# Notes on Cultures of Violence, Cultures of Caring and Peace, and the Fulfillment of Basic Human Needs

**Ervin Staub**

*University of Massachusetts at Amherst*

*Some conditions in the lives of children, adults, and groups can be construed as fulfilling universal human psychological needs. The constructive fulfillment of these basic needs promotes caring and positive, helpful relations; their frustration creates an inclination toward hostility and aggression. The article describes diverse influences that can lead to violence between individuals, groups, and societies, as well as ways to halt and prevent genocide, mass killing, and other intergroup violence, including terrorism, in part by fostering culture changes that promote harmony and peace. Ideally such culture change would involve healing from past wounds, the creation of positive (rather than destructive) ideologies, supportive communities, reconciliation and the creation of a shared collective memory, education that promotes peace, and the development of inclusive caring in children. The article also refers to work in Rwanda that aims to foster healing and reconciliation, in part by helping people understand the roots of violence and its implication for prevention. Societies and families that help to fulfill basic needs promote goodness as well as optimal human functioning—the continued growth and development of individuals.*

What is required for individuals, groups, and nations to not act violently, but instead to care about and promote others' welfare? What are the cultural, social, and psychological requirements for a peaceful world that nourishes the human spirit and helps individuals develop their personal and human potentials? As I discuss these questions, I comment on the influences that generate violence, with some reference also to the evolution of terrorism. In considering what leads to violence, how it may be prevented, and how caring and peaceful relations among individuals and groups may be promoted, I argue that cultural and societal conditions that frustrate basic psychological needs make violence more likely, whereas conditions that help fulfill these needs in constructive ways contribute to the development of peaceful relations and fully human lives.

## Basic Human Needs

A basic needs perspective can help in considering the origins of both violence and caring, and it can point to ways to build cultures of peace (Staub, 1989, 1996b, 1999b, in press-a; see also Burton, 1990; Kelman, 1990; Maslow, 1954/1987). This perspective assumes that human beings have fundamental, shared needs. In my work I have focused on the needs for security, for a positive identity, for a sense of effectiveness, for both positive connection to other people and autonomy, and for a comprehension of reality. Another need, which emerges most strongly when the needs I have listed are reasonably satisfied, is the need for transcendence. This is an aspect of spirituality—the need to go beyond one's own material concerns and beyond the self. When these needs are fulfilled, people are well on their way to harmonious, caring relationships with others, as well as continued growth in their lives.[1]

Certain conditions in children's lives—such as warmth and affection from adults and peers, and effective guidance, especially when this guidance is not punitive—have been found to contribute to caring for and helping others (Eisenberg, 1992; Staub, 1996a, in press-a). Important forms of guidance include reasoning, such as explaining the reasons for rules and pointing out to children the consequences of their behavior for other people, as well as setting an example (or pointing out the example of other people). The experiences that these practices provide are likely to fulfill basic needs. In contrast, neglect, hostility, harsh treatment or abuse by parents and peers, and lack of structure and guidance contribute to aggression. Such experiences frustrate basic needs (Staub, 1996a, in press-a). Similarly, social conditions that frustrate basic needs—such as economic deterioration, great and rapid societal change and social disorganization, and intense conflict and the threat of or actual attack by other groups—are instigators of violence by groups (Staub, 1989; see also Kelman, 1990).

Poverty has many negative effects, including an adverse effect on the way parents treat and guide their children. But economic *deterioration* can have especially strong effects. In addition to frustrating the basic needs I described, it usually enhances the already existing discrepancy between more and less privileged groups. It activates or intensifies the experience of injustice. Social

---

[1] In addition to Maslow's (1954/1987, 1968) well-known theory of the hierarchy of needs, a number of psychologists and other social and behavioral scientists have proposed what is usually referred to as human needs theories (Burton, 1990; Christie, 1997; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Kelman, 1990; McCann & Pearlman, 1990; Murray, 1938; Pearlman & Saakvitne, 1995, among others). These theorists proposed somewhat varied but overlapping needs as central to human functioning and their fulfillment as central to well-being. An example of an important use of human needs theory in political psychology is in the realm of conflict resolution. Kelman (1990) and Burton (1990) have used needs theory as a way of understanding why intractable conflict—persistent, seemingly unresolvable, violent conflict (Staub & Bar-Tal, in press)—develops, and why the groups in conflict cannot resolve it. In Kelman's view, it is threat to or the failure to fulfill needs for identity, security, dignity, and justice that causes and/or maintains intractable conflict.

injustice—or comparisons between self and other, or one's group and other groups, that lead to a belief that one is unfairly treated—gives rise to anger and resentment and potentially to violence. Justice is a powerful human motive. Possibly, it is another basic need. But it may be, instead, that injustice frustrates many of the basic needs I have described, especially the need for a positive identity (as a person is treated with less respect and feels less worthy) and the need for effectiveness and control (because injustice means that one's actions can't bring about the outcomes one deserves).

However, people have different, and potentially divergent and competing, definitions of justice. Many people think of justice in terms of equity and equality, but they may have different views of what constitutes equity or equality. As a result, people in one group may experience injustice, which motivates them to create justice, while others—especially people in conflict with them—may not recognize or acknowledge the existence of injustice.

It is likely that children whose basic needs have been constructively fulfilled also develop resilience (Staub, in press-b). Their needs may be less deeply frustrated by difficult personal or social conditions. They may be less likely to respond with violence to personal frustration. They may be less attracted to destructive ideological visions and less likely to join potentially destructive movements as avenues to fulfill needs frustrated by social conditions.

Obviously, the fulfillment of basic needs is not just an individual matter. Even apart from societal crises constituted by difficult life conditions or group conflict, in everyday life the nature of culture, relations between groups, the institutions of society, and the existence and nature of local communities provide the frame in which families and individuals live. They greatly affect the extent to which basic needs are fulfilled under normal, everyday conditions. Culture, institutions, and social conditions shape how children are treated, determine to a greater or lesser extent who is poor and who is rich, affirm or diminish people as individuals and members of groups, and shape connections among people. It would make sense to evaluate the "goodness" of societies in terms of the ease or difficulty of fulfilling basic needs, and to identify desirable social changes in terms of their probable contribution to the fulfillment of basic human needs.

Differentiating "them" from "us" and devaluing them is central to violence against "them," while a positive view of the other is central to helping "them." Devaluation and discrimination—for example, media images that devalue a group (whether a minority, women, or any other group)—will frustrate a number of needs of members of the devalued group. An obvious one is the need for positive identity. Certain kinds of negative images have the potential to incite harmful action, thereby also frustrating the need for security. Extreme negative images, and especially discrimination and physical threat that may accompany them, obviously affect connections between groups, but can also affect connections within a devalued group. Devaluation, threat, and frustration can break down the ability of members of a group to connect to and support each other (Tajfel, 1982). Affirm-

ing the humanity of members of a devalued group—in the media, in literature, through laws and societal practices, in everyday relations—will help fulfill their basic needs. Thus, humanizing the other is likely to have many significant effects.

The fulfillment of basic needs of whole groups, and whole nations, is affected by their relationship to other groups. Being accepted and respected by other nations, being engaged with and connected to others, can help fulfill the basic needs of group members and of leaders. Isolation contributes to violence within families, to child and spouse abuse. Connection to other nations makes genocide by groups less likely (Harff, Gurr, & Unger, 1999).

The existence of many and varied community organizations, whether religious or secular, helps fulfill the basic need for connection. The more there are, and the more accessible and varied in nature, the less dependent people will be on any one of them, and the less likely it will be that people passively remain part of an organization that becomes destructive.

When conditions in a society lead many young women without life partners (especially teenagers) to have children, this will frustrate a number of basic needs of both the mothers and the children. Young, single mothers, especially if they are poor, are more likely to abuse their children. They are certainly more likely to neglect them, to not provide them with the warmth and guidance they need. The presence of supportive adults in their lives—for example, a grandmother—greatly improves their parenting (Staub, in press-b).

Certain practices in families are important in fulfilling basic needs. Such activities as eating family dinners together or reading to young children can foster connection. However, allowing and even fostering autonomy is also important. Especially in an individualist culture, as children get older, it becomes important for them to be able to make decisions for themselves, to have time for themselves.

Although human needs in this perspective are universal, culture and the experiences of people in their groups will shape the needs themselves, and perhaps even more their customary manner of fulfillment. For example, one culture may teach humility, another a focus on the self. This may affect not only the strength of the need for a positive identity, but perhaps even more, how this need can be fulfilled—in one case by being appropriately humble, in another by affirming oneself in visible ways.

All children need both connection and autonomy, but the ideal balance depends on the nature of the culture, how individualist or collectivist it is. The individualist cultures of the United States and Europe, especially Western Europe, focus on autonomy—individuals making decisions for themselves and acting to fulfill individual goals. The need for connection, although shaped so that it perhaps becomes less central, is still a basic need, although more difficult to fulfill. In the collectivist cultures of much of the rest of the world, the focus is on membership in the group—people acting to fulfill goals that serve not only their own purposes, but also their family or whole group. Rules to live by are more restrictive (Triandis, 1989). The need for autonomy may become less important but still necessary to fulfill, although more difficult. Similarly, the need for effectiveness

and control is more possible to fulfill by direct, instrumental action in individualist societies, and by "secondary control" in collectivist societies, such as joining or identifying with important, influential people or exercising cognitive control in rearranging one's understanding of events (Weiss, Rothbaum, & Blackburn, 1984).

These cultural variations are not just stylistic. Some of them may deny the importance of particular needs and therefore their expression, or may severely restrict the permissible modes, and thereby the extent, of their fulfillment. This can have general consequences associated with need frustration, as well as specific ones related to aggression and peace. For example, secondary control may make it more likely that people submit themselves to authorities, rather than question them when these authorities institute potentially harmful and violent policies and practices (Staub, 1989; 1997).

### Raising Inclusively Caring, Morally Courageous Children

Even among people who have learned to care about others' welfare, caring can be limited to those in their own group. To create a nonviolent, caring world, to create goodness, it is essential to extend the boundaries of "us." Inclusive caring—the extension of caring to the "other," ideally to all human beings— develops through words and images that humanize all people, through the example of models, ranging from parents to cultural heroes, who show caring for people regardless of their group membership, and through one's own experience of connection to varied people (Oliner & Oliner, 1988; Staub, 2002b).

Moral courage is also important for a nonviolent, caring world—the courage, even in the face of opposition and potential disapproval and ostracism, to express important values in words and actions. A positive sense of self and confidence in one's judgment are sources of strength to act according to one's values. Support from like-minded others can greatly contribute, as in the case of the abolitionists in the United States; even when acting alone, facing hostile groups while advocating the abolition of slavery, they were supported by their feelings of connection to other abolitionists. People may also find support from internalized, imagined others—like parents who exemplify moral values, or a belief in what God would require them to do. Affirmation when a child or teenager speaks out against cruelty or injustice, or simply expresses beliefs or points of view that are contrary to those of others, can help develop moral courage (Staub, in press-a).

Because morally courageous people, as active bystanders, can make a crucial difference at important moments in many settings, it is essential that we learn more about the origins of moral courage and create conditions that help it develop. Not being embedded in the group, which makes an independent perspective possible, may be an important precondition for moral courage. A fair percentage of rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust were in some way marginal to their communities (Tec, 1986). Constructive patriotism (in contrast to blind patriotism) gives people a separate enough perspective to question problematic policies and practices of their group (Schatz, Staub, & Lavine, 1999; Staub, 1997). People who

are both morally committed and courageous can help overcome the inertia of social systems, activate other bystanders, and work on creating societies and an international community that promote harmony and caring in human relations.

## Types of Violence: Interpersonal, Group (Genocide, Mass Killing, and Terror), and War

There are different cultures of violence, different conditions that lead to different types of violence. For example, there has been a very high level of interpersonal violence in the United States. This may occur for a number of reasons: neglect and harsh treatment of children; culture changes, which affect parents' confidence in providing guidance to their children as well as the frequency of divorce and its attendant effects on some children; lack of community and of support for parents and other caretakers of children; welfare and other social policies that make life stressful for poor people and difficult to adequately attend to children; the availability of weapons; and art and media that have come to idolize violence (Staub, 1996a, 1996b). Creating the opposite conditions would reduce individual violence.

The highly individualistic, competitive worldview that characterizes U.S. culture also contributes. Given the belief that everybody has the opportunity to pursue success, individuals who have not succeeded are likely to be greatly frustrated. Difficult social conditions may lead young people to lose hope in the future. Young people whose security and identity are threatened often become members of violent movements, such as Nazi stormtroopers in Germany or paramilitary groups that killed many people in the genocide in Rwanda (des Forges, 1999). In the United States, in addition to individual violence, such conditions and experiences contribute to the generation of groups with extreme ideologies that identify either minorities or the state (or both) as their enemies. Out of this hate, crimes and terrorist violence arise. Many young members of extreme right-wing groups in the United States had harsh, painful childhood experiences that are likely to frustrate basic needs, diminish hope in the future, and limit the capacity to build a good life (Ezekiel, 1995).

In contrast, considering the social and cultural influences that lead to genocide and mass killing (Fein, 1993; Smith, 1999; Staub, 1989, 1999a, 1999b), there seems to be little chance of such violence within the United States at this time. Although devaluation, prejudice, and racism do exist, they have greatly declined, certainly since the Second World War. Laws and social practices have evolved to protect the rights of individuals regardless of group membership, even if not equally—there are great disparities in how the justice system treats whites and minorities, and racial profiling has become notorious—to a substantial enough degree that the evolution of harmdoing or violence toward a subgroup of society has become highly unlikely.

But the United States has engaged numerous times since the Second World

War in violence against other countries. It has overthrown democratically elected governments, using Marines as in Guatemala or supporting internal factions as in Chile. It has militarily attacked Panama, Libya, Iraq, Afghanistan, and other countries. One likely source of these actions is the "group self-concept" of the United States (Staub, 1989).

Groups are ethnocentric, seeing their values and beliefs as superior to those of others (Sumner, 1906). As citizens of a great power, the people and the leaders of the United States seem to have developed a perhaps even stronger than usual belief in their country's specialness and superiority; this notion is at least indirectly supported by the especially strong patriotism in the United States (Schatz & Staub, 1997). As an aspect of this, the United States has developed ideologies and principles, such as the Monroe doctrine, that affirm its right to interfere in the affairs of others. Two world wars and the Cold War, in which the United States was both the savior and victor and saw itself that way, have strengthened and extended this view to other areas of the world.[2] The United States also has the power to back up its group self-concept and beliefs about its role in the world. In addition, not infrequently the world turns to the United States and expects it to take action.

Although at times the use of force is necessary and can be constructive (as when protecting groups that are harmed), a group inclined to aggression tends to use force to serve its goals, or turn to force when it should use other, peaceful means to serve constructive goals. Both have been the case with the United States. The problematic nature of the group beliefs and psychology that at times have led to destructive violence by the United States (Staub, 2000) has also expressed itself in the unwillingness of the United States to participate in international conventions—whether they have to do with the rights of the child, the abolition of land mines, the establishment of an International Criminal Court to try perpetrators of genocide and other great human rights violations, or other matters. Self-examination and the resulting self-awareness can be a starting point for changes in culture—including group beliefs that lead to violence against outside groups—by nations that intend to be and claim to be constructive members of the international community.

## Halting the Evolution of Violence by Social Movements

Frequently, groups that engage in ethnic/political violence, as well as terrorist groups, start with grievances, often some form of injustice, and political action to bring about change. People who are dissatisfied or want to justify their actions may claim injustice, even where there is none. But the grievances can be real,

---

[2] What may be called the "Bush Doctrine," a foreign policy statement by the Bush administration in the fall of 2002, seems to suggest that the United States will not tolerate other countries developing military power comparable to its own.

deeply felt, an authentic source of motivation, and the changes groups advocate can have deep legitimacy.

For example, in Argentina in the 1960s and early 1970s a number of groups wanted to bring about social changes, to enhance the rights, opportunities, and material well-being of less privileged groups. Some of them, like the Montoneros, later turned to terrorism, which led to counter-terrorism and then to great violence by a military government not only against them, but also against people who held liberal political views or simply tried to improve the conditions of poor people (Staub, 1989). Mob violence is also often initiated by grievances and attempts to address them that receive no response. In the United States such grievances often concern treatment by the police of people living in certain neighborhoods, usually members of minority groups (Staub & Rosenthal, 1994).

The more authorities and societies respond in positive and effective ways to grievances by groups and to the political and social movements that arise from them, the less likely they are to turn violent. However, in a country that practices repression, the easing but not lifting of repression increases hopes and expectations. This may lead to further demands and revolutionary movements. An effective response to grievances, whether they arise from people in a particular neighborhood or from larger groups, must be multifaceted, involving constructive actions, continued engagement, and the building of relationships among parties.

Unfortunately, dominant, powerful groups don't easily yield power and privilege, and they may come to consider even limited demands as encroaching on their power and privilege. This can be true even in a democracy, especially when the prevalent ideology holds that everyone has equal opportunity and therefore the advantages of privileged groups have been earned and are deserved. Thus, justice as equity can be used to proclaim the grievances of the less privileged as unjustified. But the engagement with each of parties in conflict is crucial for nonviolent social change. Just being heard can be of great importance to people who feel aggrieved and are trying to bring about change. It can lead to a continuation of a nonviolent process.

Facilitating the evolution of democracy can be a contribution to peaceful change processes. But the issues I raised above also apply to democracies. Democracies are rarely complete, often not genuinely participatory, and (in capitalist countries) individualist and competitive; as a result, many individuals and groups can feel left out, experience injustice and feel unheard, their basic needs frustrated. Creating a social and political system that is responsive to the needs, condition, and grievances of individuals and groups—a society that is just and benevolent—will reduce violence and create harmony. In a democracy, every person can contribute to this.

## Ideology and Community

Movements that end in mass violence or come to practice terrorism attract adherents for several reasons. One is the existence and experience of genuine

grievances. Another is that certain people seek the connection, identity, and leadership offered to them by a group. They may have frustrated needs and resulting problems with identity, and may seek ways to relinquish a burdensome self. They may have difficulty finding purpose and direction in their lives. Difficult conditions of life can intensify these needs, or can give rise to them in people who under normal conditions are able to manage their lives. Some persons may harbor resentment and hostility that attracts them to movements that are destructive from the start, in that a significant element of their ideology is enmity toward some group.

However, some groups that become violent may provide at the start a positive vision, ideals, and hope. Such visions may appeal not only to people moved by personal, individual concerns, or enmity toward particular groups, but also to people who are genuinely concerned about human suffering and want to improve lives—their own, their families', but also those of people in their community or larger society, perhaps the lives of all human beings. Caring, idealistic, morally committed persons do, of course, get involved in social movements.

Over time some groups become more radical, their ideology more extreme, the means by which they attempt to achieve their ideals more violent. Violence can become the end rather than the means. This is partly because social change is so difficult to bring about, and partly because of the dynamics of such groups. Along the way most members will undergo varying degrees of personal transformation. Especially early on, members do leave such groups. But as time passes, the dynamics of the group—such as intense connection among members, an increasingly shared vision, separation from the rest of the world so that there is no moderating influence, and strong disapproval and the possibility of revenge against those who abandon the group—may cause members to remain. Change or transformation in individual members, and in the norms, beliefs and ideology of the whole group, may be fostered by members expressing radical views (so as to be heard and to gain influence within the group) and by the group engaging in violent actions. Research on terrorist groups such as the Baader-Meinhof gang in Germany and the Red Brigade in Italy offers a picture consistent with all this (McCauley & Segal, 1989).

This picture may also apply to the terrorists of 11 September 2001. Thomas Friedman wrote in one of his *New York Times* columns that the men who perpetrated 9/11 came from highly traditional Islamic societies. All of them moved to Europe. There, they experienced intense culture clash between the views they had held and the extreme openness of the societies they encountered. Traditional societies that are also repressive—where custom, law, and authorities combine to limit exposure to new ideas and ways of life—make it especially difficult for people to deal with culture change. In the contemporary age, despite tradition and repression, changes in the world often seep in. But restrictive tradition and change are difficult to integrate, making it difficult for people to generate a usable, meaningful comprehension of reality.

Friedman wrote that these young men were also greatly affected by the lack

of respect for Muslims in Europe. The result of their disorientation and exclusion was that the teachings of the radical mosques and prayer groups they had joined had great influence over them. Under this influence they went to Afghanistan, where they received training in Osama bin Laden's camps (Friedman, 2002).

Here again, a basic needs perspective is helpful. Community is crucial in fulfilling needs for connection and identity. David Buss (2000), an evolutionary psychologist, suggested that we humans have evolved over time in close-knit groups and need the connection they offer for well-being and happiness. However, in the modern age, people living in big cities and nuclear families lack community. They may turn to or create communities, such as gangs or ideological movements, that generate destruction.

Societies ought to be creative in building communities that help people to constructively fulfill basic needs. Institutions of learning, for example, ought to help young people to integrate the old and the new. Communities should enable youth on the margin to constructively participate in social processes. Arnold Goldstein, a pioneer in youth violence reduction, has developed a strategy for creating "prosocial gangs." Rather than trying to break up a gang, he would guide it to positive action. He would help gangs to create legitimate enterprises: rather than selling drugs, own laundromats (Goldstein, Glick, & Gibbs, 1998).

### Healing From Past Wounds and Altruism Born of Suffering

Healing from past wounds diminishes evil and creates goodness. Not only members of victimized groups but also many children and adults in the course of "normal" existence have painful, wounding experiences, what I call "life injuries" (Staub, in press-b): exclusion by peers, conflict with and at times the resulting loss of friends, divorce, the death of loved ones, and others. These can be a source of vulnerability, mistrust of other people, unhappiness in life, as well as hostility and violence. Healing requires that people engage with their painful experiences, have their suffering and pain acknowledged, receive empathy, and experience loving connections (Herman, 1992; Pearlman & Saakvitne, 1995; Staub, 1998).

Such corrective experiences can lead to what I have called "altruism born of suffering." Many people who have been neglected, were physically or sexually abused, or survived persecution, torture, or genocide against their group, do not become hostile or vengeful against the world; instead they devote themselves in significant ways to helping others. Many child survivors of the Holocaust have jobs in which they help people (Valent, 1998). Even partial healing, which healing from deep psychological wounds usually is, seems to lead some people to become caring and helpful. Many want to do what they can so that other people won't suffer like they have.

An important source of healing, and probably of altruism born of suffering, is the experience of loving connection and support. Loving connections are important in the development of resilience in children—the ability to function well

despite difficulties, obstacles, victimization, and other painful experiences early in life (Masten, 2001; O'Connell Higgins, 1994; Rutter, 1987). Loving connections help people to better endure them. Loving connections afterward help them to better heal from them. They offer those who have suffered an image of possibilities in life different from what their painful experiences have shown (Staub, 1998; in press-b).

One of my students, a very bright, very attractive young woman, had a terrible year in 8th grade. There was a boys' clique that dictated the rules by which the girls were to behave. In additional to sexual teasing, they would touch the girls—their breasts, their buttocks. They engaged in many degrading actions, which most of the girls endured and even acted as if they had welcomed. Because she did not go along with this, she was viciously teased and ostracized, not only by the boys but by the girls as well. The teachers witnessed all this but did nothing, even making such comments as "boys will be boys." She suffered all this without yielding, but suffered greatly.

In her home life, however, she received a great deal of love and affection before this, and much love and support while this was happening. She also saw her parents as moral, spiritual people, instilling in her an understanding of others (she came to interpret the behavior of the boy who was the main gang leader as a child of busy socialites who paid little attention to him), as well as independence. She believes that it was the combination of her background and her suffering that year that led her to engage in her many and varied activities to help others: volunteering with mentally and physically disabled children; spending time in a town in a poor area of the country helping to rebuild it after it was devastated by a disaster; serving as a peer mentor, tutor, and counselor for emotionally disturbed girls; volunteering at many charities and organizations; being the kind of person to whom others turn for consolation, and more.

Positive temperamental characteristics have also been found to contribute to resilience in children. This may be, at least in part, because an "easy," appealing temperament generates interest and may lead to loving connections. However, adults are capable of choice and can reach out to children needing loving connections who are shy, withdrawn, moody, intense, or impulsive—that is, even if they don't have an easy temperament.

As with moral courage, our knowledge of the roots and nature of altruism born of suffering is quite limited. I have already presented the hypotheses that healing from past wounds and loving connections are among these roots. Having had active bystanders intervene in one's behalf at times of victimization or suffering—a form of love—may also play a role. Other possible contributors are positive actions by a person in his or her own behalf, whether as a child or an adult, and the actions of parents in saving their families from harm inflicted on them. Many of the child survivors of the Holocaust were helped by bystanders, by their parents, and (young as they were) by their own actions.

Effective self-protection under extreme conditions powerfully affirms one's

efficacy and control. Learning that persecution and violence can be evaded and thus defeated may also show people the potential for goodness in the world. However, victimized people who evade persecution and violence primarily by the use of personal violence may learn something different. Children who are treated with great harshness by parents or others and are also taught to use violence in their defense may learn that only violence will give them security, a feeling of control, a positive identity. This may start them on the road to a life of violence (Rhodes, 1999).

When individuals or groups are completely focused on their injuries and pain, and/or preoccupied with the dangers the world poses for them, it is understandable that they would hardly notice others' suffering. But when such people heal, when their pain eases, as they become less self-focused and feel reasonably safe, and as they see the possibilities of human goodness, it makes sense that their past suffering would enable them to understand and respond to others' need. What is true of individuals is probably also true of groups. Although past suffering makes violence by them more likely, healing combined with certain conditions may enhance their empathy, caring, and helping. This may have been the case with the Huguenots in the village of Le Chambon, whose inhabitants saved thousands of Jews during the Holocaust (Hallie, 1979). Having known great religious persecution, they may have understood more and empathized more with others who were persecuted.

Healing from intense victimization, like the genocide in Rwanda or persistent abuse by parents, is a difficult and slow process, as is healing from any great trauma. Often people who have been deeply wounded never enter a road to healing. Some develop a way of life—whether as individuals or as people embedded in a group and its activities—that offers connection, positive identity, and strength, through dominance and violence. Their basic needs may get some fulfillment, even if in destructive ways. As a result, they may never attend to the wounds that ought to heal and may actually live in denial of their past suffering. At times only extensive and special forms of therapy may help (Milburn & Conrad, 1996). When people do heal, whether through therapy, other healing approaches, or life experience, the healing is often partial, even in the long run.

But even partial healing can enable people who have suffered to experience empathy with others. For example, Ingo Hasselbach, who in 1989 became a high-level neo-Nazi leader in East Germany, had a very difficult life as a child, adolescent, and young man, with abandonment and bad treatment by parents and harsh treatment by police. He repudiated, however, the neo-Nazi movement, as a result of several influences, including a German filmmaker who "perhaps for the first time in his life . . . valued him as an individual and was able to hold up a mirror in which Hasselbach saw himself clearly for the first time" (Milburn & Conrad, 1996, p. 226).

Will empathy and altruism born of suffering characterize the United States in the wake of 9/11? Like all countries, the United States has had painful experi-

ences in the course of its history—to name a few, the Civil War, slavery and its aftermath, the depression, the Vietnam war, and inner city riots. But 9/11 was a highly unusual experience of direct attack.

People in the country pulling together, the successful war against Afghanistan, the demonstration of strength and power by the United States, have rebuilt a reasonable sense of security and have had healing effects. These expressions of strength, however, also seemed to have reestablished the feeling of rightness and superiority that I have noted before, interfering with the recognition of similarities in our pain and the pain of weak, helpless victims elsewhere. This is indicated, for example, by the quiet acceptance by the U.S. government, apparently in exchange for support of the war against terrorism, of varied countries around the world engaging in violence against and human rights violations of members of opposition groups, calling them terrorists. An important subject for exploration is what might move groups that have suffered to altruism born of suffering. What social processes, in addition to healing from past wounds, might be required, and how might they be generated? And what might help groups to "see themselves," to have a perspective on themselves?

## Reconciliation and a Shared Collective History

To prevent new violence and promote positive relations between formerly hostile groups, or individuals, requires not only healing but also reconciliation. Healing can create greater openness to other people and may be an essential precondition for and contributor to reconciliation. When there are perpetrators and victims, perpetrators must also heal. Perpetrators of great violence at times had been wounded before, which is one of the influences that led to their violence. But even if that is not the case, they have almost certainly been wounded by their own violent acts. At the very least, they would have closed themselves to their victims. Over time the decline in their capacity for empathy, guilt, and other moral feelings would be likely to extend to more and more people (Staub & Pearlman, 2001).

Reconciliation also requires some sense of justice. Only one source of this is the punishment of wrongdoers. Other sources are an acknowledgment by perpetrators of the harm they have done (especially when accompanied by expressions of regret and apology) and social arrangements that not only acknowledge that unacceptable suffering was imposed on victims, but also make future harmdoing less likely. These can contribute to a sense of justice, to forgiveness (Lederach, 2001), and to reconciliation. So does compensation that improves the lives of survivors of violence (Gibson, in press), who may have been greatly impoverished in the course of the violence against them or as a result of the psychological aftereffects of the violence on them (Staub & Pearlman, 2001).

Another important element of reconciliation, between both individuals and groups, is a vision of the past that is acceptable to all parties, a shared collective

history (Bar-Tal, 2002; Staub & Bar-Tal, in press). Usually the parties' view of what has happened is profoundly contradictory. Groups blame each other for the conflict and violence and see their own actions as justifiable self-defense. In an interview I conducted in a prison in Rwanda with "Agnes," the justice minister of the country at the time of genocide, she said the reason for the genocide was "the past slavery of the Hutus." Perpetrators also minimize the harm they have inflicted and see the other as exaggerating his or her suffering (Baumeister, 1997), a research finding with individuals that almost certainly applies to groups as well.

An important tool for the creation of a shared history is the understanding of the roots of violence and harmdoing, including how genocide and other group violence come about (see Staub, 1989). Applying a conception about the origins of group violence to two groups' history, it is possible to see how persecution and violence in a particular instance have come about (Staub, 1999a). Such an exploration of the genocide in Rwanda can show the traditionally greater power and privilege of Tutsis over Hutus. The Belgian colonialists had the Tutsis administer the country for them, further enhancing the Tutsis' power and privilege and leading to the abuse of power by them. The Hutu experience of repression and injustice led to anger and the desire for revenge. In a Hutu uprising in 1959, more than 50,000 Tutsis were killed (des Forges, 1999). It was in reference to this history that Agnes claimed that the genocide was the outcome of the enslavement of Hutus by Tutsis, several decades before. The mutual devaluation, antagonism, and fear that would have existed at this point can help explain why, under the Hutu rule that followed as the country became independent, there was discrimination as well as violence against Tutsis, including periodic mass killings.

A thorough examination of what has generated violence in the course of two groups' history with each other, in a way that creates understanding and even empathy, can contribute to acceptance by each group of what the other has done and what one's own group has done. It can lead to acknowledging and taking responsibility for the actions of one's own group, without the usual justifications. It can lead to a shared collective memory. It can lead to teaching children a history that does not maintain the antagonism. It can contribute to peaceful engagement with the other. Accomplishing all this requires commitment to a long process by the parties involved and by caring bystanders or "third parties."

Even if the issue is not reconciliation between two parties living together, an exploration of problematic aspects of a country's past has great value. A truthful engagement with the past, one that is also empathic with mistakes made, creates self-awareness that can lead to more constructive actions in the future. Such aspects of the past in the United States may include the Vietnam war, slavery and the long history of repression of black people that followed, overthrowing democratic governments, and supporting dictatorships. In European countries it may include the behavior of these countries in the colonial era and complicity with Nazi Germany in the extermination of the Jews and in other matters. The

healing may be from wounds inflicted by one's own country's conduct, and reconciliation may be with one's own country.

## Education That Promotes Caring and Peace

As the preceding discussion indicates, education to prevent violence and promote caring is important. In work in Rwanda on healing, forgiveness, and reconciliation (Staub & Pearlman, 2001; Staub, Pearlman, Hagengimana, & Gubin, 2002), we found that learning about the roots of genocide had a very great impact on people. In a 2-week-long seminar/workshop, people who worked for local organizations that worked with groups in the community were trained. Part of the training was psychoeducation, brief lectures and extensive discussion about basic human needs, the impact of trauma on people, paths to healing from trauma, and the origins of genocide. The latter topic was presented in general terms, with many examples, with participants themselves applying the conception about the origins of genocide to Rwanda in the course of the discussion. Participants seemed to feel humanized, as they learned that other people had also experienced such horrible events, and as they came to see the roots of their terrible experience as understandable. In addition to these psychoeducational experiences, people in small groups talked about their painful experiences during the genocide, crying together and empathically supporting each other.

An experimental evaluation found that when people who were so trained conducted relatively brief training with groups in the community, 2 months after the training both the Tutsi and Hutu participants of the community groups had lower trauma symptoms and developed a more positive attitude toward members of the other group. This change occurred over time as well as in comparison to control groups and to groups led by people we did not train, who used the methods they have traditionally used (Staub et al., 2002).

Education in these realms must consist of more than instruction. To the extent that it consists of information, it must engage people's experience. At the very least, it must combine information and discussion and bring about what seems like *experiential understanding*. By this I mean a joining and integration of facts and ideas with life experiences, thus creating a deep, "organismic" understanding that reaches beyond thoughts to feelings.

Such experiential education, and the healing from past wounds that it may promote, are relevant in many contexts. They are needed by young people in inner cities of the United States who are exposed to and traumatized by having friends and relatives killed, by witnessing shootings and seeing dead bodies, and by feeling unsafe walking the streets. They are needed by children and adults who have been physically or sexually abused, and by women and men who have been victims of physical abuse by a spouse or partner.

## Culture, Personality, and Self-Awareness

Devaluation of others, very strong respect for authority and a tendency to obey it, inequality and the experience of injustice, monolithic political organization and values, and unhealed wounds all contribute to violence between groups and among individuals in a society. Conversely, positive evaluation of others, a reasonable, moderate respect for authority and a willingness to question authority (and to oppose potentially destructive policies and actions), a reasonable distribution of power and privilege, a pluralistic and democratic political system, and processes of healing and reconciliation all contribute to peaceful, harmonious relations between groups and among individuals in a society (Staub, 1989, 2002a, 2002b).

In addition to other avenues to the creation of cultures and political arrangements that promote the positive side of this balance (Staub, 1999a, 1999b; Staub & Bar-Tal, in press; Staub & Pearlman, 2001), self-awareness and awareness of the culture and practices of one's group are also of great importance. Individuals (and groups) who are unaware of the impact of their behavior on others will react very differently from those who see how their actions have contributed to others' actions. Without such awareness guiding action, an intensifying cycle of hostile interactions may follow. Many conflicts—for example, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict—are maintained in part by the inability or unwillingness of each party to consider the reactions that its own actions create.

Aggressive boys who tend to initiate aggression toward their peers and are unpredictable in their behavior are unpopular among their peers, but are unaware of this. They become more aggressive over time, and many of them later engage in criminal violence. In contrast, nonaggressive boys who are unpopular know it. It is presumably this awareness and the adjustment it makes possible that contributes to their greater acceptance by peers over time (Zakriski, Jacobs, & Coie, 1997). Going a step deeper and becoming aware of the origins of one's own or one's group's actions in thoughts, feelings, values, beliefs, and motives also has great value. It makes choice and self-control possible.

Awareness of the larger world is also important. Terrorism, usually defined as violence by small groups against noncombatants, and state terrorism, violence by the state against its nonviolent citizens, should be unacceptable to the international community. Terrorism should be distinguished from people fighting against a violent, repressive system.

But the roots of such violence are essential to understand. In the United States, as an example, there has been a relative absence of public exploration after 9/11 of the roots of terrorism in general, and of the sources of hostility toward the United States in particular. In the Arab world, these sources might include sanctions against Iraq, which made sense at the end of the Persian Gulf war of 1991 but were continued after it became evident that they were not accomplishing their aims but were creating much suffering in the population. They might include

support for repressive systems, like Saudi Arabia, Iran before its fundamentalist revolution, and other non-democratic restrictive and repressive Arab states; the role of the United States as a creator of much contemporary culture that seeps into traditional societies that are also repressive and have difficulty handling culture change (Staub, in press-c); or seeing the United States as the supporter of Israel in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Other sources (which may not be of special concern to Arab terrorists or would-be Arab terrorists) might also include U.S. unwillingness to be a good citizen of the international community, as shown by its refusal to participate in many international agreements; and possibly U.S. economic policies being seen as a cause of others' poverty. Engaging in critical self-examination makes changes in action possible.

Self-preoccupation interferes with happiness (Lubomirsky, 2001). Complexity in thinking about the self—at least a type of it in which people use many dimensions in describing the self but without necessarily integrating these dimensions—buffers to some degree reactions to stress, but it does not contribute to positive mood and well-being (Rafaeli-Mor & Steinberg, 2002). But constructive self-examination and self-awareness must, seemingly by definition, make meaningful choice possible. They can motivate and help create positive change in oneself and one's group. It is important to help children develop a capacity to reflect on their experiences and gain self-awareness. It is also important for societies to practice self-examination, without censorship, and in a democracy, without the self-censorship that is imposed by culture, prevailing values, and prevailing views of the group that have become difficult to question (Staub, 1989).

## Goodness and Optimal Human Functioning

Many of the experiences that contribute to a person becoming caring, helpful, and an active bystander in response to harmdoing are the same experiences that contribute to optimal human functioning. By this I mean our continued growth as persons, the unfolding and evolution of our positive human and personal potentials. I mean the capacity to live a full and satisfying internal/emotional life, a fulfilling and constructive life of relationships, and a creative and purposeful work life. It is likely that some of the internal and relational aspects of optimal functioning are similar in most people, including self-awareness, empathy, respect for other people, and a feeling of effectiveness in the world. These qualities include what Abraham Maslow (1954/1987) and Carl Rogers (1961) have identified as qualities of self-actualized persons, and what Daniel Goleman (1995) has described as emotional intelligence.

Optimal human functioning is an outgrowth of the fulfillment of basic needs. Although we can expect uniformity in some processes that characterize a person whose basic needs have primarily been fulfilled, as well as in processes involved in fulfilling basic needs (for example, affirming a child and what she or he does),

there will be differences in content (for example, what activities the child is engaged in and what the child is affirmed for). Thus, the realms in which a person develops efficacy, the nature of the person's identity, the elements of his or her worldview will vary. People who are highly skilled in and whose identity is invested in the study or practice of literature, or carpentry, or social interaction, may all be optimally functioning individuals. In different cultures, aspects of optimal functioning will look different. It is likely, however, that optimal human functioning will express itself, whatever the profession, activity, or culture, in some degree of creativity, at least creativity in living life.

Goodness is likely to be one expression of optimal functioning. A group of caring, morally committed people who have been studied, including university presidents and successful business people who have used their skills to promote others' welfare, as well as people working full time to feed, clothe, or in other ways benefit poor people or promote positive social change, reported deep satisfaction from helping others. The considerable time they spent on such activities was not a sacrifice for them. Their personal goals embodied helping others: Acting in others' behalf brought a fulfillment of their own personal goals as well (Colby & Damon, 1992). Their deep caring and moral commitment was the outcome of a personal evolution. As adults, they shaped themselves through choices they have made and the actions and experiences these choices led to. In the end, their caring about others was a wholly integrated part of themselves.

## Active Bystandership

Passivity by witnesses or bystanders greatly contributes to the evolution of violence and harmdoing by groups (Staub, 1989). Creating goodness, bringing about positive social/cultural change, requires active bystandership by individuals, organizations, communities, and nations. Speaking out can stop those who do harm from doing more harm, whether it is a child in a school, an adult in a workplace, or a group that is beginning to develop a destructive ideology. A caring peer or teacher can be a turning point in a child's life, remembered forever. Third parties are often essential for the peaceful resolution of conflict. Active bystanders can help create caring schools (Staub, in press-a). Working together, people can promote the cultural/societal characteristics that in turn create and maintain harmony, goodness, and peace.

Although individuals can have great influence, it is necessary for people to work together to create social change. To be active bystanders requires caring values, a feeling of responsibility, as well as a feeling of efficacy—the belief that one can bring about positive ends. Active bystandership is also facilitated by mutual support, people working together for a shared cause. The study of genocide and terrorism shows how intensely people can support each other as they work together for destructive ends. People can support and inspire each other working for beneficial ends as well.

Active bystandership entails risks. The risks are usually lower when bystanders act early in a sequence of events, and when they act skillfully. When attempting to stop kids, adults, or groups from harming others, words and actions can exert positive influence, or they can confront. Often the former is most beneficial and sufficient; at times the latter is necessary. Active bystandership also has many potential rewards, like immediate benefits to someone's welfare, awareness of long-term benefits, and the satisfaction inherent in living up to one's values. A great reward, in the end, is knowing that one has been leading a worthwhile life. Erik Erikson (1959) described, as a last stage of psychosocial development, integration versus despair. In looking back on our lives, integration and contentment may come from not having focused only on ourselves, from having lived as true members of the human community.

## AUTHOR'S ADDRESS

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Ervin Staub, Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Amherst, MA 01003. E-mail: estaub@psych.umass.edu

## REFERENCES

Bar-Tal, D. (2002). Collective memory and physical violence. In E. Cairns & M. D. Roe (Eds.), *Memories in conflict*. London: Macmillan.

Baumeister, R. F. (1997). *Evil: Inside human violence and cruelty*. New York: Freeman.

Burton, J. W. (Ed.) (1990). *Conflict: Human needs theory*. New York: St. Martin's.

Buss, D. M. (2000). The evolution of happiness. *American Psychologist, 55*, 15–24.

Christie, D. J. (1997). Reducing direct and structural violence: The human needs theory. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 3*, 315–332.

Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1992). *Some do care*. New York: Free Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). The dynamics of self-determination in personality and development. In R. Schwarzer (Ed.), *Self-related cognition in anxiety and motivation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

des Forges, A. (1999). *Leave none to tell the story: Genocide in Rwanda*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

Eisenberg, N. (1992). *The caring child*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Erikson, E. H. (1959). Identity and the life cycle. Selected papers. *Psychological Issues, 1* (Monograph 1). New York: International Universities Press.

Ezekiel, R. S. (1995). *The racist mind*. New York: Penguin.

Fein, H. (1993). Accounting for genocide after 1945: Theories and some findings. *International Journal of Group Rights, 1*, 79–106.

Friedman, T. L. (2002, 27 January). The 2 domes of Belgium. *New York Times*, p. 13.

Gibson, J. L. (in press). Truth, justice and reconciliation: Judging the fairness of amnesty in South Africa. *American Journal of Political Science*.

Goldstein, A. P., Glick, B., & Gibbs, J. C. (1998). *Aggression replacement training: A comprehensive intervention for aggressive youth*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than I.Q.* New York: Bantam.

Hallie, P. P. (1979). *Lest innocent blood be shed: The story of the village of Le Chambon, and how goodness happened there.* New York: Harper and Row.

Harff, B., Gurr, T. R., & Unger, A. (1999, November). *Preconditions of genocide and politicide: 1955–1998.* Paper presented at the Conference on Differing Approaches to Assessing Potential Genocide, Politicides and Mass Killings, Vienna, VA.

Herman, J. (1992). *Trauma and recovery.* New York: Basic Books.

Kelman, H. C. (1990). Applying a human needs perspective to the practice of conflict resolution: The Israeli-Palestinian case. In J. W. Burton (Ed.), *Conflict: Human needs theory.* New York: St. Martin's.

Lederach, J. P. (2001). Five qualities of practice in support of reconciliation. In S. J. Helmick & R. L. Petersen (Eds.), *Forgiveness and reconciliation: Religion, public policy and conflict transformation* (pp. 183–195). Radnor, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.

Lubomirsky, S. (2001). Why are some people happier than others? The role of cognitive and motivational processes in well-being. *American Psychologist, 56,* 239–250.

Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being* (2nd ed.). New York: Van Nostrand.

Maslow, A. H. (1987). *Motivation and personality* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper and Row. (Original work published 1954)

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist, 56,* 227–238.

McCann, I. L., & Pearlman, L. A. (1990). *Psychological trauma and the adult survivor: Theory, therapy, and transformation.* New York: Brunner/Mazel.

McCauley, C. R., & Segal, M. D. (1989). Terrorist individuals and terrorist groups: The normal psychology of extreme behavior. In J. Groebel & J. F. Goldstein (Eds.), *Terrorism.* Sevilla: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla.

Milburn, M. A., & Conrad, S. D. (1996). *The politics of denial.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in personality.* New York: Oxford University Press.

O'Connell Higgins, C. (1994). *Resilient adults overcoming a cruel past.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Oliner, S. B., & Oliner, P. (1988). *The altruistic personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe.* New York: Free Press.

Pearlman, L. A., & Saakvitne, K. (1995). *Trauma and the therapist.* New York: Norton.

Rafaeli-Mor, E., & Steinberg, J. (2002). Self-complexity and wellbeing: A review and research synthesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6,* 31–58.

Rhodes, R. (1999). *Why they kill.* New York: Knopf.

Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57,* 316–331.

Schatz, R., & Staub, E. (1997). Manifestations of blind and constructive patriotism. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the lives of individuals and groups* (pp. 229–246). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology, 20,* 151–175.

Smith, R. W. (1999). State power and genocidal intent: On the uses of genocide in the twentieth century. In L. Chorbajian & G. Shirinian (Eds.), *Studies in comparative genocide* (pp. 3–15). New York: St. Martin's.

Staub, E. (1989). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Staub, E. (1996a). Altruism and aggression: Origins and cures. In R. Feldman (Ed.), *The psychology of adversity* (pp. 115–147). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Staub, E. (1996b). The cultural-societal roots of violence: The examples of genocidal violence and of contemporary youth violence in the United States. *American Psychologist, 51*, 117–132.

Staub, E. (1997). Blind versus constructive patriotism: Moving from embeddedness in the group to critical loyalty and action. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the lives of individuals and groups* (pp. 213–229). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Staub, E. (1998). Breaking the cycle of genocidal violence: Healing and reconciliation. In J. Harvey (Ed.), *Perspectives on loss* (pp. 231–241). Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.

Staub, E. (1999a). The origins and prevention of genocide, mass killing and other collective violence. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 5*, 303–337.

Staub, E. (1999b). The roots of evil: Personality, social conditions, culture and basic human needs. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 179–192.

Staub, E. (2000). Mass murder: Origins, prevention and U.S. involvement. In *Encyclopedia of violence in the United States*. New York: Scribner.

Staub, E. (2002a). From healing past wounds to the development of inclusive caring: Contents and processes of peace education. In G. Solomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concepts, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 73–89). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Staub, E. (2002b). Preventing terrorism: Raising "inclusively" caring children in the complex world of the 21st century. In C. Stout (Ed.), *Psychology of terrorism*. New York: Praeger.

Staub, E. (in press-a). *The psychology of good and evil.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Staub, E. (in press-b). *A brighter future: Raising caring, nonviolent, morally courageous children.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Staub, E. (in press-c). Notes on terrorism: Origins and prevention. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology.*

Staub, E., & Bar-Tal, D. (in press). Genocide, mass killing and intractable conflict: Roots, evolution, prevention and reconciliation. In D. Sears, L. Huddy, & R. Jervis (Eds.), *Handbook of political psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Staub, E., & Pearlman, L. (2001). Healing, reconciliation and forgiving after genocide and other collective violence. In S. J. Helmick & R. L. Petersen (Eds.), *Forgiveness and reconciliation: Religion, public policy and conflict transformation* (pp. 195–219). Radnor, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.

Staub, E., Pearlman, A. L., Hagengimana, A., & Gubin, A. (2002). *Healing, forgiving and reconciliation: An intervention and its experimental evaluation in Rwanda.* Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Staub, E., & Rosenthal, L. (1994). Mob violence: Societal-cultural sources, group processes and participants. In L. Eron & J. Gentry (Eds.), *Reason to hope: A psychosocial perspective on violence and youth* (pp. 281–314). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways.* New York: Ginn.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33*, 1–39.

Tec, N. (1986). *When light pierced the darkness: Christian rescue of Jews in Nazi-occupied Poland.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Triandis, H. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review, 96*, 506–520.

Valent, P. (1998). Child survivors: A review. In J. Kestenberg & C. Kahn (Eds.), *Children surviving persecution: An international study of trauma and healing*. New York: Praeger.

Weiss, J., Rothbaum, F., & Blackburn, T. (1984). Standing out and standing in: The psychology of control in America and Japan. *American Psychologist*, 955–975.

Zakriski, A., Jacobs, M., & Coie, J. (1997). Coping with childhood peer rejection. In S. A. Wolchik & I. N. Sandler (Eds.), *Handbook of children's coping: Linking theory and intervention*. (pp. 423–452). New York: Plenum Press.