

# The Origins and Prevention of Genocide, Mass Killing, and Other Collective Violence

Ervin Staub

*Department of Psychology  
University of Massachusetts at Amherst*

Difficult life conditions give rise to scapegoating and ideologies that identify enemies and lead a group to turn against another. Conflict between groups and self-interest are additional instigators of group violence. Discrimination and limited violence change individuals and groups and can lead to an evolution that ends in mass killing or genocide. Certain cultural characteristics make this process more likely. The passivity of bystanders allows it to unfold. This conception, previously used to understand other instances of collective violence and further developed here, is applied to the exploration of the roots of genocide in Rwanda. To *halt* violence, once it begins, action by nations and the community of nations is essential. Reasons for bystanders' passivity and necessary forms of action are discussed. To *prevent* group violence may require the healing of wounds due to past victimization, reconciliation, and the resolution of conflict between antagonistic groups. Changes in elements of a group's culture are also important. Without prevention, great social changes and other contemporary conditions make frequent future group violence probable.

We live in a time where genocide, mass killing, and other violence *by* groups of people directed *at* groups defined by their ethnicity, race, religion, culture, or political affiliation is widespread. Because the differentiation between groups that engage in such violence can be of many kinds, I will refer to such violence across group lines simply as *collective violence*.<sup>1</sup>

---

Requests for reprints should be sent to Ervin Staub, Department of Psychology, Tobin Hall, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Amherst, MA 01003. E-mail: estaub@psych.umass.edu

<sup>1</sup>*Collective violence* includes ethno-political violence, but also violence between groups based on criteria other than ethnicity. Such violence may be differentiated from war between states.

There was hope after World War II that the horrors of the Holocaust, Nazi Germany's crusade against Jews, and the killing of millions of other people would bring such violence to an end forever. Instead, collective or group violence has become commonplace in the second part of the 20th century. Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Tibet, East Timor, Argentina, El Salvador, Chile, Guatemala, Colombia, Bosnia, and Rwanda are only some of the better-known places where such violence has been perpetrated. Its forms have also been numerous, including genocide, mass killing, abductions or disappearances of large numbers of individuals, and widespread torture (Suedfeld, 1990).

There has been research and writing about the origins of such violence, especially genocide (e.g. Fein, 1979, 1990; Kressel, 1996; Kuper, 1981; Smith, 1998; Staub, 1989; and many others). Whereas collective violence in general has received limited attention in psychology, there are signs of change (see Cairns & Darby, 1998; Comas-Diaz, Lynes, & Alarcon, 1998; Rouhana & Bar-Tal, 1998; for earlier work, see also Kelman, 1973; Kelman & Hamilton, 1989). There is also increasing attention to prevention (Carnegie Commission on the Prevention of Deadly Conflict, 1997; Charny, 1991; Fein, 1994; Staub, 1996b).

Without effective prevention, the frequency of such violence is likely to rise further in the 21st century. Poverty, the experience of injustice, and social and psychological disorganization that prevents the meeting of basic human needs in a rapidly changing world tend to lead people to turn to ethnic, religious, national, or other "identity" groups to strengthen individual identity and to gain support and security. This, combined with ideologies that groups adopt in difficult times, whether Nazism, communism, nationalism, racial supremacy, or something else, frequently leads to antagonism and violence against other groups.

To understand collective violence requires an interdisciplinary perspective. Individual psychology, group psychology, culture, social institutions, the social conditions in a country, the political system, and the system of international relations all have roles in both causation and prevention. In this article I review a conception of the origins of such violence (Staub, 1989; 1996a) and then in greater detail address its prevention. Understanding the influences that lead to collective violence is necessary for prediction; both understanding and prediction are essential for prevention. For effective prevention, it is highly important to further our understanding of commonalities in both causes and methods of prevention as well as to respect the particulars of each potentially violence-producing situation.

The conception of origins that follows has been applied to analyses of the Holocaust, the genocide of the Armenians, the "autogenocide" in Cambodia, and the disappearances in Argentina (Staub, 1989). It has also been applied in a limited analysis to the group violence in Bosnia (Staub, 1996a). It is assumed, and the applications of this conception have shown, that genocide and lesser violence by groups have shared determinants. Here the conception is extended: by addressing the role of leaders, by using it to look at the roots of the genocide in Rwanda, and

by exploring at the end of this article why in some cases of group conflict, when violence-generating conditions existed, the level of violence remained low.

## INSTIGATORS OF VIOLENCE

Like individual violence, so group violence has instigators. Difficult conditions of life in a society, singly or in combination, are frequent instigators: severe economic problems, great political turmoil, great and rapid societal change. At times, when there are other potential instigators, difficult life conditions may activate them or magnify their instigating power. In all the instances noted in the preceding paragraph, a starting point for genocide or mass killing was intense, persistent difficulties of life, usually of varied kinds.

Difficult life conditions frustrate basic human needs (Staub, 1989, 1996a, 1998b, in press-a; in press-b; see also Burton, 1990; Kelman, 1990), such as the needs for security, a feeling of effectiveness and control, a positive identity, and positive connections to other people. Difficult life conditions create chaos and turmoil that frustrate the need to understand the world and one's own role in it. The frustration of basic needs does not directly lead to group violence. Instead, it leads to psychological processes in individuals and social processes in groups that result in turning against and harming members of another group.

Another instigating condition is conflict involving vital interests, such as territory needed for living space, as in the case of the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians. Although living space and other vital interests are "objective" needs, they have powerful psychological elements, like intense need for security that groups feel the territory will provide, or intense identification by groups with a particular territory.

A further instigating condition is conflict between a dominant group in a society and a subordinate group that has limited rights and receives few of the society's resources. Since World War II, demands by subordinate groups for greater rights and more resources have been frequent instigators of genocide (Fein, 1993) or other group violence. Other contributing conditions are abrupt transitions in government, difficulty by a new government to effectively govern, and ethnic or revolutionary war (Institute for Genocide Studies, 1999).

Poverty by itself does not appear to be a primary instigator of collective violence. Relative deprivation and the experience of injustice are likely to be more important. The experience of injustice in economically difficult times, as members of a less privileged group are severely affected by life problems whereas others are not, seems to enhance the instigating power of difficult life conditions (Staub, 1989). As in Argentina at the time of the disappearances, frequently demands, limited violence, or both by the subordinate group lead to mass killing or genocide by the dominant group. Occasionally, as in the case of Cambodia, fighting that ends in

victory by the subordinate group is followed by genocide or mass killing (Staub, 1989).

Violence against groups is at times also motivated by self-interest. For example, an indigenous group may live in a territory that others want to own or develop economically, as in the case of Native Americans in the United States (Sheehan, 1973; Staub, in press-a) or the Ache Indians in Paraguay.

## IDENTITY, SCAPEGOATING, AND IDEOLOGIES

Certain psychological and social processes move a group from conditions that are instigators to actual violence. Difficult life conditions lead individuals to turn to the group for identity and connection. They lead to scapegoating, claiming that some other group is responsible for life problems. They lead to the adoption or creation of ideologies, visions of a better world, of ideal social arrangements. Turning to the group, scapegoating and ideologies do not by themselves improve life conditions, but they satisfy needs for identity, connection, and comprehension of reality.

Ideologies are present in the life of all groups, and positive visions in difficult times can be very valuable. But in response to difficult life conditions, especially when certain cultural conditions exist, ideologies are adopted or created that identify enemies, which makes them destructive. These ideologies usually identify a devalued, vulnerable group, often the scapegoated group and sometimes a historical antagonist, as an enemy that stands in the way of the ideology's fulfillment. The presence of such an ideology, leaders propagating it, and its wide appeal are all important sources of and indicators of potential violence.

Some form of destructive ideology is almost always present before group violence. "Better world" ideologies, like communism, claim to improve the welfare of all human beings. Nationalistic ideologies come in two forms: the desire to create one's own nation, which at times is a reasonable and constructive goal (Kelman, 1997) but often creates conflict and is pursued by violent means; and the desire to enhance the power, wealth, and purity of one's group.

Dominant groups usually develop "hierarchy legitimizing myths" (Sidanius, in press) or legitimizing ideologies that justify subordinating other groups. They often see themselves as superior and deserving of their status due to their race, religion, intelligence, hard work, worldview, or other characteristics. Groups also embrace ideologies of development and visions of economic progress, identifying the victim group as standing in the way.

A history of conflict and antagonism between groups can create an *ideology of antagonism* (Staub, 1989), a view of the other as a mortal enemy and a view of one's group as the enemy of the other. The ideology is then activated by life problems, conflicts, or even by improvement in the condition of the other group. Implicit in ideologies of antagonism is the vision of a world without the historical

enemy. Ideologies of antagonism often arise from, and in turn give rise to, continuing cycles of violence, often over generations (Fisher, in press).

People can become intensely committed to the mode of thinking, goals, and social movement created by an ideology. The ideals the ideology propagates can become a higher morality that overrides conventional morality. Although human beings need positive visions, especially in difficult times, when these visions identify enemies they become destructive and are important danger signals to those interested in prevention.

### HARMFUL ACTS AND THE CONTINUUM OF DESTRUCTION

Violence usually evolves. Harmful acts by individuals make further and more intensely harmful acts probable (Buss, 1966; Goldstein, Davis, & Herman, 1975). As an examination of instances of group violence clearly shows (Staub, 1989, 1996a), limited discrimination changes to progressively greater discrimination, persecution, and violence against victimized groups. With "steps along a continuum of destruction," this can lead to mass killing or genocide.

Lesser acts of discrimination and violence change and ultimately transform perpetrators and then the whole group. Perpetrators justify their actions by devaluing the victims more. They come to see them as less human and exclude them from the moral universe (Opotow, 1990; Staub, 1990). Public norms of behavior change, and institutions change or new ones are created that serve persecution and violence. People hostile to the victim group move into prominent positions (Merkl, 1980). The attitude of "bystanders," the rest of the population, changes. Increase in the level of harm inflicted on a group that has been historically victimized is an indicator of current danger, because it may be the start of the evolution of intense violence.

### THE ROLE OF LEADERS AND ELITES

The role of followers is important in generating violence, that is, the way a population turns to destructive leadership in the presence of the instigating conditions I described and certain cultural characteristics. In previous analyses I have focussed on how such conditions lead people to be open to, or seek and select, leaders, and even generate leadership that turns the group against others (Staub, 1989). Still, except under the most extreme conditions, leaders have some latitude in how they deal with difficult life conditions or group conflict. They can offer positive visions that unify rather than divide people. They can engage in the difficult task of joining all people in efforts to improve life conditions.

Instead, leaders and a country's elite frequently intensify already existing hostility (Kressel, 1996). They work to maintain differences between groups in power and status. They use propaganda to enhance devaluation of and fear of the other. They propagate a destructive ideology and thereby offer "higher ideals" in behalf of action against the other. They create organizations that are potential instruments of violence. In many places, paramilitary organizations, broadly defined, are created and used as tools of collective violence: in Bosnia (Kressel, 1996), Rwanda (des Forges, 1999; Prunier, 1995), Argentina (Nunca Mas, 1986) and other South American countries, Turkey, Germany (Staub, 1989), and elsewhere.

### BYSTANDER ACTIONS

Bystanders are witnesses who are in a position to know about events. They may close their eyes and ears to events and information and claim they did not know—hence we need the concept of being in a position to know. Passivity by internal bystanders (members of the population where the violence is occurring) and by external bystanders (outside groups and nations) encourages perpetrators. It allows the evolution of increasing violence. Such passivity is common.

Internal bystanders are affected by difficult life conditions or other instigators; they have learned to devalue victims (see the following sections) and are affected by other cultural preconditions. Their passivity further changes them. It distances them from and leads them to increasingly devalue victims. It diminishes their capacity to empathize with those in distress and their sense of guilt about their inaction. In the end, they go along with and frequently even support persecution and violence, as they did in 1915–1916 at the time of the genocide of the Armenians in Turkey (Dadrian, 1995) and during the increasing persecution of the Jews in the 1930s in Germany.

External bystanders frequently continue commercial, cultural, and other relations with a country that engages in violence against a group of its citizens (Simpson, 1993), thereby expressing tacit acceptance. Often some countries actively support perpetrators. Many countries supported Iraq before its invasion of Kuwait, even though it had started a war against Iran and used chemical weapons against its Kurdish citizens. The United States increased its aid to El Salvador in 1984, even though about 40,000 people were killed there between 1979 and 1983, a large percentage of them extrajudicial executions by security forces. The United States has trained South American military personnel in "counterinsurgency" techniques and continued to do so when it was already evident that the techniques were employed during the disappearances in Argentina (Nunca Mas, 1986), as well as in violence against the population in other South American countries.

Research on individual behavior in emergencies (Latane & Darley, 1970; Myers, 1996; Staub, 1974), as well as the behavior of bystanders in actual life situ-

ations, like the rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe (Hallie, 1979; Oliner & Oliner, 1988; Staub, 1989, 1993), has demonstrated the great power and potential of bystanders to influence the behavior of other bystanders, and even of perpetrators. Nations as well have had great influence, on the rare occasions when they acted as committed bystanders.

## PREDISPOSING CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS

Certain cultural or societal characteristics, which include political arrangements, make ethno-political violence more likely. A history of *devaluation of a subgroup* of society makes it easier and more likely that the group will be scapegoated and chosen as the ideological enemy. At times, there are rifts in a society, indicated by mutual devaluation. In Cambodia, there was a historical rift between peasants in the countryside and people in the cities who owned the land and administered the country (Kiernan & Boua, 1982). Different forms or intensity of devaluation may exist or evolve, ranging from seeing the other as inferior, to seeing the other as morally bad, even evil, and finally to seeing the other as an enemy bent on one's destruction. More intense devaluation makes violence against the other easier and more likely. Ideologies of antagonism, which were described earlier, are intense, mutual devaluations, with each group devaluing the other, that have become stable characteristics of each group, its identity and worldview.

Another important predisposing characteristic is a *monolithic* (in contrast to pluralistic) society. A plurality of values and ways of life, and access by all groups to the public domain, make both intense devaluation and passivity by the population in the face of increasing harm inflicted on a subgroup of society less likely. An aspect of true pluralism is reasonable distribution of rights and privileges. This is especially important in multiethnic, multicultural states. It has been suggested that democracies, which are more pluralistic, neither engage in genocide nor start wars against other democracies (Rummel, 1994).

However, this is primarily true of "mature" democracies, in which pluralism and democratic process are deeply rooted in culture and social institutions and the rights of varied groups are respected. Germany was a new democracy during the Weimar Republic. Many Germans mourned the collapse of the monarchy and opposed the Republic. Germany soon became a totalitarian system under the Nazis. In Argentina, prior to the disappearances, military dictatorships regularly replaced elected governments. In Colombia there are tremendous disparities in rights and privilege. The military and other segments of society (drug lords, guerrillas, paramilitary groups) have power that enables them to subvert democratic processes (U.S. Department of State, 1996).

A strong *authority orientation* is another predisposing cultural characteristic (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989; Milgram, 1974; Staub, 1989). All societies teach

some respect for and obedience to authority, but there is great variation in degree. For example, long before Hitler came to power, Germans were regarded as especially respectful of and obedient to authority (Girard, 1980). There is evidence from Serbia as well of authoritarian child-rearing and strong respect for authority (Kressel, 1996).

In strongly authority-oriented societies, people will be more impacted by difficult life conditions when the capacity of their leaders, the authorities, to provide security and effective leadership breaks down. They will have more difficulty dealing with conditions of uncertainty (Soeters, 1996). They will yearn for leaders who offer hopeful visions of the future and will be more likely to blame other groups for life problems. They will be less likely to speak out against leaders who lead them to discrimination and violence against other groups, and they will be more obedient when ordered to perpetrate violence.

Another important societal characteristic is *unhealed group trauma*. When a group has experienced great suffering, especially due to persecution and violence at the hands of others, it is more likely to respond to renewed threat with violence. Trauma affects people's assumptions about and orientation to the world (Herman, 1992; Janoff-Bulman, 1992; Pearlman & Saakvitne, 1995). It creates insecurity, a feeling that the world is a dangerous place. It leads to experiencing threat very intensely. In the case of conflict it makes it difficult to consider the needs of others. Victimized groups are more likely to engage, therefore, in what they see as defensive aggression (Staub, 1996b, 1998b).

These predisposing characteristics, as well as some others (Staub, 1989), are present to some degree in most societies. When they are present to a greater extent and in combination, they make group violence more likely. When they are present to a lesser extent, they can inhibit processes that might otherwise lead to violence.

## THE EXAMPLE OF RWANDA

### Instigators

Intensely difficult economic and political conditions preceded the genocide in 1994 in Rwanda. Hutus, who constituted about 85% of a population of eight million people, with Tutsis making up about 14%, killed somewhere between 600,000 and 800,000 Tutsis. About 50,000 Hutus were also killed, either because they were politically moderate or because they came from the southern part of the country and were mistrusted by the current Hutu leadership from the Northwest (for historical information, see des Forges, 1999; Gourevich, 1998; Kressel, 1996; Prunier, 1995; Smith, 1998).

In an already densely populated country, there was great population growth. In the late 1980s the price of coffee, the primary export of Rwanda, had substantially



declined, as did the price of tin, the major mineral produced in Rwanda. In a highly authoritarian political system, where the elite grew rich while the population suffered, there were demands for greater rights by various groups. The economic problems and political pressures created divisions among the Hutu elite, who were vying for positions of advantage.

The invasion by the Tutsi Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) in 1990, consisting of refugees or children of refugees who fled after previous massacres, intensified political turmoil. Although this invasion was stopped, the RPF went on the offensive again in 1992 and then a year later after massacres of Tutsi peasants. Thus, in addition to difficult life conditions created by economic problems, there was both intense conflict between the dominant group and subordinate groups and a civil war. A peace agreement was signed in 1993 that was to create a multiparty system, with power-sharing by several groups. The RPF, which propagated national unity, would have controlled 5 out of 21 ministries.

## Evolution

About 50,000 Tutsis were killed in 1959, even before the country gained independence from Belgian rule in 1962, with more violence in the early 1960s and in the 1970s. There was only limited violence after that until the 1990s, with the Hutus firmly in control. There was substantial discrimination, with Tutsis excluded from or marginalized in the administration of the country. In the early 1990s, there were small-scale massacres. A simple but powerful ideology of "Hutu power" developed and was propagated by the elite, which included advocacy of the destruction of Tutsis (des Forges, 1999; Gourevich, 1998; Prunier, 1995). Earlier mass killings, followed by discrimination and periodic violence against a group represent an evolution that, especially when combined with an ideology of antagonism, make a seemingly sudden flare-up of intense violence possible. In this context, the invasion of the RPF and the resulting mutual violence also enhanced the potential for more intense violence.

## The Role of Elites

An extensive media campaign, especially involving radio, was used against Tutsis; the propaganda called them cockroaches and incited fear and hatred. Although the RPF did commit some atrocities (killing of noncombatant civilians) after the genocide began (des Forges, 1999), there were earlier, false reports of atrocities by them. People were told that the Tutsis were going to return to reclaim all their property. Paramilitary groups were created and prepared to engage in genocide. The Hutu president was assassinated, apparently by the Hutu leadership, possibly in part as a

result of a power struggle and in part to subvert the multiparty system and power-sharing with Tutsis that he had agreed to. The genocide began immediately after this.

The genocide was organized and systematic, its aim the elimination of the Tutsi population. Des Forges (1999) presents evidence that an extremist Hutu leadership strategically used the image of the Tutsi as an absolute menace, together with threats to and violence against dissidents. What the accounts do not sufficiently stress is that even when such images are strategically used, they tend to be based on psychological realities, such as intense devaluation, antagonism, and fear. Although the genocide was primarily perpetrated by the army and paramilitary groups, the tactics used by the leadership, combined with the historical division between Tutsis and Hutus and the tendency to obey authorities, succeeded in involving a significant although probably relatively small portion of the population as perpetrators. However, some Hutus tried to protect Tutsis. Most of the few who did so publicly were killed. As the genocide began, Hutus were killed for political reasons. Later, some were killed for their property (des Forges, 1999). As violence evolves, such expansion of it is quite common (Staub, 1989).

### The Role of Bystanders

In response to the first invasion by the RPF, the French sent troops to support the government. They made no response to "small-scale" massacres of Tutsis that followed, such as the killings of about 2,000 Tutsi peasants in 1993. As passionately described by Gourevich (1998), the international community made no response to reports of the impending violence against the Tutsi, which came from varied sources, including Human Rights Watch. The United Nations (UN) took no action on the information about plans for a genocide that the head of the UN peacekeeping troops, General Dallaire, received from a highly placed Rwandan. As the genocide began, some Belgian peacekeepers were killed. Partly under Belgian influence, the UN removed its peacekeepers. Not to invoke the genocide convention, which would have created strong pressure to take action, the world, including and in part led by the U.S. government, avoided the use of the term *genocide* (see des Forges, 1999).

### Cultural Predispositions

The division between Tutsis, who were cattle-herding warriors conquering ethnically diverse farming peoples in the 15th century, and Hutus, who were farmers, over time became primarily a division of economic status and political power. The Tutsis ruled, in a complex relationship with the Hutus, until early in the 20th century. The Belgian colonizers created structural changes in the relation between Hutu and Tutsi that greatly enhanced Tutsi dominance and Hutu exploitation, intensifying Hutu hostility toward Tutsis. Soon after the Hutu revolution in 1959,

when many Tutsis were killed, Rwanda gained independence, leaving the Hutu majority to rule the country.

The Hutu government had total control over the population. Everyone was registered. People had to carry ethnic identity cards and were not allowed to move without registering. Tutsis had no access to the public domain. Observers have reported that child-rearing was authoritarian (Smith, 1998), the culture was characterized by strong respect for and obedience to authority, and society was organized in a highly hierarchical fashion. There also had to be some woundedness among the Hutu, due to their past experiences as a subordinate, badly treated group. Even though the Tutsis suffered discrimination, their past history, culture, and better education enabled them to have good jobs in the small but important private sector. This situation—a devalued, disliked group doing relatively well—intensifies hostility, as many instances show, including the Jews in Germany and the Armenians in Turkey (Staub, 1989).

### Genocide and After the Genocide

It was in this cultural and societal context that intensely difficult life conditions developed, consisting of economic problems, social injustice, political unrest and demands by the population, divisions within the Hutu leadership, and the invasion by a Tutsi army. It was in this context that intense anti-Tutsi feelings were propagated by the leadership and an effective machinery for the destruction of the Tutsi was developed that centered around the use of paramilitary groups and parts of the army. The motivations discussed in previous sections, the anti-Tutsi ideology and propaganda, fear of the Tutsi, violence against Hutus who did not cooperate, and obedience to leaders led segments of the population to participate in the killings. The killings were finally brought to an end by the victory of the RPF.

The renewed passivity of bystanders following the genocide has contributed to renewed violence. Huge numbers of Hutus left the country after the victory of the RPF and were settled in refugee camps outside the border. Among them were the perpetrators of the genocide. They were not separated from the rest of the refugees. After a while they renewed their violence against the Tutsis, at first with incursions into the country from the camps. Later some of them returned with the rest of the refugees and continued the killings from inside the country. Others continued the violence from the neighboring Congo (Gourevich, 1998), contributing to a war in that country.

## HALTING AND PREVENTING GROUP VIOLENCE

The stronger the instigators, the more they give rise to mediating processes like scapegoating and destructive ideologies, and the greater the presence of predispos-

ing cultural characteristics, the more important is prevention. If these forces have already led to increased discrimination, persecution, and violence, there must be an initial focus on *halting* the further evolution of violence. Bystanders, witnesses to events, must act, because by this point perpetrators are usually committed to their violent course.

### Halting Group Violence

When reactions or interventions by bystanders or outsiders are early, perpetrators' commitment to violence against a victim group is often still limited. The motivation for mass killing or genocide may not yet have evolved; inhibitions against violence may not yet have disappeared. A plan of action or a system to execute it may not yet exist. Persistent efforts by external bystanders, nations, and the international community are likely to be effective even without the use of military force. I explore at some length the reasons for the passivity of nations, the importance of action by them, and the forms of actions required to halt violence. Such bystander action is essential in halting group violence, and psychologists have important contributions to make, and therefore significant responsibility, in furthering understanding and change in this realm.

*From early warning to early action.* Recent attention has focussed on early warning. It is important to have a valid conceptual base for identifying, collecting, and analyzing relevant information. The conception of the origins of genocide described in the first part of this article offers a system for identifying relevant information both for halting violence and for prevention (the presence of difficult life conditions and group conflict; scapegoating; ideologies; cultural characteristics like devaluation, authority orientation, and so on; change in the degree of discrimination or other forms of harm inflicted on a group, which is especially important in indicating the need to halt violence; and the passivity of bystanders). Other systems, overlapping with this one, have also been proposed (Bond & Voegelé, 1995; Charny, 1991; Harff & Gurr, 1990; Kuper, 1984).

The European Community has proposed the establishment of a center for early warning, but practical efforts to implement it have not followed (Rupesinghe, 1996). Because important motivational and mediating processes are psychological in nature, many kinds of psychologists, including political, social, and peace psychologists, should be involved in the specification of the type of information needed, the development of assessment tools, and research in evaluating the validity of information.

An even more important issue is the use of information. The UN, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and the embassies of various nations al-

ready provide a great deal of early information. But in Rwanda and elsewhere, information has not led to action. Actions to halt and prevent group violence will become more likely if standards are developed for *when* action is required, *what* actions are required depending on circumstances, and *who* is to take action, and if institutions responsible for activating responses are created or strengthened.

Without effective institutions whose job is to activate response, early warning is unlikely to lead to action, especially early action. The institutions of the UN, which have been so ineffective in Rwanda and elsewhere, need to be strengthened. Appropriate institutions within regional organizations, such as the Organization of African States, must also be created. However, because the UN and regional organizations rely on and require for action the help of member nations, and because nations sometimes may need to take the lead, it would be extremely important to establish corresponding institutions within national governments. These institutions would be responsible for processing information about actual and potential violence against groups (relevant to either halting or preventing violence) and play the required role, in cooperation with international organizations, in activating responses.

*From passivity to humanitarian intervention.* Many kinds of bystanders have potential influence, including individuals, community groups, NGOs, nations, and international organizations (Rupesinghe, 1996). But as discrimination, persecution, and violence evolve beyond a certain point, the influence and power of states and the community of nations is required to halt further violence.

Why do they usually remain passive? At least in theory, the principle of nonintervention in each others' internal affairs guides states' relations. There was seemingly permanent warfare in Europe until the treaty of Westphalia, in 1648, with its central principles of the sovereignty of states and nonintervention. The principle of nonintervention became part of the UN charter, which states in article 2(7) that "nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state."

Perhaps governments believe that by not intervening they uphold an orderly international system. However, in practice states do intervene, but usually for self-serving reasons. The United States has engaged in or supported a number of self-serving and ideologically guided military interventions: in Guatemala in 1954, helping to overthrow a democratically elected President; in Nicaragua; in Panama; and elsewhere.

Another reason for passivity is that states like to have complete jurisdiction over their citizens. They avoid interference in others' affairs, so that others won't interfere in their affairs. This has been shown by the unwillingness of states to include political groups under the genocide convention and by continuing attacks by

some states on principles of human rights. Abiding by a principle of humanitarian intervention may also require states to go against an ally or business partner identified as a perpetrator nation, as well as to assume some of the burdens of intervention.

States have traditionally acted to further what they view as their national interest, usually defined in terms of power, wealth, or influence. They have not seen themselves as moral agents with responsibility for the welfare of people outside their borders. This seems not only immoral but shortsighted, because violence usually expands, and nations that have turned against their own citizens ultimately have often turned against other nations as well, as did Germany, Iraq, Argentina in the Falkland's war, and others.

Nations that have close ties to a perpetrator nation are especially likely to remain passive or provide continuing support. Unfortunately, such close ties usually generate loyalty not to the citizens of a country, certainly not to a minority within the country, but to its government. Because these countries have maximum potential influence (Fein, 1994), they have a special responsibility to act.

Nations have also withheld support that the UN needs to deal with human rights issues. They are especially reluctant to provide material support or force. In Rwanda, only 1 nation out of 60 responded to the Secretary General's plea for more troops, and 2 out of 50 for his plea for police officers (Ramsbotham, 1995).

In spite of all this, concern about human rights and the physical safety and basic rights of individuals and groups has been greatly expanding. These concerns are expressed in various international conventions and institutions within the UN. But for nations to act, the international climate must change further. Citizens must exert influence on their governments.

Psychologists can contribute by elucidating some of the psychological sources of passivity. They can publicize already-existing knowledge and gather new information about diffusion of responsibility (Latane & Darley, 1970; Myers, 1996); about the differentiation between "us and them," which makes violence against "them" easier and action on behalf of "them" less likely; about both perpetrators and bystanders excluding victims from the moral and human realm and blaming victims (Lerner, 1980; Opatow, 1990; Staub, 1990); and about other processes that lead either to passivity or action by bystanders (Myers, 1996; Oliner & Oliner, 1988; Staub, 1993). However, we need to know much more about how to activate bystanders, and especially groups, including nations. Psychologists can also use already-existing knowledge to help citizens influence their governments, so that they act in behalf of people outside their own borders.

In summary, it is important to develop criteria that differentiate between self-serving, "imperial" interventions and humanitarian interventions; to establish both the principle of intervention *for the protection of human rights* and appropriate forms of intervention; to develop institutions whose job is to activate early responses; and to create an international climate that leads to action.

*Forms of intervention.* All or nearly all violence-generating situations, no matter how important their objective elements, have important psychological dimensions. Psychologists must participate both in devising and executing methods of intervention. If time allows it, intervention may best start with high-level private communication. This may include condemnation of the policies and practices that harm the victim group, specification of actions that the international community will take if they continue, and offers of help with mediation and conflict resolution. Positive inducements, material aid, support, and efforts to help fulfill a group's basic needs are important. Doing all this in private enables the leaders of the perpetrator group to change course without losing face, without appearing weak in front of their followers. Such psychological considerations in shaping bystander actions are of profound importance. However, if victimization continues, public condemnation and then action by the international community must follow.

Nations and the community of nations, by what they say and do, can reaffirm and possibly to some degree reinstate in the eyes of perpetrators the humanity of the victims. They can raise concern among perpetrators about their image in the eyes of the world and create fear of the consequences of their actions to themselves. They can also help fulfill some of the goals that motivate violence, both material and psychological, in other ways. The media, if it can penetrate into the perpetrator country, given the censorship that usually accompanies such situations, can communicate the perspective of the outside world and thereby move some internal bystanders to action.

If all this is ineffective, nations can intensify their response by withholding aid, by sanctions and boycotts. The earlier such actions and the more uniformly nations abide by them, the more effective they are likely to be. Further study is required of how to use sanctions and boycotts so that they will effectively bring about psychological change in the attitudes and motives of perpetrators and internal bystanders.

An international boycott had an important role in bringing apartheid to an end in South Africa, partly because the business community in South Africa was unwilling to suffer the damage it inflicted. But its effectiveness may have been enhanced by preceding actions such as decades of exclusion of South African athletes from international competition (Pogrud, 1991). In an extremely sports-minded country, this has continuously communicated to South Africans the world's disapproval of apartheid.

Sanctions have been less effective in some other instances. The reasons for this may include that they start late, or without private warnings and dialogue, or both; that not all nations adhere to them; that powerful rulers are unwilling to publicly give in; and that sanctions at times aim not only to stop violence but to topple the leadership (e.g., Iraq and Cuba).

However, harm-doing might have been much greater in some instances, like Bosnia, without boycotts and other actions that showed concern and vigilance by the world. At times boycotts have limited effects in changing policies but harm the

population of a country, as in Cuba and Iraq. Targeting sanctions so that they penalize those most responsible for the crisis (e.g. freezing leaders' personal assets; Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, 1997) may enhance the effectiveness of sanctions and reduce the suffering of the general population.

At times a military response is essential to stop violence. Limited military action in Bosnia, for example, was effective in bringing the violence to an end. A UN force of some kind has long been advocated (Fein, 1994; Institute for Genocide Studies, 1999), perhaps consisting of volunteers, but it has not been created. But the earlier other measures are used and the more extensive they are, the less will be the need for military action.

To be effective, actions by bystanders require wisdom and sensitivity. The definition of a situation very much matters: How bystanders see it and what sense they make of it shapes their actions. For example, seeing Iraq as an important counterweight to Iran, rather than as an aggressor that is violent both internally and against outsiders, created United States support for Iraq. In Somalia, seeing General Adid as a warlord who is the primary source of the violence, rather than as a leader of one of several factions and a representative of a significant group of people, led the United States to focus on him and attempt to capture him (Farer, 1996). This resulted in retaliation, the killing of American soldiers. Because of the legacy of the Vietnam War, the American people and American leaders became frightened about another quagmire. Sensitivity and wisdom are required in all preventive efforts by outsiders, especially knowledge about and openness to the requirements of a specific culture (Wessels & Montiero, in press).

*Special envoys and advisory teams.* As part of an early response, special envoys (see Carnegie Commission on the Prevention of Deadly Conflict, 1997), working with advisory teams, can be useful in efforts either to halt or prevent group violence.

On the one hand, they can carry private and public messages from the international community. On the other hand, in their interactions with leaders, special envoys can to some degree address the psychological forces that drive leaders, as well as followers. It is frequently assumed that leaders act purely out of opportunistic motives, to gain and hold power, or to develop influence over their supporters. This view is so deeply ingrained that it was offered as an explanation of Hitler's anti-Semitic policies, even after World War II, and even by a wise psychologist like Gordon Allport (Allport, 1954).

But leaders are also members of their group and the product of its culture, including its devaluation of and enmity toward certain others. They are also affected by conditions of life in their society. As they propagate scapegoating and destructive ideologies and initiate harmful actions against the designated victim, they are fulfilling their own and their groups' needs, but in destructive ways. They create



(usually false) understanding of causes, offer hopeful (but ultimately destructive) visions, make people feel effective, create connections and strengthen identity in the group.

Frequently, perpetrators also carry a feeling of prior victimization. The Serbs were ruled by Turkey for five centuries, until late in the 19th century. Hundreds of thousands of Serbs were killed by Croats during World War II, with Muslims allied to Croats (Staub, 1996b). When Croatia declared independence, the Serbs attacked Croatia, and after the Croat counterattack, about 200,000 Serbs were ousted, or ethnically cleansed, from Croatia.

In Rwanda, not only were the Hutus long subordinated to the Tutsis, but they witnessed Tutsi massacres of Hutus in Burundi (and after the genocide, Tutsi killings of Hutu refugees in Zaire). Leaders in part act out of their group's woundedness, as well as their own corresponding woundedness, as in the case of Serb leaders (e.g., Mladic, the military commander in Bosnia, whose parents were killed by Croats during World War II).

In their interaction with leaders, the aim of diplomats and professionals who work with them should be to move beyond formal diplomatic engagement. In an effort to help the group move to constructive modes of need fulfillment, they should try to help leaders generate inclusive visions that bring members of different groups together in the service of shared goals. To the extent possible, they should act as agents of healing and reconciliation.

Even though they carry the message that violation of the rights of others is unacceptable to the international community, they can show genuine appreciation of and empathy for the past suffering of the group and its leaders. Special envoys may be the only party situated to engage in such constructive efforts with leaders of a group that has begun an evolution toward group violence. Psychologists have important roles to play, in developing a knowledge base, providing training, and participating as members of such teams.

Let us examine postgenocide events in Rwanda and the conduct of the international community. With the return of Hutu refugees to Rwanda from neighboring countries in 1996, many former members of the militias and the military who were the prime perpetrators of the genocide also returned. At least some of them resumed killing Tutsis, mainly in the northwest region of the country that has long been the center of Hutu extremism. The government forces have apparently killed Hutu civilians in retaliation (Drumtra, 1998). In such a situation, over time, a "siege mentality" (Rouhana & Bar-Tal, 1998) can develop. A government that seems to have been genuinely interested in creating a just and peaceful society, and has punished its own soldiers for unjustified violence (Drumtra, 1998), might increasingly engage in what it sees as defensive violence.

Although Rwanda has received some humanitarian aid, the international community has taken no discernable action to help stop the continued Hutu violence against Tutsis. However, by the middle of 1999, the government of Rwanda suc-

ceeded in bringing such violence to a halt. Still, a combination of high-level, visible condemnation by the international community, third parties (perhaps high-level special envoys) working with both sides, and the introduction of international peacekeepers can be important actions by the international community in such situations.

### Preventing Group Violence

When cultural preconditions for group violence exist, but there has been no significant increase in harm-doing, there is still time for preventive action. Economic development, increasing security at the time of postconflict reconstruction (and thereby preventing new cycles of violence), an effective justice system, and other structural elements have been proposed as means of prevention (Carnegie Commission on the Prevention of Deadly Conflict, 1997). These steps are important but have a long-range horizon and by themselves not sufficient. More recently, the UN has enunciated principles of Cultures of Peace and has begun developing efforts to promote them. Creating Cultures of Peace is consistent with the approach taken here, which focuses on psychological components in prevention while also considering some structural and cultural elements.

*Healing and reconciliation.* Victimization deeply affects the quality of life of victimized people. Survivors of genocide, as research with Holocaust survivors has documented, experience pain and distress (Eitinger & Krell, 1985). They have emotional problems later in life (Danieli, 1994; Klaus & Cox, 1992) and diminished well-being in old age (Bar-Tur, Levy-Schiff, & Burns, 1997). Helping them heal can improve the quality of their lives.

Because the identity of persons is usually deeply rooted in their groups (Bar-Tal & Staub, 1997), even those members of a victimized group who were not personally victimized are deeply affected. Members of victimized groups tend to feel vulnerable and unsafe. They mistrust people and see the world as a dangerous place. They feel disconnected from people and a world that has harmed them and, at the very least, has not protected them. Their individual and group self-esteem is diminished. Without healing, there is increased likelihood that they will respond to threats with what they see as defensive violence (Staub, 1996b, 1998b). On the other hand, at least among individuals, past trauma combined with healing experiences, which include significant human connections, can lead to altruistic concern about others' welfare (Herman, 1992; Valent, 1998), what I have called "altruism born of suffering" (Staub, 1998a).

In many places, for example in Rwanda and Bosnia, the way groups are geographically intertwined makes reconciliation crucial for avoiding renewed violence. But without some prior healing, victimized groups will be much less open to

reconciliation. And without some reconciliation, healing will be halted, partly because the opposing group continues to be a threat.

The acknowledgment by the world of their pain and suffering, and of the horrors they have experienced, can help individuals and groups heal. But this rarely happens. The Holocaust is one of the unusual cases in which the culpability of the perpetrators and the innocence and great suffering of the victims were affirmed. This probably happened because the perpetrator was an enemy to much of the world. But even in this case, the suffering of the victims and survivors was held at arm's length for many years after World War II. And a movement has emerged to deny that the Holocaust ever took place.

By contrast, the world has been extremely ambivalent in acknowledging the genocide of the Armenians. This is partly due to Turkey denying that it ever occurred and using diplomatic pressure on other countries to stop them from acknowledging it (Smith, 1986). The denial of what happened to them has interfered with healing by Armenians. A great deal of their attention has focused on fighting the denial. As the new state of Armenia came into being, its politics and policies, including its relation to Turkey, have been affected by this unhealed trauma ("Problems of Genocide," 1997).

Survivors of genocide or mass killing tend to feel that there must be something wrong with them. Otherwise, why would such horrible things have been done to them? Acknowledging the injustice and immorality of what was done to them can strengthen survivors' identity as well as build connections to those who offer such support.

As I have already noted, usually perpetrators also feel wounded, due to prior victimization, mutual violence, or retaliation by some of the victims. Even if none of this is the case, harming people, especially in cruel and horrendous ways, is wounding. Actual perpetrators need to defend themselves from facing their deeds, whereas the members of perpetrator groups need to defend themselves from what their group has done. Prior research has found that in comparison to their victims, individuals who have perpetrated harm on others see their actions as less serious, more justifiable, and more forgivable (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Wotman, 1990). Devaluing victims and focusing on their own victimization are ways for perpetrators to avoid facing their deeds.

James Baldwin wrote "I imagine one of the reasons people cling to their hates so stubbornly is because they sense, once hate is gone, they will be forced to deal with their pain" (quoted in Templeton, 1997, p. 83). When perpetrators can access their own pain, when they allow themselves to feel both pain for their own suffering and sorrow and guilt for the suffering they have created, they can begin to heal.

This in turn makes it possible for them to stop blaming the people they harmed, to open themselves to the victims' suffering, and to begin to assume responsibility for having harmed them. This is extremely difficult for perpetrators. It should be somewhat easier for members of the perpetrator group who have not been direct

perpetrators; they are less guilty and have lost face less (Brown, 1968). Because reconciliation requires both parties, and healing is required for reconciliation, healing by perpetrators is essential for reconciliation to occur.

To heal, like victimized individuals (Herman, 1992; McCann & Pearlman, 1990), members of victimized groups need to establish what has actually happened to them. They need to know, remember, grieve, and feel empathy for themselves. They can do this by writing about their experiences (Pennebaker & Beall, 1986; Pennebaker, Hughes, & O'Heeron, 1987) or talking about them with each other or in therapeutic settings (Herman, 1992). But for whole groups of people to heal, other approaches must also be developed.

People may engage with their victimization and suffering together. In small groups they can write about and then share their stories, offering empathy and support to each other (Pearlman & Staub, 1996). This can promote healing and transform pain from a source of disconnection to people to a source of connection. Psychological trauma thwarts central needs. This approach provides experiences that help, to some degree, to fulfill needs for security, positive identity, a sense of effectiveness, and positive connection to other people. When both members of a victim group and those members of a perpetrator group who have not themselves been directly involved in perpetration participate together, mutual forgiveness and reconciliation may be furthered.<sup>2</sup>

Group healing on a broader scale can occur in the context of memorials, ceremonies, and testimonials. Members of a victim group can tell their stories on as wide a scale as possible: in person, through writing, in plays, on television. The outside world can participate in memorials and ceremonies, even helping to create them. Here again, the participation of members of the perpetrator group who have not been direct perpetrators can be beneficial, and to both parties. The participation of direct perpetrators is likely to be unacceptable to victims, at least initially.

The nature of such ceremonies is important. In many countries, memorializing national traumas has fixated the group on its historical wounds, generating nationalism and hate. The relation of the Serbs to their defeat at Kosova by the Turkish army in the 14th century is one example of this. In contrast, in South Africa, national ceremonies have helped people grieve apartheid and its victims while fostering reconciliation. For ceremonies and memorials to have beneficial effects, they must help people grieve and feel empathy for themselves and their group as well as

---

<sup>2</sup>This is part of an approach that my collaborators and I are using in a project in Rwanda on "healing, forgiveness, and reconciliation," a project funded by the John Templeton Foundation. We are training the staff of local organizations to use this experimental approach, together with psychoeducation about the origins of genocide, the impact of trauma on people, and paths to healing, as they work with groups in the community. We will evaluate the effects of this approach when it is integrated with their usual approach, and compare it to the effects of their traditional approach and to changes in an untreated control group.

foster the experience of forgiveness, optimism about the future, and inclusive orientation to other groups.

Forgiveness in the aftermath of intense violence like mass killing or genocide, or in cases of intractable conflict with a long history of violence, is difficult to even contemplate, but it is likely to be an important part of the complex of healing and reconciliation (Fisher, in press). For example, research with women who have been incest victims has shown that as people forgive those who have harmed them they experience not only less hostility but also less anxiety and depression and improvement in self-esteem and general well-being (Al-Mabuk, Enright, & Cardis, 1995; Freedman & Enright, 1996). Especially for people who have experienced deep hurt, forgiveness is associated with less anxiety (Subkoviak et al., 1995). Conversely, people who engage in revenge fantasies demonstrate more psychopathology (Greenwald & Harder, 1994; Zelin et al., 1983). Participation in a forgiveness program can bring psychological benefits (Hebel & Enright, 1993). It can decrease feelings of revenge and increase conciliatory behavior toward the offender (McCullough & Worthington, 1995). Forgiveness by survivors of intense violence against their group should help improve their well-being. Forgiving at least those members of the perpetrator group who have not directly participated in perpetrating the violence makes revenge and defensive violence less likely.

*Helping children heal.* Trauma is handed down through the generations. Even the children and grandchildren of survivors, those who were not yet born at the time, are deeply affected (e.g., Rubenstein, Cutler, & Templer, 1990). Even if they are silent about their experiences, by their actions and mode of being in the world, parents, relatives, and the whole community transmit their trauma to children. Many survivors of the Holocaust were silent, whereas some intensely focused on their experiences. Both approaches create problems for children.

Children of survivors need to learn what has happened. How were their parents and other people in their group affected, and how in turn has this affected them? Without such self-awareness, children are impacted by strong forces that they don't understand. But information about their parents and their group's suffering has to take into account children's age, their capacity to handle and process intensely emotional information, and their ability to deal with feelings engendered in them.

*Truth and punishment.* A common purpose of truth commissions in Argentina (Nunca Mas, 1986), other South American countries, and South Africa (Carnegie Commission on the Prevention of Deadly Conflict, 1997) has been to establish what has happened, acknowledge the suffering of victims, and suggest courses of action to prevent recurring victimization. Truth commissions facilitate remembering, grieving, and other requirements for healing.

Establishing a record of events that members of the perpetrator group cannot discount is a great service of truth commissions and international tribunals. This may have been the greatest contribution of the Nuremberg trials. Although there were many influences at work, such as a period of occupation and the Marshall plan, the trials may have provided a basis and underpinning for the evolution of present-day German democracy. The overwhelming evidence of the countless horrors committed by Nazi Germany made it unlikely that the Germans would see themselves as victims.

South Africa is an impressive experiment in truth and reconciliation. Hopefully, it will ultimately show that perpetrators publicly admitting their role in these events does foster reconciliation. Testifying before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission can be one step on the road toward healing for victims. However, the amnesty that many perpetrators receive on admitting their deeds, even without expressing regret or sorrow about the victims' suffering or making some form of compensation, has left many survivors' need for justice unfulfilled (Hamber, 1998). Regret and apology by perpetrators are important for forgiveness to occur (Freedman & Enright, 1996). Some of the victims' experience of injustice may be heightened by their circumstances of life: continued poverty without substantial improvement.

Ideally, the perpetrator group would feel guilt, responsibility, and empathy for their former victims. But groups, their members and leaders, are rarely able to look at themselves and acknowledge their own wrongdoing, at least in the short run. They usually point at their victims or, when mutual victimization has occurred, at their opponents, and claim that their own actions have been defensive (e.g., New York Times Conference, 1996). Punishment of the perpetrators can communicate to victims that the perpetrators' actions were immoral and unacceptable. It can affirm the innocence of victims and help create a sense of justice. It can make survivors feel safer and thereby foster healing and reconciliation.

However, "good" punishment is a complex societal process; if the violence was mutual, it needs to be evenhanded. It needs to be selective, not make a whole group feel victimized, and orient people to the future in constructive ways. Extensively documenting the behavior of perpetrators, punishing those who organized and led the violence, punishing individual perpetrators rather than focusing on group guilt, even limiting how many people are punished by not punishing lesser perpetrators, may prevent feelings of victimization and renewed hostility by members of the perpetrator group. To help survivors accept all this requires that forgiveness is facilitated while punishment is administered.

The creation of an international penal court has been long advocated. Such a court can both punish and, through its proceedings, serve as an international truth commission. By taking punishment out of the hands of the government that succeeds the one that perpetrated the violence, it can make healing and reconciliation in a society easier.

*Dialogue, conflict resolution, problem solving, and other joint projects.* Dialogue groups, engagement in problem solving by antagonistic groups, conflict resolution, and joint projects serve a number of positive goals. They can help overcome devaluation and foster healing and reconciliation. They can also resolve political issues and point to solutions for practical problems.

Creating contact is one of their significant contributions. Deep engagement by members of groups with each other, ideally under conditions of equality and other supporting conditions, can help overcome negative stereotypes and hostility (Allport, 1954; Cook, 1970; Deutsch, 1973; Pettigrew, 1997; Staub, 1989). The creation of joint goals and shared efforts in their behalf are extremely valuable (Deutsch, 1973; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961; Staub, 1989).

In dialogue groups, members describe the pain and suffering of their group. They are led to express empathy and to assume responsibility for their group's role in causing the other's suffering (Fisher, 1997; Volkan, 1988). In problem-solving workshops (for example, Kelman, 1990; Rouhana & Kelman, 1994), which are one version of conflict resolution approaches (Fisher, 1997, in press), members address real-life issues, practical as well as political, that have to be resolved for the groups to live in peace. Some of the processes that take place in dialogue groups must occur, and can occur, relatively naturally in the course of problem solving. Both parties are aware of their own difficulties, but their awareness expands. Like themselves, members of the other group endanger themselves as they act to promote peace, given the fear of and enmity in each group toward the other.

Practitioners of these approaches have emphasized the importance of the frustration of basic needs in originating conflict and of the fulfillment of the basic needs of protagonists in resolving it (Burton, 1990; Fisher, 1997; Kelman, 1990; Rothman, 1992). Kelman has suggested that the failure to fulfill needs for identity, security, recognition, participation, dignity, and justice, or threat to such needs, significantly contributes to the origins, escalation, and perpetuation of conflict between groups. He noted that the Israelis became more open to talking with the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) when they perceived it as less intent on destroying them, and members of the PLO became more willing to talk when their identity was affirmed by the international community. Christie (1997) has suggested that the fulfillment of the needs for security, identity, material well-being, and self-determination is central to peace-building.

Dialogue groups and problem-solving workshops must be small to work well. Membership is at times confidential, to protect participants from hostility in their communities. At other times, members are officials who are sent by leaders (Fisher, 1997). To bring about change in group relations, these groups must include influential individuals. As practical circumstances make this feasible, the processes that take place ought to be extended to the larger community through public events, literature, and the media.

Dialogue groups and problem-solving workshops provide significant contact. But members of antagonistic groups can also create other joint projects: rebuilding ruined houses, cleaning up neighborhoods, participating in business projects, and so on. In Macedonia, journalists from different ethnic groups joined in teams. Together they interviewed ordinary people belonging to the different groups and wrote articles about their lives, which were published in the papers of each ethnic group (Manoff, 1996).

When there is antagonism and hostility between groups, the creation of shared goals and joint efforts often requires the committed effort of active bystanders, of third parties who are willing to foster and guide engagement between hostile parties. Given the psychological components of all these efforts, clinical, social, political, and other kinds of psychologists, and professionals in specialties like conflict resolution, have a potentially important role in envisioning, initiating, and executing them. NGOs, the UN, individual nations, and single individuals have all initiated such efforts, but a much more organized approach is required to make them the powerful tools in prevention they can be.

*Rebuilding communities.* The approaches required to heal and rebuild communities, both to improve individual lives and to avoid continued violence, are extremely multifaceted. In addition to generalizable needs, there are specific local needs. In addition to knowledge brought by psychologists and other Western specialists, local culture, custom, and knowledge must be drawn on. Communities can only be rebuilt by its members (Wessels & Montiero, in press).

For example, Angola is a country that has been greatly impoverished and its communities severely impacted by decades of violence between a government initially supported by the Soviet Union and rebels supported by the United States. Many adolescents were forced or enticed into joining the two armies. These adolescents may have killed people even in their own villages. They need to heal as individuals and, to recreate normal community life, they must be reintegrated into their communities.

This requires traditional ceremonies, with the engagement of the whole community. This process can be helpful to all members of a community devastated by war, disorder, and poverty. Psychological education that helps adults understand and thereby respond more effectively to the impact of traumatic experiences on young people can facilitate this process. Such youth also need schooling and jobs, which is not available to most of them. Outside help with economic development and with rebuilding of institutions is often essential (Wessels & Montiero, in press).

*Culture change and democratization.* It is difficult for external bystanders to further culture change in a society. People feel a right to their culture and



resist interference. Help in rebuilding local communities offers one avenue to culture change. Helping countries with democratization is another relatively accessible way to this. At times of great societal upheavals, as in Eastern Europe after the collapse of the Soviet Union, there has been danger that nationalistic and other extreme ideologies and violent movements would emerge. Some bystanders tried to help develop institutions that maintain a "civil society" (Sampson, 1996). Outsiders have participated in developing school programs that promote good citizenship, a well-functioning media, and other institutions. When this is appropriate and accepted, outsiders can also help create inclusive visions and practices. As democracy develops, takes hold, and acquires roots, culture is likely to become more pluralistic and less authority oriented.

*The role of the media.* The importance of the media in combating human rights violations has long been recognized (see Manoff, 1996). The media can play a crucial role in preventing group violence. It can report human rights violations and present groups in ways that diminish rather than enhance antagonism. It can identify issues between parties and articulate their positions in nonconfrontational ways. It can call attention to the psychological needs that underlie conflict. It can point to the passivity of bystanders, or their collaboration with perpetrators, and it can mobilize bystanders. Inattention by the media can allow violence against groups to unfold with little public knowledge.

How the media presents victims and perpetrators greatly affects public attitudes. By devaluing victims and giving the benefit of the doubt to perpetrators, the media can generate passivity. Consider that in 1938, after years of increasing persecution of Jews in Nazi Germany, there were intensely anti-Semitic radio programs in the United States (e.g., that of Father Coughlin; Wyman, 1968, 1984). The media can join people as they follow an inclination to devalue victims, which may arise from a belief that the world is a just place and people who suffer must have deserved it (Lerner, 1980), as well as from other psychological processes. Such reporting by the media can lead people to distance themselves from victims. Alternatively, accurate reporting by the media can generate empathy with the victims' plight, caring, and action.

Providing members of the media with relevant training is essential. The training should promote psychological knowledge of the kind I review in this article. It should also promote self-awareness. Membership in one's culture affects attitudes and the perception of events. It can lead to favoring certain groups based on past relations with them and to favoring their ideology. It can lead to self-censorship due to dominant cultural perspectives (Staub, 1989). For example, when Franco ruled Spain, the editors of *Time Magazine* rejected a report on Spanish communists because it made them "look too good" (Gans, 1980). Lack of familiarity with far-away lands (e.g., not knowing who Tutsi and Hutu are) is probably another important reason for ignoring the evolution toward intense violence.

A crucial way for bystanders to promote human rights is by fighting censorship, intimidation, and control of the media by authorities. Even sanctions seem justified to protect freedom of the media. To counteract censorship, at times outside news broadcasts on radio and television in the country's language may be appropriate.

But media freedom is a complex issue, and international standards for media responsibility are needed. The anti-Semitic radio broadcasts of Father Coughlin during the 1930s in the United States were highly popular, and they continued until it was discovered that he had used verbatim translations of speeches by Goebbels, the Nazi propaganda minister (Wyman, 1968). Sometimes hate and nationalism are propagated by government-controlled media, sometimes by elites who have control over the media, and sometimes by individuals. And sometimes journalists who write the truth are killed (Committee to Protect Journalists, 1997).

### KOSOVA: THE NEED FOR FLEXIBLE BYSTANDER RESPONSE

The many failures of response by the international community were followed by a very delayed but effective response in Bosnia. Once serious bombing of the Serb military began, it speedily led to a halting of violence, followed by the Dayton peace negotiations. Even in Kosova, the response was delayed: Warnings about potential violence in Kosova had started to come in the late 1980s. The bombing began after negotiations and after significant ethnic cleansing had taken place (Adelman, 1999). But, at least, there was a bystander response before large-scale violence.

A likely reason for this was awareness of, attention to, and a commitment that has developed in Bosnia to stopping Serb aggression, an evolution in a positive direction. The same leaders were on the scene. The failure of a response in Rwanda, and the apology by President Clinton to the Rwandan people that acknowledged responsibility, may have added at least to his motivation to act. This evolution has not led, however, to the creation of international institutions that might be helpful in other crises. The specificity of concern and commitment does not offer the hope of more active bystandership by the community of nations.

Given that bombing stopped Serb aggression in Bosnia, it was understandable that the same method was tried in Kosova. But this was a different situation, given the symbolic meaning of Kosova for Serbs, their view of it as essential to their identity. It was evident within a few days that instead of stopping violence, the NATO bombing was creating great suffering, especially for Albanians who were being expelled and killed by Serbs, and increasingly for Serbian civilians as well.

Flexibility, the capacity to change course, is essential when the means intended to stop violence create rather than relieve suffering and destruction. Effective change in strategy requires understanding of history, culture, and the needs of both

members of a society and its leaders. Given their history, the needs of the Serbs for a feeling of security and for identity as a people must have been intense. The Serbs, victimized in the past and having constructed an image of themselves as a victimized people, once again could see themselves as victims. Perhaps much of the violence in the former Yugoslavia would have been prevented if the world had responded to the Serbs when communism collapsed and Yugoslavia began to collapse, with awareness of the need to contain their readiness for violence, but also with awareness of their woundedness and need for security and identity.

There has been a quality to Serb behavior that may be regarded as suicidal, and suicide is usually born out of some form of desperation. With the whole world watching, with the most powerful alliance perhaps in the history of the world threatening and later attacking, they have engaged in terrible violence, both in Bosnia and in Kosova. Explaining this as Milosovic's way of maintaining power seems insufficient. Beliefs about a hostile world and about the need for self-defense are likely to be involved.

After a period of bombing that showed the seriousness of the world community as represented by NATO, a shift in NATO policy would have been useful. Showing respect for the Serbs, in spite of their actions, for their history and their victimization, might have made a difference. President Clinton, Kofi Anan, and other important leaders could have offered to meet with Milosovic, perhaps in a neighboring country, involving the Russians as the Serbs' only supporters. Giving Milosovic and the Serbs such respect and recognition, combined with an uncompromising demand that Serb aggression stops, might have created new possibilities. Such an approach might have saved lives and reduced human suffering.

Whatever will be the immediate resolution, the complex problems of Kosova will have to be addressed. Serb feelings about Kosova, the long-standing hostility between Serbs and Albanians, the effects of this most recent violence, the insistence of the Kosova Liberation Army on independence make a "solution" for Kosova hard to come by. In complex situations like this, it is essential to protect people, to create conditions that make them secure. It is also essential to create processes that over time can lead to a resolution. These processes include mediation and conflict resolution, healing and reconciliation, economic and other support, and committed third parties who participate.

### CHILD REARING: INCLUSIVE CARING AND MORAL COURAGE

In many societies, elements of the culture, including beliefs and orientations to the world and certain others, combined with the lack of civil society and democratic institutions, make violence more likely and postconflict reconstruction difficult. It is essential to help people change—adults, as well as children.

The socialization of children needs to promote caring about others' welfare (Eisenberg, 1992; Staub, 1979), caring that is inclusive, that expands beyond the boundaries of their group. Many of the rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe, people who endangered their lives to save lives, grew up in families where they learned not to devalue people who were commonly considered outside their group (Oliner & Oliner, 1988; Staub, 1989, 1993). To become citizens who try to stop persecution and violence, children must also develop moral courage, the courage to speak out and act against policies and practices in their group, whether a peer group or society, that are contrary to important values (Staub, 1999). Inclusive caring and moral courage develop to a large extent through children's experiences in interacting with adults and peers: their experiences of warmth and affection, positive guidance, and so on. They develop as children engage in actions that benefit others. They develop through participation in community, responsibility for decision making, and action. Schools can provide many of these experiences (Eisenberg, 1992; Staub, 1979, 1992, 1995). An important function of bystanders can be to create schools that will do so.

Caring, commitment to human welfare, and moral courage shape individuals' relationship to their group. They are likely to give rise to constructive rather than blind patriotism—that is, to the capacity to question the policies and practices of one's group when they are contrary to important values (Schatz & Staub, 1997)—and to efforts to create humane, nonviolent societies.

## RESTRAINING FORCES AND POSITIVE EVOLUTION

In a number of situations that might have led to mass killing or genocide, the escalation of violence was limited. The conception of causation and prevention I described may help us understand the forces that contained it.

Usually, the role of bystanders has been crucial. In Bosnia, after years of hesitation and confusion, NATO took limited military action that stopped escalating violence. Continued efforts by nations and by NGOs and individuals promoting healing and reconciliation (Agger, 1998) provide hope for the future.

The latest upsurge of the seemingly intractable conflict between Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland has resulted in comparatively limited violence, about 3,000 deaths from the 1960s to the late 1990s. This was probably to a significant extent because of the presence of the British army and a substantial police force. The recent agreement may have been reached in part because of the positive roles played by Britain, as well as the United States, in bringing the parties together. Along the way positive leadership has improved the quality of life of the Catholic minority. Community groups and schools have made extensive efforts to create contact between Catholics and Protestants (Cairns & Darby, 1998). Even as violence continued, there was an underlying positive evolution (Pruitt, 1998).

In Israel and the West Bank, violence may have remained limited due to the continuous involvement of outside parties, especially the United States. In addition, Israel is a democratic society with substantial pluralism. Significant segments of the population disapproved of violence against Palestinians. Many groups have been working on creating positive contact between Jews and Palestinians, originating outside as well as within the region (Kelman, 1990; Rouhana & Bar-Tal, 1998; Rouhana & Kelman, 1994). Thus, a positive evolution was evident here as well.

Both bystanders and a prior positive evolution limited violence in response to the civil rights movement in the United States. As the marches and sit-ins proceeded in the South, a significant segment of the population in the North came to support civil rights for African Americans, as did the government. The readiness of the National Guard and the military to intervene and their physical presence certainly had an inhibiting effect, and so too their symbolic role as representatives of the government and the people. We can contrast this with the indifference and impunity surrounding the lynchings in the South in earlier times (Ginzburg, 1988). The Supreme Court's decision on the desegregation of schools, the desegregation of the military, the contact between Southern Blacks and Whites in the military and around military bases (Reid, 1998) were all part of a prior positive evolution. As violence evolves step-by-step, so does the possibility of constructive relations between groups.

Such positive evolution can lead both to the selection of new leaders and new directions chosen by leaders. It is likely that changes in the public mood within South Africa, at least partly due to the actions by the international community noted earlier, led to the election of De Klerk, the significant actions he took, or both. On becoming president, he legalized Black liberation organizations, which had been outlawed for 30 years.

The changing public mood may have had a role in affecting other bystanders as well. A White South African lawyer, the husband of a friend of Winnie Mandela, took it on himself to influence his friend, the justice minister Jacobus Coetsee, to initiate contact with Nelson Mandela (Sparks, 1994). The character of Nelson Mandela, as it later showed itself to the world, and as it appeared to Coetsee on their first meeting, was also important. Coetsee, in turn, seems to have influenced De Klerk to initiate contact. Psychologists need to study both the macroprocesses and the microprocesses involved in such positive evolution.

## CONCLUSION

The more the basic physical and psychological needs of groups of people are satisfied by constructive means, the less likely it is that psychological and social processes that lead to group violence arise. But without significant efforts at preven-

tion, group violence is likely to become more widespread. There are a number of reasons for this. In our interconnected world, steeped in communication, as people see the riches that others possess, feelings of deprivation and injustice are likely to arise, and people turn to their group as a vehicle for improving their lives. In a world that is changing with tremendous speed, with small, local communities often destroyed, people turn to ethnic, religious, or ideological groups for security, identity, connection, and support. In a world where increasingly relatively small groups become new countries, the disengagement from and continuing conflict with the group they leave and conflicts around ethnicity and other subgroup differences in the new country, are potential sources of violence.

Psychologists—and other social scientists—must develop and use their professional knowledge and skills to work for the prevention of group violence, for a world in which basic psychological needs are satisfied by constructive means. This requires multidisciplinary scholarship. It also requires the application of developing knowledge to the real world. It requires, finally, that scholars and researchers act as morally committed persons, as active and morally courageous bystanders.

## REFERENCES

- Adelman, H. (1999). *Early warning and ethnic conflict management: Rwanda and Kosovo*. Unpublished manuscript, York University, Toronto.
- Agger, I. (1998, June). *Evaluating different methods of helping victims*. Paper presented at the Conference on Ethnopolitical Warfare: Causes and Solutions. Derry/Londonderry, Northern Ireland.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Al-Mabuk, R. H., Enright, R. D., & Cardis, P. A. (1995). Forgiveness education with parentally love-deprived late adolescents. *Journal of Moral Education, 24*, 427–444.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Staub, E. (1997). Introduction. Patriotism: It's scope and meaning. In Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the lives of individuals and nations* (pp. 1–21). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Bar-Tur, L., Levy-Shiff, R., & Burns, A. (1997). Past traumatic losses and their impact on the well-being of elderly men. *Journal of Personal and Interpersonal Loss, 2*, 379–395.
- Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A., & Wotman, S. R. (1990). Victim and perpetrator accounts of interpersonal conflict. Autobiographical narratives about anger. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 994–1005.
- Bond, D., & Voegelé, W. (1995). *Profiles of international "hotspots"*. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Brown, B. R. (1968). The effects of need to maintain face on interpersonal bargaining. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 4*, 107–122.
- Burton, J. W. (1990). *Conflict: Human needs theory*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Buss, A. H. (1966). The effect of harm on subsequent aggression. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1*, 249–255.
- Cairns, E., & Darby, J. (1998). The conflict in Northern Ireland. *American Psychologist, 53*, 754–760.
- Carnegie Commission on the Prevention of Deadly Conflict. (1997). *Preventing deadly conflict: Final report*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Charny, I. (1991). Genocide intervention and prevention. *Social Education, 124*–127.
- Christie, D. J. (1997). Reducing direct and structural violence: The human needs theory. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 3*, 315–332.

- Comas-Diaz, L., Lynes, M. B., & Alarcon, R. D. (1998). Ethnic conflict and the psychology of liberation in Guatemala, Peru, and Puerto Rico. *American Psychologist*, 53, 778-792.
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (1997). *Effects on the press in 1996: A world-wide survey of the committee to protect journalists*. New York: Author.
- Cook, S. W. (1970). Motives in conceptual analysis of attitude-related behavior. In W. J. Arnold & D. Levine (Eds.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Dadrian, V. N. (1995). *The history of the Armenian genocide*. Providence, RI: Bergholn Books.
- Danieli, Y. (1994). As survivors age, part II. *NCP Clinical Quarterly*, 1-7.
- des Forges, A. (1999). *Leave none to tell the story: Genocide in Rwanda*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Drumtra, J. (1998). *Life after death: Suspicion and reintegration in post-genocide Rwanda*. Washington, DC: U.S. Committee for Refugees, Immigration and Refugee Services of America.
- Eisenberg, N. (1992). *The caring child*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Eitinger, L., & Krell, R. (1985). *The psychological and medical effects of concentration camps and related persecutions of survivors of the Holocaust*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.
- Farer, J. (1996). Intervention in unnatural humanitarian emergencies: Lessons of the first phase. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 18, 1-22.
- Fein, H. (1979). *Accounting for genocide: Victims and survivors of the Holocaust*. New York: Free Press.
- Fein, H. (1990). Genocide: A sociological perspective [Special issue]. *Current Sociology*, 38, 1-126.
- Fein, H. (1993). Accounting for genocide after 1945: Theories and some findings. *International Journal on Group Rights*, 1, 79-106.
- Fein, H. (1994). *The prevention of genocide*. New York: City University of New York.
- Fisher, R. J. (1997). *Interactive conflict resolution*. Syracuse: NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Fisher, R. J. (in press). Social psychological processes in interactive conflict analysis and reconciliation. In Ho-Won, Jeong (Ed.), *From conflict resolution to peace building*. Dartmouth Publishing.
- Freedman, S. R., & Enright, R. D. (1996). Forgiveness as an intervention goal with incest survivors. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 64, 983-992.
- Gans, H. (1980). *Deciding what's news*. New York: Vintage.
- Ginzburg, R. (1988). *100 Years of Lynching*. Baltimore, MD: Black Classic Press.
- Girard, P. (1980). Historical foundations of anti-Semitism. In J. Dimsdale (Ed.), *Survivors, victims and perpetrators: Essays on the Nazi Holocaust* (pp. 55-79). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- Goldstein, J. H., Davis, R. W., & Herman, D. (1975). Escalation of aggression: Experimental studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 162-170.
- Gourevich, P. (1998). *We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Greenwald, D. F., & Harder, D. W. (1994). Sustaining fantasies and psychopathology in a normal sample. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 50, 707-710.
- 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 & Row.
- Hamber, B. (1998). The burdens of truth. *American Imago*, 55, 9-28.
- Harff, B., & Gurr, T. R. (1990). Victims of the state genocides, politicides and group repression since 1945. *International Review of Victimology*, 1, 1-19.
- Hebel, J. H., & Enright, R. D. (1993). Forgiveness as a psychotherapeutic goal with elderly females. *Psychotherapy*, 30, 658-667.
- Herman, J. (1992). *Trauma and recovery*. New York: Basic Books.

- Institute for Genocide Studies. (1999). *Ever again? Evaluating the United Nations Genocide Convention on its 50th anniversary*. New York: University of New York.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). *Shattered assumptions*. New York: Free Press.
- Kelman, H. C. (1973). Violence without moral restraint: Reflections on the dehumanization of victims and victimizers. *Journal of Social Issues, 29, 4, 25-61*.
- Kelman, H. C. (1990). Applying a human needs perspective to the practice of conflict resolution: The Israeli-Palestinian Case. In J. Burton (Ed.), *Conflict: Human needs theory*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kelman, H. C. (1997). Nationalism, patriotism and national identity: Social-Psychological dimensions. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the lives of individuals and nations* (pp. 165-190). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Kelman, H. C., & Hamilton, V. C. (1989). *Crimes of obedience*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kiernan, B., & Boua, C. (Eds.). (1982). *Peasants and politics in Kampuchea, 1942-1981*. Armonk, NY: Sharpe.
- Klaus, K., & Cox, B. J. (1992). Symptoms of PTSD in 24 survivors of the Holocaust. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 149, 337-340*.
- Kressel, N. J. (1996). *Mass hate: The global rise of genocide and terror*. New York: Plenum.
- Kuper, L. (1981). *Genocide. Its political use in the twentieth century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kuper, L. (1984). *International action against genocide*.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Appleton-Crofts.
- Lerner, M. (1980). *The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion*. New York: Plenum.
- Manoff, R. (1996). *The mass media and social violence: Is there a role for the media in preventing and moderating ethnic, national, and religious conflict?* Unpublished manuscript, New York University.
- McCann, L., & Pearlman, L. A. (1990). *Psychological trauma and the adult survivor*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- McCullough, M. E., & Worthington, E. L. (1995). Promoting forgiveness: A comparison of two brief psychoeducational group interventions with a "waiting list" control. *Counseling and Values, 40, 55-69*.
- Merkel, P. H. (1980). *The making of a stormtrooper*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Myers, D. (1996). *Social psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- New York Times Conference on the Internet. (1996). *Bosnia: Uncertain path to peace*. Forum on Healing and Reconciliation.
- Nunca Mas. (1986). *The report of the Argentine National Commission on the disappeared*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Oliner, S. B., & Oliner, P. (1988). *The altruistic personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*. New York: Free Press.
- Opatow, S. (Ed.) (1990). Moral exclusion and injustice. *Journal of Social Issues, 46(1)*.
- Pearlman, L. A., & Saakvitne, K. (1995). *Trauma and the therapist*. New York: Norton.
- Pearlman, L. A., & Staub, E. (1996, November). *Trauma and the fulfillment of the human potential*. Workshop presented at the meeting of the International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies, San Francisco.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23, 173-185*.
- Pennebaker, J. W., & Beall, S. K. (1986). Confronting a traumatic event: Toward an understanding of inhibition and disease. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 95, 274-281*.



- Pennebaker, J. W., Hughes, C. F., & O'Heeron, R. C. (1987). The psychophysiology of confession: Linking inhibitory and psychosomatic processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 781-793.
- Pogrud, B. (1991). *The transformation in South Africa*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts.
- Problems of genocide. (1997). *Proceedings of the International Conference on Problems of Genocide*, April 21-23, 1995. Yerevan, Republic of Armenia: National Academy of Sciences.
- Pruitt, D. (1998, June). *Resolving seemingly intractable conflict*. Paper presented at the conference on Ethnopolitical Warfare: Causes and Solutions. Derry/Londonderry, Northern Ireland.
- Prunier, G. (1995). *The Rwanda crisis: History of a genocide*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ramsbotham, D. (1995). The changing nature of intervention: The role of UN peacekeeping. *Research Institute for the Study of Conflict and Terrorism*, 282, 1-28.
- Reid, J. (1998, June). *What has limited bloodshed in the American South?* Paper presented at the conference on Ethnopolitical Warfare: Causes and Solutions. Derry/Londonderry, Northern Ireland.
- Rothman, J. (1992). *From confrontation to cooperation: Resolving ethnic and regional conflict*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rouhana, N. N., & Bar-Tal, D. (1998). Psychological dynamics of intractable ethnonational conflicts: The Israeli-Palestinian case. *American Psychologist*, 53, 761-770.
- Rouhana, N. N., & Kelman, H. C. (1994). Promoting joint thinking in international conflicts: An Israeli-Palestinian continuing workshop. *Journal of Social Issues*, 20, 157-178.
- Rubinstein, I., Cutler, F., & Templer, D. I. (1990). Multigenerational occurrence of survivor syndrome symptoms in families of Holocaust survivors. *Omega*, 23, 239-244.
- Rummel, R. (1994). Democide in totalitarian states: Mortacracies and megamurders. In I. Charny (Ed.), *Genocide: A critical bibliographic review 3*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Rupesinghe, K. (1996). *From civil war to civil peace: Multi-Track solutions to armed conflict*. Unpublished manuscript, International Alert.
- Sampson, S. (1996). The social life of projects. Importing civil society to Albania. In C. Hann & E. Dunn (Eds.), *Civil society: Challenging western models*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 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*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Sheehan, B. (1973). *Seeds of extinction*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Sherif, M., Harvey, D. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. K., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robber's cave experiment*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Book Exchange.
- Sidanius, J. (in press). Ethnic identity, legitimizing ideologies and social status: A matter of ideological asymmetry. *Political Psychology*.
- Simpson, C. (1993). *The splendid blond beast*. New York: Grove.
- Smith, N. S. (1998). The psychological roots of genocide. *American Psychologist*, 53, 743-753.
- Smith, R. W. (1986, August). *Denial and justification of genocide: The Armenian case and its implications*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.
- Soeters, J. (1996). Culture and conflict: An application of Hofstede's theory to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 2, 233-244.
- Sparks, A. (1994, April). Letter from South Africa: The secret revolution. *The New Yorker*, 56-89.
- Staub, E. (1974). Helping a distressed person: Social, personality and stimulus determinants. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 7, pp. 203-342). New York: Academic.
- Staub, E. (1979). *Positive social behavior and morality: Socialization and development* (Vol. 2). New York: Academic.
- Staub, E. (1989). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Staub, E. (1990). The psychology and culture of torture and tortures. In P. Suedfeld (Ed.), *Psychology and torture* (pp. 49–77). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- Staub, E. (1992). The origins of caring, helping and nonaggression: Parental socialization, the family system, schools, and cultural influence. In S. Oliner, P. Oliner, L. Baron, L. A. Blum, D. L. Krebs, & M. Z. Smolenska. (Eds.), *Embracing the other: Philosophical, psychological and historical perspectives on altruism* (p. 390–413). New York: New York University Press.
- Staub, E. (1993). The psychology of bystanders, perpetrators and heroic helpers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 17, 315–341.
- Staub, E. (1995). How people learn to care. In P. G. Schervish, V. A. Hodgkinson, M. Gates, & associates (Eds.), *Care and community in modern society: Passing on the tradition of service to future generations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Staub, E. (1996a). 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. (1996b). Preventing genocide: Activating bystanders, helping victims and the creation of caring. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 2, 189–201.
- Staub, E. (1998a). *Basic human needs and their role in altruism and aggression*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Staub, E. (1998b). Breaking the cycle of genocidal violence: Healing and Reconciliation. In J. Harvey (Ed.), *Perspectives on loss: A source book*. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Staub, E. (1999). *A brighter future: The development of caring and nonviolent children*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Staub, E. (in press-a). Mass murder: Origins, prevention and U.S. involvement. In the *Encyclopedia of Violence in the United States*. New York: Scribner's.
- Staub, E. (in press-b). The roots of evil: Social conditions, culture, personality and basic human needs. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*.
- Subkoviak, M. J., Enright, R. D., Wu, C., Gassin, E. A., Freedman, S., Olson, L. M., & Sarinopoulos, I. (1995). Measuring interpersonal forgiveness in late adolescence and middle adulthood. *Journal of Adolescence*, 18, 641–655.
- Suedfeld, P. (Ed.). (1990). *Psychology and torture*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- Templeton, J. M. (1997). *Worldwide laws of life: 200 eternal spiritual principles*. Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press.
- U.S. Department of State (1996). *Country report on Colombia*. Washington, DC: Author.
- 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.
- Volkman, V. D. (1988). *The need to have enemies and allies*. Northvale, NY: Jason Aronson.
- Wessels, M., & Montiero, C. (in press). Psychological intervention and post-conflict reconstruction in Angola: Interweaving Western and traditional approaches. In D. Christie, R. V. Wagner, & D. Winter (Eds.), *Peace, conflict and violence: Peace psychology for the 21st century*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wyman, D. S. (1968). *Paper walls: America and the refugee crisis. 1938–1941*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Wyman, D. S. (1984). *The abandonment of Jews: America and the Holocaust, 1941–1945*. New York: Pantheon.
- Zelin, M. L., Bernstein, S. B., Heijn, C., Jampel, R. M., Myerson, P. G., Adler, G., Buie, D. H., Jr., & Rizzuto, A. M. (1983). The Sustaining Fantasy Questionnaire: Measurement of sustaining functions of fantasies in psychiatric inpatients. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 47, 427–439.