several conflict locations (Autesserre has been an intervener herself), the author analyses the interactions among international interveners and between interveners and local actors. Accordingly, she identifies patterns of behaviour, often unbeknown to the individuals themselves, that undermine the peace-building agenda. The first part of the book focuses on how interveners construct knowledge about their areas of intervention. In Chapter 2, Autesserre demonstrates how intervening agencies systematically favour thematic knowledge (in fields such as human rights or gender) over local knowledge (of the Kivus in Congo, for example) and how this leads to the implementation of general best practices without an evaluation of what works in a specific context. Moreover, interveners only stay for a short period in specific locations and they seldom speak a local language. A bias towards thematic expertise also leads