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Abstract

In this paper we offer insights into a new educational venture in Israel, which aims at overcoming inter-ethnic conflict through bilingual co-education. Our insights are based on a two-year research project in which we followed the activities of two, recently established, Arab-Jewish bilingual schools. Our analysis is based primarily on qualitative data on educational and socio-cultural processes involved in the functioning and development of the schools as they relate to four major areas: language, cultural and religious identity, national identity, and social interactions. Our study revealed the potential benefits of one type of intergroup contact, namely, bi-lingual long-term co-education, but also shed light on the complexity and difficulties facing all parties involved in such an adventurous enterprise.
Arab-Jewish Bilingual Co-education in Israel:
A long-term approach to inter-group conflict resolution

In this paper we offer insights into a new educational venture in Israel, which attempts to reduce inter-ethnic conflict through bilingual co-education. Our insights are based on a two-year research project in which we followed the activities of two, recently established, Arab-Jewish bilingual schools.

The study provides the opportunity to address some of the shortcomings of current theorizing in the fields of conflict resolution through inter-group encounters and of bilingual education. The first has for the most part focused on short-term encounters specially designed to encourage dialogue between conflicting groups (Genesee & Gandara, 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 2001) and the second has emphasized bilingual and academic achievements in educational efforts (Moran & Hakuta, 1995; Tucker, 1998). Our own effort aims at a better understanding of cultural and identity issues as these evolve within sustained long term bilingual educational procedures.

There is a rather long history to the attempts, through inter-group encounters, to mitigate inter-group conflicts. Psychological premises have in one way or another guided most of this activity (for a review see Abu-Nimer, 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 2001; Weiner, 1998). The Contact Hypothesis, in its various formulations and elaborations, suggests that inter-group contact - which takes place under the conditions of status equality and cooperative interdependence while allowing for sustained interaction between participants and allowing for the potential forming of friendships - might help alleviate conflict between groups and encourage change in negative inter-group attitudes (Allport, 1954; Amir, 1976; Pettigrew, 1998). A recent meta-analysis provided stark
evidence for the benefits of intergroup contact, especially when the contact situation maximizes most or all of its optimal conditions (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000).

The study of intergroup contact in general, and of Arab-Jewish encounters in Israel in particular (Bar, Bargal, & Asaqała, 1995; Halabi & Sonsense, 2000; Suleiman, 1997), is increasingly adopting a contextual approach, emphasizing the need to account for the socio-historical situatedness of the encounter activity, which must be seen as taking shape in dialogue with the outside world. Recently Maoz (2000) theorized about the need for a new paradigm which would account for the unavoidable incursion of outside power struggles, identity clashes, and structural asymmetry into contact situations.

An additional strategy suggested for the improvement of intergroup relations is bilingual education. Language has been used historically in various educational settings to produce different linguistic outcomes, fostering monolingual and/or bilingual speech communities (Garcia, 1997). However, language education has been shown to entail socio-cultural products beyond purely linguistic outcomes.

Language plays a crucial role in social interaction and the transmission of cultural and social values (Fishman, 1970; Fishman, 1997; Safran, 1999). As a symbolic system, language not only constructs social identity, but may also solidify or revitalize national/ethnic identities and loyalties (Fishman, 1989; Haarmann, 1986; Haarmann, 1995; Smith, 1998). Language is thus a socio-cultural resource with which nations may unify and separate national/ethnic groups into discrete speech communities, each with its own level of access to concomitant social resources and each loyal to its own divergent linguistically constructed culture (Haslett, 1989; Scollon & Scollon, 1981).
Bilingual education can also serve as empowerment pedagogy through the incorporation of home language and culture in the school community increasing the self-esteem of minority students (Garcia, 1997; Giles & Weimann, 1987). As far as the majority group is concerned, bilingualism would not only allow for greater intellectual enrichment, but the elite would also benefit from the social consequences of greater cultural integration and pluralism. Two recent reviews have examined the influence of bilingual and cooperative learning on prejudice, discrimination and the acquisition of new cultural paradigms. Genesee and Gandara (1999) emphasize the importance of paying explicit attention to societally based inter-group factors if bilingual education is to improve inter-group attitudes and relationships. Slavin and Cooper (1999) point at the need to stress pedagogical factors such as cooperative educational approaches so as to create the needed conditions for reframing cultural relations.

Considering the socio-political context in Israel (Ghanem, 1998; Smooha, 1996), it is clear to all that the idea of creating Arab-Jewish co-education is a daring enterprise. The Center for Bilingual Education in Israel (CBE) was established in 1997 with the aim of initiating and fostering egalitarian Arab-Jewish cooperation in education, mainly through the development of bilingual, bi-national and multicultural cooperative educational institutions. Since 1997, the Center has been involved in the establishment of two schools, one in Jerusalem and one in Misgav, in the northern Galilee.

The schools, at the time of the study, include up to the third grade and are recognized as “state schools” supported by the Israeli Ministry of Education. They teach the regular curriculum of the state school system, with the difference that both Hebrew and Arabic are used as languages of instruction. The schools have adopted a strong
additive bilingual approach, which emphasizes symmetry between both languages in all aspects of instruction (Garcia, 1997). In terms of aims and processes, the bilingual project is geared towards what Skutnabb-Kangas and Garcia’s (1995) have defined as the three main benefits of an effective bilingual educational project: 1) a high level of multilingualism; 2) equal opportunity for academic achievement; and 3) a strong, positive multilingual and multicultural identity including positive attitudes toward self and others.

Parents sending their children to these schools are generally from the upper-middle socio-economic class in Israeli society. When asked about their reasons for sending their children to the bilingual school, Jewish parents mentioned first ideological reasons. However, they also believe that the educational level will be equal to if not higher than that of a regular Israeli school. Arab parents, on the other hand, first indicated their wish to safeguard their children from the putatively backward and unpromising education offered by regular Arab schools, and only then they mention ideological reasons (Bekerman & Horenczyk, unpublished).

The rather optimistic political outlook, following the Oslo agreements, which characterized the atmosphere in which the bi-lingual schools were created, has changed radically. In 2000, the events of Yom Ha’Adama (Day of the Land – an annual protest against the confiscation of Arab lands by the Israeli Government), and those which followed Ariel Sharon’s visit to the El-Aksa Mosque area on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem in October 2000 provoked an outburst of violence throughout the areas controlled by the Palestinian Authority as well as strong demonstrations by Arab Israelis in the northern area of Israel. These events shattered the already fragile Arab-Jewish relations within Israel and shocked both schools’ populations. The fact that, despite these
events, the two schools are still functioning and have started their fourth year of activity, is a testimony to their ongoing efforts to keep their dream alive under extremely difficult circumstances.

During the 2000-1 school year (the second year of our study), the two schools run three classes, from first to third grade. In the Jerusalem school, 37 Arab children (21 boys and 16 girls) and; 26 Jewish children (half boys and half girls) were enrolled. The Galil School was attended by 41 Arab children (25 boys and 16 girls), from cities and villages in the vicinity of the school, and 35 Jewish children (17 boys and 18 girls) living in nearby settlements.

It is worth noting the higher proportion of boys among the Arab students, probably due to the Arab tendency to keep the girls more within traditional boundaries. There are also more Arab than Jewish students. This disproportion points at one of the most serious issues threatening the future of the bilingual schools. Arab registration, given the very few good educational alternatives available to Arab parents, is always high; whereas Jewish registration, which is dependent on strong ideological commitment and contingent on political developments, tends to be relatively low.

From its inception, the CBE has emphasized the need to sustain symmetry at all organizational, curricular and practical levels. They have pursued this goal by securing the services of a balanced educational staff; both an Arab and a Jewish teacher in each class and, at the Galil School, an Arab and a Jewish school principal.

Our analysis is based on data gathered using a variety of methods, from diverse methodological perspectives, during the two years of research. We conducted interviews with parents, teachers, and students; we recorded meetings of the various committees; we
conducted both systematic as well as informal observations during class and recess; we attended national and religious ceremonial events; questionnaires were administered to parents; first-language assessments were conducted using a quasi-experimental research design, and second-language comprehension was also measured. In this paper, we limit ourselves to an analysis, based primarily on part of the qualitative data, of educational and socio-cultural processes involved in the functioning of the schools as they relate to four major areas: language, cultural and religious identity, national identity, and social interactions. In the last section, we discuss possible implications for inter-group relations of long-term educational efforts and suggest directions for further research.

Language

During the first year of our study, teachers experimented with ways to prevent either of the languages used at school from becoming segregated or compartmentalized into any specific discipline or time slot, while continuously trying to assure equality of Arabic and Hebrew in class practice. This was a laudable and demanding endeavor considering that, to a large extent, such a curriculum had to be invented from scratch.

Bilingual instruction was more successful among the Arab students. As shown by the results of our language assessment, these children were able to learn Arabic at a pace similar to that in which Arabic is learned at comparable monolingual Arab schools in Israel, and they were also able to learn Hebrew sufficiently well to be optimistic about their future achievements. Jewish kids showed less bilingual competencies. They performed well in their mother tongue, when compared to students in monolingual Jewish schools, but their performance in Arabic was lower than expected. In the second-
language comprehension tests, the scores of the Jewish students were markedly lower than those of their Arab peers.

For the second year, the staff at both schools adopted a new policy regarding language: Arabic would be preferred over Hebrew. In the Jerusalem school, for example, eight out of the nine extracurricular activities were led in Arabic by Arab teachers; in the Galil school, the Arab and Jewish teachers organized their work so as to allow Arabic to be the leading language in class.

Even after all these steps were taken, the educational staff was still aware that full bilingualism would not be easily achieved and that the “affirmative action” (in favor of the Arab language) undertaken might not succeed. They were conscious that much of what went on in the educational background was still biased towards the Hebrew language. Teachers interactions were conducted in Hebrew, and Hebrew was also the reigning language of staff meetings and training sessions, meetings of parents and of the Steering Committee. For the most part children’s interactions in class, recess and in the rather few visits they exchanged with their Jewish or Arabs friends, were conducted in Hebrew. English started being taught the second year of our study. English successfully captured the good will of both Arab and Jewish children and their parents. With the appearance of English in school we have come to hear more Jewish parents’ and children’s voices questioning, if not the absolute need to study Arabic, then the amount of time invested in it. In the larger context within which Hebrew is the dominant language and English has the potential of offering a free pass into a global reality, Arabic risks being undermined at every turn. Context might be too powerful even for the most well intentioned bilingual educators.
Thus, in spite of all the efforts invested in enabling kids to acquire both languages, nobody in the educational staff seems to be happy with the results. As suggested by our quantitative and qualitative data, parents do not seem to share this dissatisfaction. Arab parents have a sense that their kids are learning Arabic properly, and rely on their own efforts at home if anything is in need of strengthening. They expect the Hebrew of their children to reach a level which will allow them to go unrecognized in the larger Jewish Israeli population and they believe that this aim will be achieved in the long run. Jewish parents do not worry either. They consider Arabic as a worthwhile addition but not necessarily an essential one. They are happy that their kids are getting a basic knowledge of the language and show some passive understanding, but their true expectations relate to achievements in academic subjects. Their approach follows their basic view that what is needed to improve Arab-Jewish relations is primarily cultural knowledge and understanding. From their standpoint, the school’s bicultural aims and achievements are much more important than its bilingual aspirations.

Still it becomes apparent from our interviews with Arab parents that the present policy is ultimately the one that allows them to be proud of sending their children to an educational setting which otherwise would be ideologically difficult to defend from their perspective as a minority.

Cultural and religious identity

Dealing with culture and religion is relatively easy. Arabs and Jews alike agree that culture and religion are the areas within which mutual understanding can help bridge the gaps that separate both populations in Israel and can contribute to peaceful coexistence. Parents stress the importance they see in getting their children to know and
understand the others’ culture better and believe that this is well on its way to being successfully achieved in school. Although throughout the year cultural and religious issues are raised and discussed, for the most part, they become salient during special events – such as school trips (e.g., visits to a nearby synagogue, mosque and church) – or school festive events such as the celebration of Hanukkah, Id’l Fitter, and Christmas.

What becomes apparent in these celebrations is that they carry a strong religious emphasis. Paradoxically it could be said that religious aspects are disproportionately emphasized in these schools, when considering that, for the most part, families belong to the secular segments of the Israeli society. The Jewish population of the school is almost totally secular and the Moslem population, though more traditionalist, is mostly non-religious. It is important to note that in both schools special time has been allotted to religious studies, which are conducted separately for the Jewish, Moslem and Christian populations. Secular Jewish parents have expressed some concern and ambivalence about this religious emphasis but, at the same time, they seem to find solace in the religious underpinning from their (mostly unarticulated) fear of the erosion of their children’s Jewish identity as a result of their participation in a bi-national program. This attitude seems to be shared by the Jewish teachers, who expressed their need to emphasize knowledge of Jewish traditions as an antidote to the perceived superficiality of secular Jewish identity and its possible weakening within a bi-national environment.

Cultural sensibilities and differences also emerge when dealing with supposedly unrelated issues. For example, Arab parents underlined during interviews the importance they attach to what they perceive to be good educational practices. They consider an orderly curriculum and regular homework assignments as the hallmarks of a good
education. Paradoxically, these elements are among those that characterized the regular Arab educational system they abandoned so readily when the bilingual opportunity emerged. At the same time, Arab parents seek for their children what they perceive to be the self-confidence characteristic of Jewish Israeli children, which they assume to be the product of educational practices adopted in the general Jewish Israeli system. These contrasting visions and practices are the source of much tension. These same parents also fear that their children might adopt some of the cultural patterns of modern Israeli Jews which are perceived to be disrespectful of traditional cultural Arabic patterns. They fear that crossing such cultural boundaries might threaten their children’s ethnic identities and brand them, in the eyes of their own communities, as derisive of their own culture and in danger of assimilation. Indeed it could be said that Arab participation in the bilingual adventure precipitates tensions between “modernity” and “tradition” which are in urgent need of being addressed.

The fears of Jewish parents seem to mirror those of their Arab counterparts. The more the Arabs lose their stereotypical features as these are perceived by Jews – i.e., the more modern they act, the more Hebrew they know – the more the silent anxiety of assimilation mounts, an anxiety mostly expressed in the fear of intermarriage. This aspect of Jewish fear is expressed, in the interviews, in the willingness of Jewish parents to have their children continue in the school only up to the end of primary school (sixth grade), in order to avert any confusion about their ethnic/national/religious identity, which the perceived syncretistical approach offered by bilingual education seems to threaten.
The bilingual initiative is strongly committed to contribute to the fostering and maintenance of separate national identities. Without such a commitment, neither Jewish nor Arab parents would have enrolled their children in these schools. Be this as it may the issue of national identity has, nonetheless, become the ultimate educational challenge for parents and educational staff in the bilingual schools.

National issues are easily compartmentalized into rather short and discrete periods in the school year: those dates corresponding in the Jewish Israeli calendar to the events of Commemoration and Independence Day, and in the Arab calendar to the Day of the Naqbe (the Catastrophe). Both schools have decided to hold separate short ceremonies for each national group on these national remembrance dates. While during the first year of our study these events flowed rather smoothly, during the second year they were strongly influenced by the tense and violent political climate in the outside world. Much of the educational work during the second year was carried out under a growing sense of suspicion on the part of both national groups represented at the school. For the first time the Jewish staff requested information from the researchers (present at all national ceremonies) as to whether the Arab teachers had or had not made use of the Palestinian flag in their ceremony. Although in early planning meetings, teachers had agreed that no flags would be present at school during these days, both groups raised their flags in their separate ceremonies.

Yom Ha’Adama also turned out to be a difficult event, with many Jewish parents questioning the ways in which Jews had been represented at school in the exhibit. It would seem that the Jewish group feels the most threatened. This may be due to its status as part of the hegemonic majority which, for the most part, enabled its members to take
their identity for granted. The Jews at the schools clearly represent the politically liberal center-left segments of Israeli society. They see themselves as being truly open to the needs of the Arab population at school and willing to grant expression to their identity. However, the forms of Arab expression do not always seem to fall within the limits of legitimate Arab expression delineated by the liberal Jews. For them, Israeli Arab cultural and religious expression in school is legitimate, but national identification with the Palestinian Authority is not welcomed.

Arabs who, as a minority, have become used to subduing expressions of their national consciousness, approach the school with restrained expectations regarding their national needs. They clearly expect not to have to hide their national cultural identities but seem to be ready to apply here too the many mechanisms they have developed over long years of repression, such as not attending school on national Jewish days or just quietly reinterpreting ritual events when compelled to participate in them.

It has now become apparent that Arab Israeli parents have ever-growing expectations to give what in their eyes is proper expression to their national identity. Jewish parents have reacted with surprise and at times with a sense of danger. At first they were happy to consider themselves true liberals, willing to open up their doors to those oppressed; now they had to face their own misconceptions and fears.

The schools, through specially convened parent and staff meetings prior to national events, encouraged participants to air their fears and expectations at both the personal and institutional levels. At these meetings we became aware of the degree to which the national feelings of many of the Arab parents were repressed. Many of the Jewish parents became defensive and offensive at the same time. On the defensive side,
they called for a balanced approach to the historical narrative and emphasized the emergent need for a Jewish home after the catastrophic events of the Holocaust. Some even considered favorably the proposal to create joint commemorations for Naqbe and the Israeli (IDF) Soldiers Remembrance Day, affording Arabs the opportunity to reinterpret the traditional 11 o’clock siren to include the memory of the Naqbe victims as well. On the offensive side, the discussions on national events allowed Jews to display their ultimate weapon: the threat that if the delicate balance of national symbolization is violated they will consider pulling their children out of the schools. Arab parents, for the most part, refrained from attacking back. When considering the very few options open to their children in the present Israeli school system, they prefer to try to work things out quietly, in a way that allows them to find solutions to these problems without betraying their own feelings and symbolic needs. Given their current and historical circumstances any step in this direction can truly be conceived of as a triumph.

And there were such triumphs. The format agreed upon in the bilingual schools, which includes separate Naqbe and Soldiers Remembrance Day ceremonies as well as Day of the Land commemorations, are outstanding examples of progress in Israel so much so that regular Arab schools are trying to learn from the bilingual experience.

The bilingual schools’ experience can also teach us valuable lessons about the flexibility of religious and national symbols, and about the complex give-and-take processes involved in intergroup cooperative work in general, and educational work in particular. Take, for example, the combined celebration of Hanukkah, Id’l Fitter and Christmas. In both schools the ceremonies downplayed the traditional national overtones that characterize Hanukkah celebrations in regular Israeli schools, virtually ignoring
Yehuda Ha’ Maccabbee (the Jewish military religious leader who led the rebellion against the Greeks) while emphasizing the miracle of the oil slack which burned for eight days in the temple. In the celebration at the Jerusalem school, Christmas was denuded from its messianic overtones and presented as heralding the New Year almost without mention of the birth of Jesus. Id’l Fitter’s traditional religious forms, considered to be inconsequential to either Jews or Christians, were left untouched. It seems that only through the delicate and ongoing calibration and negotiation of meanings between the groups’ grand narratives religious and national tension can be conciliate.

Social interactions

‘Nobody is really happy’ is a statement which reflects what all adults involved in the bilingual schools feel regarding social interactions. Not being really happy does not mean being upset. It just means that adults expected more.

Throughout the two years of our research we have seen some progress, but in general the patterns stay fit. In class, inter-group interaction is greater than when kids are free and on their own, during recess and in other unstructured periods. In class kids will work together in cross-national teams and assist each other with different assignments, but when at home, inter-group visit are rare. Exceptions do exist in both schools but in general the educational staff and parents keep questioning why more gains have not been made in this area.

Attempts to explain the present situation are varied. Some point to the distance between the settlements in which the children live and/or the segregated areas inhabited by the groups. Others point to cultural differences regarding the protocol of social interaction; still others mention that language gaps are a barrier to social communication
outside of class. Some suggest that the events of September and October 2000 have worsened the social situation.

Children are also aware of the situation. In our conversations with them they acknowledge the patterns described above and openly discuss issues which adults find more difficult to confront. Still they clearly differentiate between ‘bad’ and ‘good’ members of both the Arab and the Jewish groups, with all of the school population belonging to the ‘good guys’ in both groups. There have been some situations of profound empathy. Such was the case when Jewish children expressed the fear that their Arab friends would be expelled from their homes and offered them shelter after the commemoration of the Day of the Land, once again demonstrating that children’s perceptions of historical narratives do not always fit adult plans – for the young children, remembering what happened 25 years ago was as much part of a possible present as of a possible past.

Conclusions

As indicated in our introductory section, research has shown that intergroup contact seems to generally promote intergroup acceptance, especially when appropriate conditions for the contact are been met. Our study showed the potential benefits of one type of intergroup contact, namely, bi-lingual long-term co-education, but also shed light on the complexity and difficulties facing all the parties involved in such an adventurous enterprise. It is important to note that intergroup contact can be based on, or can emphasize, various – and sometimes contradicting – strategies (Hewstone, 1996): decategorization (or personalization), categorization, crossed-categorization, and recategorization. In the bilingual schools described in our study, neither decategorization
nor crossed-categorization approaches seem to be allowed for in school practices, thus preventing the implementation, at least partially, of strategies which allow for an increase of complexity in inter-group perceptions. The schools seem to have adopted a purely categorized approach, based on the premise that strengthening ethnic/national identities is the path to achieving their aims. As to the “recategorization” strategy, one that calls for the development and strengthening of a “common ingroup identity” (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993), this would be reflected in attempts to enhancing the perception of common “Israeliness” – the fostering of an overarching civil identity. Data from our questionnaires suggest that at the rhetorical level this approach is endorsed by parents, Jewish and Arabs alike; but when translated into practices, our analyses documented the almost insurmountable obstacles on the way to the articulation and eventual adoption of a common Israeli identity.

Research in bilingual education points at the potential positive effects of this type of strategy on inter-group attitudes among the students (Genesee & Gandara, 1999). Empirical evidence suggests, however, that bilingual initiatives need to pay sustained attention to contextual societal factors (Cleghorn & Genesee, 1984; Delgado-Larroco, 1998; in Genesee & Gandara, 1999).

It is yet too early to ascertain whether in the near and distant future, the students attending the bilingual schools will exhibit attitudes, behaviors, and commitments that are different from those of their parents or those of their peers attending monolingual schools. What is apparent is that the bilingual schools under consideration have not yet reached an acceptable level of articulation regarding their aims and the optimal paths to their achievement. It is clear that the stakeholders involved in the enterprise – parents,
teachers, and the CBE architects – hold different perspectives on what exactly is the problem to be solved by the educational initiative. Jewish parents seem to look for options which will allow them to actualize their partial liberal ideologies, while Arab parents look for a place of solace in an educational system which, for the most part, has not offered their children adequate opportunities for development and social mobility. The CBE staff is the bearer of an ideology that wishes to offer equality to, and only to, a well-defined ethnic/national minority group in the midst of a well-defined ethnic/national majority. Teachers are torn between the, at times, contradicting directions and expectations. Apparent as well is the fact that centrifugal contextual/external forces are continuously at work in shaping the schools’ agenda. Consequently school practices seem sometimes to work in different directions. School seems to make efficient use of religious contents, somewhat denuded, to bond an otherwise divided community. National and ethnic boundaries, the best markers of conflict in this troubled area, although arguably imaginary, become painfully real for adults involved in school activities while children are saved from it by their, yet, youthful candidness.

It would seem that the bilingual schools still suffer from some of the problems identified by the research on bilingual education and cooperative learning reviewed earlier. Although the efforts by parents and teachers to cope with the complexity of issues facing the bilingual enterprise are laudable, our study points to insufficient attention paid to many contextual and structural factors. The problem of social interaction seems to characterize, at this point, also the bilingual schools: We have shown that only within school, and there only within the classroom, positive relations between groups have evolved. It should be noted that positive peer relationships have been shown to be a
crucial mediating variable through which integrated schooling has an impact on intergroup attitudes (Aboud & Levy, 2000).

It is surely worth the effort to try and better understand if and in what ways educational efforts seeking to bridge cultural/ethnic/religious/national gaps, can shape individual and group perspectives and help overcome tensions and conflict. One promising direction for further research is the design of comprehensive longitudinal studies on the long-term effect of bilingual, bi-cultural education on students, their cultural identities and their perceptions of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Unfortunately not much is known in this field. There is little longitudinal research on the development of cultural identity in general, and even less on its unfolding and transformation within the context of educational initiatives such as the one described in this paper.

The bilingual schools are indeed an extraordinary new experiment, one that carries the promise of a better future for Jewish-Arab relations in Israel. Their work is done on roads as yet un-traveled and – although always at risk – they carry the dream for a peaceful, more honorable world of co-existence. It is yet to be seen if the foundational ideology that sustains them can survive the present escalating conflict and achieve its goal.
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