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BOOK REVIEWS

regarding the expected outcomes of educational attainment should be how to include the family values and cultural expectations that the girls from al-Khatwa utilized to formulate and define their own understanding of progress and the purpose of education. Education, progress, nationalism, respectability, development, and the advancement of women should not be something left to the economists to calculate and define for the whole world. The stories, experiences, and voices of the girls of al-Khatwa school must be considered in the overall equation.

NORMA T. NEMEH
Queen Rania Teacher Academy


Social science scholarship concerning Rwanda has been understandably preoccupied with analyzing Rwanda’s 1994 genocide in terms of both its causes and effects. Research has retrospectively focused on the political and economic conditions that led to the killing of an estimated 800,000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus over a 100-day period. Scholars have also increasingly turned to examine the country in a prospective sense—one that considers Rwanda’s trajectory in light of its strategies for peace and reconciliation as well as social and economic development. In the wake of the twentieth anniversary of the genocide, Elisabeth King’s book From Classrooms to Conflict in Rwanda offers a timely and persuasive contribution to both discussions. Drawing from Kenneth Bush and Diana Saltarelli’s seminal work (The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict [Rome: UNICEF, 2000]), King uses historical, contemporary, and comparative perspectives to illustrate how the role of education in conflict is understood to have two faces: that education at once be a driver for peace, reconciliation, and unity and also for conflict, division, and inequality.

From Classrooms to Conflict in Rwanda is divided into five chapters. The first and last theorize the relationship between schooling and conflict by considering lessons learned from the Rwandan context. The middle three chapters review the emergence of schooling and the Rwandan state during colonialism, under the two Rwandan republics (1964–94), and in the postgenocide contemporary context (1994–2009).

The book is principally informed by 70 key informant interviews with Rwandans who attended or taught school between the colonial period and 2006, interviews with former Belgian colonial administrators and missionaries, and archival research. The book is well researched, includes over 800 footnotes, and draws heavily upon established scholars of Rwanda such as Newbury, Longman, and Chretien. However, before King’s book went to press, I wish she had been able to sneak in some insights from Alison Des Forges’s 2011 book Defeat Is the Only Bad News: Rwanda under Musinga, 1896–1931 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2011), which offers additional information about colonial-era schooling.

Throughout the book, King focuses on the fluid and ongoing processes of
centralization and consolidation of power and the role of formal education in this process. Doing so provides insight into the continuities, transformations, and ruptures that have given rise to the contemporary Rwandan state, and offers a unique window of analysis through which to consider the emergence of the formal educational system. The book enables us to consider the conditions and processes that facilitated the expansion of the precolonial Rwandan state, how a small contingent of European colonial authorities maintained indirect control of the country for a half-century, how and why western forms of education were introduced and positioned in ways that were at once strategic and divisive, how a Tutsi-led monarchy was followed by a Hutu-led republic, and how the 1994 genocide occurred.

Following the genocide, there was a shared sentiment among local and international observers that pre-1994 schooling had failed the country—that ethnic and regional restrictions on access, along with a racist school curriculum that discriminated against Tutsis, had exacerbated existing tensions. Rebuilding the education system in such a way that addressed these precipitating factors was of high priority for the new government called the Rwanda Patriotic Front (RPF). King’s analysis further enables us to consider the role and function of schooling during Rwanda’s postconflict recovery and reconstruction and how this has given rise to rapid social and economic transformation, different forms of social control, and an expansive effort toward education in the decade that followed.

The detailed look into the historical emergence of Rwanda’s education system provides the basis through which she analyzes the contemporary forms of governance and the education system. King admits her perspective of the RPF is critical but justifies her perspective well. Given her careful historical analyses, concern is raised about how the RPF has gone about addressing issues related to ethnic identification. Despite what is effectively a ban on ethnic identification from the public transcript, King writes, “There are deep and multiple cleavages in Rwanda that are hidden by most popular accounts.” The teaching of history in classrooms is cause for concern. Teaching history has sought to revise the past so that it aligns with the government. In her analysis of social studies textbooks, for example, she observed that “the pre-colonial period is presented as a harmonious golden age, ruptured by the divide-and-rule strategies of the colonial powers.” But drawing from her historical analysis, she adds, “This is factually incorrect” (139).

King also pays attention to the government’s recent switch from French to English as the medium of instruction in classrooms. Drawing on her detailed historical account, she notes that the central RPF leadership comprises a political Tutsi elite from an Anglophone background; thus, the language shift not only has helped to confer advantages to this elite group, but has done so in a way that is understood as having an ethnic basis. Thus, while ethnicity is no longer to be openly discussed, the issue of language and ethnic identity may give rise to further divisions and exacerbate tensions.

I found that the contemporary postgenocide context chapter could have benefited from a greater level of nuance. For example, King’s examination of the pregenocide educational context focused on educational access. In the postgenocide context, however, access to primary education is now almost universal. In 2009, the government introduced a policy to expand education access so that all children have access to 9 years of basic education (and in 2012, this policy expanded
to 12 years). The chapter could have benefited from more closely considering the “two faces” of education in light of the concerted efforts to expand the education system, particularly given that commensurate efforts to also ensure education quality have lagged far behind—an issue that has been exacerbated by the recent language shift.

Describing her methods used, King reflected upon her decision to limit her interviews to those conversant in only English or French. Her rationale was, first, that Francophones or Anglophones were overrepresented in the education system and would be able to speak to her core issues of concern and, second, that interviewees would be more open if there was not a third party (i.e., a translator) present. This is a reasonable claim, but given that roughly 99 percent of the population speak Kinyarwanda and 90 percent speak only Kinyarwanda, the study overall could have been enriched from the perspective of those who had been excluded from educational opportunities in the past or who had recently received an education but did not receive the skill set that would have allowed them to hold a conversation in a language such as English—the very language the RPF hopes will propel the country to reach its development aims. Future research can and should build off King’s otherwise excellent work to address this gap.

TIMOTHY P. WILLIAMS
University of Bath


From the implementation of the Bologna Process in Europe to the rise of branch campuses in the Middle East, higher education is transforming across the globe. Universities in the states of the former Soviet Union are no exception. In the past 20 years, policy makers, university officials, and faculty in the postsocialist space have undertaken sweeping changes, such as restructuring institutions, introducing new languages and fields of study, and diversifying opportunities for students through the introduction of private universities. *Higher Education at a Crossroad: The Case of Estonia* addresses these issues among others in the Estonian context. The volume is an excellent primer for comparative and international education scholars and students with an interest in Estonia and the region. Saar and Möttus’s objective is “to provide a comprehensive range of topics pertaining to Estonian higher education” (18). With 17 chapters spanning a range of topics and written by scholars of differing disciplines, the volume also appeals to those with an interest in higher education policy, instruction, student learning, classroom environment and ped-