**Overcoming Evil: Genocide, Violent Conflict, and Terrorism**

Ervin Staub

https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195382044.001.0001

**Published:** 2010 **Online ISBN:** 9780199864942 **Print ISBN:** 9780195382044



CHAPTER

# 16 Changing Hearts and Minds: Information, Peace Education, Deradicalization, and Public Education in Rwanda and the Congo

Ervin Staub

https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195382044.003.0016 Pages 362–386

**Published:** December 2010

## Abstract

This chapter discusses how public education can change attitudes, beliefs, and behavior. Public education can include lectures and workshops, literature, various media, and the Internet. It also has to consider local conditions. In Rwanda, an educational radio drama, developed based on the Staub–Pearlman approach, made it more likely that people use their judgment about the meaning of events and act on their beliefs. Grassroots projects, building on the radio drama, and other radio programs, also had positive effects.

**Keywords:** education programs, group violence, behavior, prevention, Rwanda, Congo, Internet, radio

**Subject:** Social Psychology

**Collection:** Oxford Scholarship Online

> Educational experiences can change people's attitudes toward a devalued and hostile group; decrease negative emotions; increase positive emotions, acceptance, and openness to the other's "narrative." They can lead to more willingness to say what one thinks and believes and to change in behavior.

Education of many kinds can counteract devaluation and promote positive ideas and caring. In the course of engagement with terrorists, dialogue and information have been used to bring about change in them. Public education through the media can influence large numbers of people. The Internet has been used both to recruit terrorists and to foster positive change in them. "Peace education" has been used to attempt to change attitudes toward the other through instruction and other ways. Education in this realm needs to be not only informational but also experiential emotional.

## Some Positive Research Findings

In one study with 565 Palestinian and Jewish Israeli adolescents, half of them who participated in a year-long peace education program were less likely to believe that war was a way to achieve the group's goals and saw peace in more positive terms. This study took place at the time of the second *Intifada*. Hostility toward Israel by Palestinian students who did not participate in the program increased, but not by Palestinians in the program.[1]

Promoting positive relations in the midst of hostility is challenging. Gavriel Salomon, an Israeli educational psychologist, reports the failure of a pilot study conducted at Haifa University at the height of the *Intifada* and Israeli military responses to it. Two pairs of Israeli-Palestinian and Israeli-Jewish teachers were to correspond over the Internet. They were to write about how the *other* side sees events that were part of the
p. 363 conflict, for example, the 1948 war and the exodus ↳ of Palestinians, and to receive reactions from the other side. A variety of projects have found seeing the past through the lens of the other group, its narrative of the past, especially challenging. The project was based on research on "induced compliance," that as people assume perspectives (or engage in actions) contrary to their position, their position changes. However, the teachers, all of them concerned with peace, were unable to see events from the other group's perspective. The Palestinian teachers were frustrated and angry. They said that they could not "step into the shoes of the oppressors of their brethrens."[2]

The work of Carol Dweck, a professor of psychology at Stanford, and her associates points to the possibility of using education to reduce hate. In her past work on how well children learn, Dweck has drawn a distinction between the belief that intelligence is an "entity," something fixed that you either have or don't have, and the belief that intelligence changes with experience. She found that students who hold an entity view of intelligence do worse academically than those who hold what she has called an incremental view. But she also found that education can develop an incremental view, leading to improved learning and performance. She applied her experience in this domain in attempting to change hate.

In research with Israelis, Dweck and her associates[3] found in one study that hearing a conflict-related text led some people afterward to check off hatred among the feelings this text evoked in them. These people were also more likely to express desire for violent action against, and the removal of, Palestinians. In another study with a national survey, they found that people who already had an incremental view of group relations, believing that groups can change, expressed less anger and hatred toward and less desire for strong actions against Palestinians and more readiness for compromise.

In a third study, they provided Israelis with information, supposedly based on basic research, to promote the view that groups can change. One part of it said, "The main finding of this research is that patterns of violence in groups changed dramatically over the years as a result of both changes in the character of the dominant leaders and changes in the environment of the group." Participants exposed to such an incremental view expressed less hatred of Palestinians and substantially more support for compromise, openness to positive information, and willingness to take risks in negotiation. This was true not only of the participants in the study as a whole but also of those identified as hawks, ideologically on the right.

This research is a beginning. Most people who on a questionnaire check off hate as one of several emotions in response to hearing or reading about threat to their group are unlikely to hate the way committed members of destructive ideological movements do. Their "hate" can be reactive and defensive, with the need for defense reduced by the belief that the other group can change. Whatever the nature of their hate, the limited information that ameliorated it is likely to have a temporary effect. But more in-depth
p. 364 information of this kind can have ↳ lasting effects. These research findings and our work and research findings in Rwanda seem consistent with and support each other. We told people what social conditions, cultural characteristics, and psychological reactions and actions by leaders, followers, and bystanders have

led to violence[4]; both this and the discussion that followed implied that with changes in some of these elements people's behavior will change and violence will be prevented.

Information provided to people can affect their perspective, either temporarily or lastingly. Research studies have shown, for example, that telling people to *observe* (i.e., to take a disinterested perspective to) someone who is experiencing distress, to *imagine* what it is like for the person, or to imagine *themselves* in that situation has very different effects on empathy. Imagining the other creates the most empathy, imagining the self in the situation somewhat less, and taking the role of an observer substantially less.[5] Information about what others' suffering is like, including one's opponents in a conflict, may be an important way to generate empathy.

In a similar vein, researchers who lead people to think about death, activating "mortality salience," have found that by also activating compassionate values of the group that people belonged to transformed the usual effects of mortality salience from negative to neutral or even positive. For example, people holding more fundamentalist Christian values in the United States support the use of military force more. But when they were reminded of the compassionate teachings of Jesus (e.g., "Love your neighbor as yourself"), they supported the use of violence less. When this was combined with thinking about death, they came to support the use of military force at the same level as non-fundamentalist Christians.[6] In another study, the combination of making mortality salient and presenting compassionate verses from the Koran reduced hostility to the United States and other Western countries by Iranian Shiite students, in comparison to students who had not thought about death or were not exposed to compassionate verses. People who visualize accepting, warm interpersonal relationships showed similar effects.[7]

When people face intense threat to their group and themselves, it is rare that they are reminded of the compassionate values of the group. Those around them tend to draw on and propagate hostile perspectives. These findings point again to the importance of developing humane values through socialization and life experience, so that they are high in people's hierarchy of values and are activated even under hostile conditions and threat. They also point to the importance of constructive leaders who activate such values even in threatening times. Research in this tradition has also found that Americans who were both exposed to pictures of families from varied cultures and were led to think about death responded with less anti-Arab prejudice.

Awareness of others, and reminders of our shared humanity, matter. Sometimes people live next to each other, but still their knowledge of the other consists primarily of stereotypes. Education about each other—
p. 365 Europeans and ↳ Muslims living in Europe, and of Israelis and Palestinians—can inform about the life, culture, and history of the other group, stress the other's positive qualities, show their past and current suffering, and generate empathy. Even people who have lived intertwined lives but have created psychological and social walls, like Hutus and Tutsis, can benefit from such education.

## Deradicalization, Disengagement and Preventing Radicalization

In recent years programs to "deradicalize" captured or suspected Islamic terrorists, approximately 100,000 in custody in 2009, have been created at many places around the world.[8] A central component of deradicalization programs is religious authorities engaging in dialogue with detainees about their ideology, in this case the nature of their religious beliefs and their relationship to terrorist activities, and promoting a more tolerant and peaceful vision of "true" Islam. In some programs former "militants" do this.

Kruglanski and his associates[9] see terrorist ideology as consisting of a grievance, inherent in which is some form of injustice, a culprit or actor assumed to be responsible for the grievance, and a method, terrorism, that is considered morally justifiable because it addresses a great injustice. However, like other destructive

ideologies, terrorist ideology can include an aspect that is positive, at least for those who hold them, sometimes specific (such as Northern Ireland uniting with Ireland), sometimes much less tangible (like creating a world consistent with God's design, or creating a Muslim Caliphate).

In Saudi prisons, moderate Muslim clerics engage prisoners in discussion in the attempt to change their understanding of Islam and their ideological views. There is also psychological counseling of prisoners. There is material help for families, at times with supplemental income, health care and schooling for the children. At the end of the program they assess the detainees' religious orientation to Islam. To prevent relapse, the program enlists families, holding them responsible for the released prisoners' actions.[10]

A project in Singapore also works with prisoners. It engages them around beliefs and ideologies, but it also helps their families—it supports the education of their children and offers professional training to their wives. It is hoped that such care for their families lessens the prisoners' anger and frustration so that they "open up to moderate religious interpretation and accept the notion that jihadism is contrary to the humane principles on which Islam is founded."[11] Helping families is hoped to address some of the emotional roots of commitment to an extreme ideology.

While anecdotal information indicates positive effects of deradicalization, these programs have not been evaluated in appropriate research. A test of religious beliefs can show knowledge of what is expected, not
p. 366 what people actually ↳ believe. While this does not mean that the program is ineffective, one graduate of the Saudi program was reported in 2010 to be a leader of Al Qaeda in Yemen.

The United States has a program in Iraq with 26,000 detainees. It offers "religious de-radicalization; coupled with vocational training; civic education; art programs; family and tribe and community engagement; counseling; medical (physical and mental) treatment; and job placement."[12] All of these elements are important for people to change and be able to reenter normal life and to reconnect with a larger community.

Developing an alternative religious/ideological view is crucial. Attempting to negate an ideology is less likely to change people strongly committed to it than offering an alternative that addresses the minds and hearts of people and fulfills the needs the original ideology has served. Belief in a more humane Islam moves in that direction. But the deradicalization programs only challenge and attempt to change belief in the use of violence, not beliefs relating to democracy or the role of women. This may make it easier for past or potential "jihadists" to accept them—or may offer too little of a changed world view to have long-term influence. Moreover, these programs don't provide people with means to address grievances—except when the grievance is their immediate life situation.

Earlier references to cases have shown that for many people, their motivation for entering terrorism is not their material circumstance. I have discussed the power of ideas (and feelings associated with ideas) in human life. Recently both in relation to terrorism and in relation to morality in general the concept of *sacred* (or protected) *values* has been used. These are values that are thought of as absolute, that possess a "transcendental" significance. Compromise, deciding about actions related to a sacred value depending on associated costs and benefits, is morally prohibited in the group that holds that value.[13] The rights of the refugees from 1948 might be such a sacred value for Palestinians. The sacred value need not prescribe solutions, but simply that the rights must be addressed. For some jihadists, violent jihad can be a sacred value. To the extent their views of what Islam holds about jihad and violence can be successfully redirected, it shows that sacred values, like most human thought and feelings, are not immutable.

But beyond such reformulation, to gain hope and inspiration, people facing complex circumstances need positive visions, constructive ideologies-relevant to their circumstances, grievances and values-and some sense that they can be fulfilled. For example, Muslim minorities in Europe need visions that realistically

offer them connection to the democratic societies they are part of, as well as community practices that develop attitudes and skills to bring this connection about.

In contrast to deradicalization, at Guantanamo their severe treatment may have intensified the prisoners' enmity. According to Pentagon sources, at least 74 of the 534 inmates released as of May 2009 have gone
p. 367 back to fighting.[14] A couple of former inmates have turned up as terrorist leaders in Yemen. ↳ To change course requires separation from one's former comrades; addressing or reformulating sacred values, finding new vision, meaning, and purpose in life; developing skills that make a new way of life possible; and reconnecting to a community. Approaches to reintegrating child soldiers into the community in African countries, which I have mentioned and will further discuss, provide some further suggestions for how to do this.

In addition to general approaches, idealist, respondents, and lost souls would best be deradicalized by different additional experiences. For idealists, a constructive ideological view would be especially important. For respondents healing from the effects of past victimization, whether personal or as group members, and coming to see constructive ways to address still existing grievances, would be important. For lost souls, connection, community, finding ways to fulfill basic needs would be paramount. For all of them, separating from a terrorist group and comrades in a dignified way, without feeling that they are betraying them, would matter. While connection to past comrades does present a danger of re-radicalization, engaging people to help their comrades move into the mainstream of society could serve this purpose. These considerations mean that the roots of engagement—the combination of personal history, the push of societal climate, social conditions, the pull of friends already involved—ought to be assessed and considered in approaches to deradicalization and prevention.

Independent of deradicalization programs, sometimes terrorists lose their motivation, become disillusioned, and disengage from their group. John Horgan, a political scientist, has studied 26 such people, former members of groups like the Irish Republican Army and Al Qaeda.[15] Some of them, while they accepted the necessity to kill, still found acts their group engaged in as morally difficult to accept, in Horgan's words as beyond their internal limit, such as killing a pregnant police officer, killing too many people, or forcing children and old people to fight with them—or robbing banks. Others were disillusioned when instead of the excitement of action in the service of improving the world they found boredom, as they sat around for interminable hours in safe houses, and competition and jealousy among members. Still others realized that the goals of the group are unattainable. However, some of those who stopped to engage in terrorist acts continued to serve their group in other ways.

Terrorist groups have intense hold on their members and leaving them is difficult. Still, what is learned from such research can be used to attract terrorists away from their groups, as well as in prevention. Members of communities from which terrorists recruit can be helped to understand, using the Internet, radio, and television programs, that this is not a glamorous life, that the group may not fulfill personal needs as much as they hope for, and that terrorist actions cross extreme moral limits, and do so without achieving worthwhile goals. Horgan also found that some disengaged because their life goals have changed with age, for example, wanting to get married and to have children. Educational influences can point out that life goals change.

p. 368 Deradicalization and preventing radicalization involve similar processes. Some programs try to prevent terrorism by entering into dialogue on Islamist Web sites. In one project, supported by the foreign ministry of Saudi Arabia, Sunni clerics and other Islamic scholars, working with psychologists and sociologists, enter extremist Web sites and engage in discussion with participants. As in deradicalization programs, the aim is to move them from extremist to more tolerant forms of Islam.

Horgan offers a useful distinction between push factors and pull factors that lead to terrorism. In my terms the push factors include both the environmental conditions (such as repression, inequality, humiliation) and the psychological effects of the personal history of people, especially respondents or lost souls. The pull factors include the opportunity to live up to ideals, to right wrongs, to fulfill basic needs, community, for some the thrill of adventure. They include what some authors refer to as a sense of significance gained by people who want to "be somebody" and believe they can be by acting for an important cause—an ideology, their community and comrades.

Especially when their terrorism does not address a true grievance, understanding the influences that give rise to it can be helpful. It enables would be terrorists to see the guidance they receive from others as incitement, not truth, and terrorism as the outcome of psychological and social influences, not heroism. It can lead them to understand reciprocity, that violence begets violence.

A significant challenge is that for some terrorists, including cases I already mentioned, an important push factor seems to be outsiders attacking Muslims and the death of Muslim civilians in the course of fighting. The wife of a Jordanian double agent, Balawi, who killed a group of CIA operatives, claimed that the United States invasion of Iraq greatly transformed her husband. Faisal Shahzad, the would be Times Square bomber, repeatedly talked to family and friends about his anger about violence against Muslims in Afghanistan and elsewhere. In 2009 and the first half of 2010 about 25 American Muslims have been arrested as potential terrorists. A number of them reported that they were motivated by revenge for U.S. drone attacks in Pakistan on supposed Al Qaeda members, which at times also kills members of their families and civilians. We don't know all selective personal factors that determine who responds to this situation with turning to terrorism. Difficulties with jobs and family relations are likely to, and appear to have a role.[16]

It is challenging, in face of the reality of fighting between Westerners and Muslims in places like Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan, and the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians, to prevent the emergence of motivation to participate in fighting and revenge by education alone. Serious discussion of differences in beliefs and world views and ways of bridging them can be useful. Education can help justify the fighting, and its particular methods, to the extent they are justifiable from the perspective of Muslims. Convincing efforts to resolve conflicts in peaceful ways, when possible, even if they don't bring results, demonstrate good will.

p. 369 Engaging with and helping to build communities can contribute to prevention, whether people's original communities or new, constructive groups. In Amsterdam, an idea important in working to prevent radicalization was that it is a result of social isolation. The mayor, Job Cohen, attempted to strengthen ethnic communities, in the belief that they reduce social isolation. His administration engaged with these communities and encouraged mosques, schools and community groups to watch out for their youths, to note changes in young people and engage with them.[17]

Preventive efforts should also expose people to the impact of terrorist violence on victims, their families and children, including Muslim victims. As I note elsewhere in the book, exposing harm doers to the *victims of others*' violence reduces defensiveness. People working in the field, with groups, have reported in conversation striking examples of how hearing some members of the group talk about how they were victimized in the past, led others in the group talk about how they victimized some people in the past, and express regret and the desire to seek forgiveness. However, I have encountered a few examples of terrorists/perpetrators who continue to believe that what they did was right. We don't know, how they would respond to such a process. Their proclaimed belief in the rightness of their action has implications for the notion, which I mention elsewhere, that perpetrators want to be reincluded in the moral realm. Whether theirs is a defensive stance or not, some seem to continue to believe that actions were moral.[18]

Prevention at the societal levels involves creating societal conditions that allow and empower all groups to participate in societal process—to express themselves in the public domain, to find ways to address grievances, to address inequality in group relations and have opportunities as individuals. In Amsterdam since 2004 more Muslims have become part of the political process. The current mayor of Rotterdam is a Moroccan immigrant. This is an important educational influence; alternative role models, who are part of society and act for the social good of the community.

## Public Education: Musekeweya, an Educational Radio Drama in Rwanda

In societies where there is enough freedom to allow this, public education can help create resistance to violence and promote reconciliation and peace building. An important form of public education is the radio, especially in countries where radio is still the primary source of information and entertainment accessible to the population.

Our first and still ongoing educational radio program in Rwanda was the radio drama *Musekeweya* (meaning "new dawn"). We developed the educational content for all our radio programs on the basis of the Staub-
p. 370 Pearlman approach ↳ that we used in our trainings with groups in Rwanda, which I described earlier.[19]* We developed a "continuum," that described the principles of origins and prevention (called that way because of the progression in the course of the evolution of violence). The approach was then translated into 12 "communication messages" (see Table 16.1), which guided the writers in including educational content into the radio drama from May 2004, when it began to broadcast, until 2007. In 2007 we expanded the communication messages to 35, to include more on prevention and reconciliation. Some of the statements at the beginning of the chapters in this book are revisions from this longer list. The radio dramas and other programs now cover the whole range of principles and issues (except terrorism) that this book engages with. We have continuously trained writers and producers in the educational material they are to convey in the radio programs.

**Table 16.1** "Communication Messages" of the Rwandan Radio Drama

| |
|---|
| 1. Life problems in a society frustrate basic needs and can lead to scapegoating and destructive ideologies. |
| 2. Genocide evolves as individuals and groups change as a result of their actions. |
| 3. Devaluation increases the likelihood of violence, whereas humanization decreases it. |
| 4. The healing of psychological wounds helps people live more satisfying lives and makes unnecessary defensive violence less likely. |
| 5. Passivity facilitates the evolution of harm doing, whereas actions by people inhibit it. |
| 6. Varied perspectives, open communication, and moderate respect for authority in society make the evolution of violence less likely. |
| 7. Justice is important for healing and reconciliation. |
| 8. Significant connections and deep engagement between people belonging to different groups help people overcome devaluation and hostility and promote positive relations. |
| 9. Trauma can be understood. |
| 10. It is important to tell one's trauma story, and there is a way to tell it that is emotionally safe and constructive. |
| 11. People can help their neighbors heal and help them tell their stories as part of the healing process; everyone can participate in and can contribute to healing. |
| 12. Healing is a slow process. |

*Source*. Reprinted from the Staub & Pearlman, 2009. We are grateful to the American Psychological Association for permission. These messages, based on the Staub-Pearlman approach, were developed in collaboration with George Weiss and the staff of LaBenevolencija.

As I wrote earlier, the radio drama became extremely popular in its first year, and from every indication, it has become more popular since. Most people in the country have been listening to it. It is a story of two villages in conflict. We learn early in the drama that some time in the past the authorities gave a fertile
p. 371 valley lying between the villages to one of them, Bumanzi. There is a drought, and ↳ people in the other village, Muhumuro, go hungry. A man instigates hostility and violence. He attracts followers and is elected the leader of Muhumuro. They attack the well-to-do village and steal the harvest.

The radio drama moderates respect for authority, one of our goals, by showing the complexity of the motivation and character of the destructive leader, Rutanagira, and by dramatizing the behavior of bystanders. He responds to the conditions in his village, the drought and scarcity of food. He blames the other village, Bumanzi. But he also acts out of personal grievances and animosities. His father had a second wife in Bumanzi. The father, when he died at the beginning of the story, contrary to tradition, appointed his son in Bumanzi as the head of the family, even though Rutanagira is the oldest son. He cannot accept this. In the dark of a night he attacks and beats up his half brother. His mother, Zaninka, driven by jealousy, instigates him against the other village. In addition, in a storm, his daughter falls off a small bridge, which the two villages built together in a period of cooperation, and drowns in the creek. For this also he blames the other village.

The villagers in Muhumuro are affected by the injustice that the fertile land was given to the other village, which makes them permanently poor, and by the current drought and scarcity. The frustration of their material and psychological needs makes them vulnerable to instigation. The instigator's influence in this authority-oriented culture greatly increases when he is elected village headman.

In the course of the conflict, active bystanders speak out against the leader and the faction that incites and engages in violence. Some older people maintain friendships across village lines. One man courageously goes to and speaks against violence at a meeting of the leader with his followers, and he continues to speak out after his house is burnt down. The most powerful example of a positive bystander is Batamuliza, the sister of the destructive leader. There is a love story between her and a young man, Shema, from the other village. Over the years of the program, the two of them are central in the activities of the young people of the two villages who organize and speak out against the violence.

Batamuliza and Shema undergo many trials. One of them is her kidnapping by one of her brother's followers, a man to whom her brother had promised her as a wife, without her knowledge. She manages to free herself and continues to defy her brother and mother. Many of the characters in this radio drama have become immensely popular, and when after many challenges Batamuliza and Shema are married in one of the episodes in February 2009, people were sending real presents for the couple.

Other characters in the radio drama provide models of active bystandership as well. A young boy encourages another boy who is about to be sent home from his secondary school, because his family cannot pay the tuition, to ask the principal to allow him to stay. In Rwanda, where decisions by authorities are customarily not questioned, such an action demonstrates and encourages more ↳ moderate respect for authority. There is a village "fool," in fact a wise man in the mold of a Shakespearean fool, who, in his foolish way, says things to the leader and his followers that show how wrong their actions are. The drama explores justice processes, including its imperfections. It shows corruption and bias by officials.

p. 372

In the first 3 years of the story, there is hostility, attacks, and counterattacks. When Bumanzi, the wealthier village, counterattacks, the inhabitants of Muhumuro become refugees. They leave their village and live under very poor conditions. There is continued hostility, with factions in both villages that persist in advocating against the other village. Some sympathizers from Bumanzi join and live with the refugees. They, and others who speak for reconciliation and peace, are the objects of suspicion and hostility. But slowly, opinions turn, and reconciliation begins. At a later time, when there is the threat of new violence in the region, the two villages join, using their past experience to stop the violence by nonviolent means. There is a transformation in some important characters, such as Rutanagira, the bad leader. He is tried, there is increasing hostility to him by "bystanders," and slowly over time he changes, joining those who work for reconciliation and peace.

Rwandan leaders advocate reconciliation, but at the same time they also limit open discussion and political processes. But this public education program that, among other things, encourages moderate respect for authorities and pluralism, people speaking their minds, has been allowed to broadcast each of its episodes twice a week.

## Evaluations and Further Story Content of Musekeweya

We placed great importance on assessing the impact of our educational interventions. Our research evaluating our earlier work in Rwanda showed that it had highly positive impact. The effects of the radio drama were also carefully evaluated, in experimental research in the first year and then by research using other methods. As in our earlier work, it is on the basis of the positive effects that the evaluation showed that we continued with our programs.

The evaluation covered the period of hostility and attacks, with resistance by active bystanders, but not the programs on reconciliation. It included individual interviews with participants, their responses to questions about program effects, focus group discussions, and an "unobtrusive" measure when participants did not

know they were evaluated. I will describe the evaluations in the first and second year separately, except when a later finding clarifies an earlier one.

Before the broadcasts began, "listening groups" were set up around the country and were visited each month to assess their reactions first to pilot programs and, during the first 3 years, to actual programs.
p. 373 Their reactions were ↳ used to shape program content.[20]* Following this model, as part of her doctoral dissertation research, Elizabeth Levy Paluck set up, during the first program year, groups in six communities (identified as treatment or reconciliation groups) that listened together once a month, on audiotapes, to the four weekly programs of *Musekeweya.* In six comparison (control or health) groups, people listened together to a radio program about health practices. There were a total of 480 people in the study.[21]* These were mixed groups of Tutsis and Hutus, but there was also one group in each condition made up of survivors only, and one group of prisoners. Health group members were promised a small reward and agreed not to listen in the course of the year to *Musekeweya* broadcasts. If they listened in spite of their agreement, one would expect smaller differences between the groups.

After the assessment of the effects of the radio drama at the end of the first year, members of the comparison or health group could also listen to the program. Another group was added to the evaluation, elites in the communities where the first-year participants were located. The effects of the radio drama were evaluated in the second year by comparing former reconciliation and health group members, as well as assessing differences among all participants as a function of how much they listened to the programs. In addition to self-report, knowledge of drama content, which corresponded well with participants' reports, was used to indicate amount of listening. People who in the previous year were treatment group members listened more to the program. Not surprisingly, people who listened more showed greater changes.[22]

The evaluation showed that the program has affected both attitudes and behavior. Among varied effects, listeners to *Musekeweya* were more likely than members of the comparison group to believe in speaking their minds and to actually do so, to express controversial views, and to show independence from authority.

## Effects on Behavior

At the end of the first year, at a party to acknowledge their participation, each group received audiotapes of the whole year's *Musekeweya* programs and a tape recorder. In every one of the six health groups, participants decided, after very little discussion, to have the village headman be in charge of them. In each case one person suggested this, and it was agreed to without further discussion. In all six of the reconciliation groups, participants engaged in long discussion of where they should keep the materials they received and who should be in charge of them. They decided that either the group jointly would be in charge or one of its members would be in charge and make them available to the others. Usually, in the reconciliation groups, one person suggested that they give the material to the village headman to manage, but others disagreed, and a long discussion followed.[23] In this unobtrusive measure, at a time when
p. 374 participants thought ↳ the project had ended, people who listened to the radio drama showed freedom to express their views and independence of authority.

In individual interviews, listeners to *Musekeweya disagreed* more with the statement, "If I disagree with something that someone is saying or doing, I keep quiet."[24]* This was one of the strongest effects of the radio drama. Listeners' behavior was consistent with this in the unobtrusive measure. In addition, in individual interviews, participants in both health and reconciliation groups agreed that there was mistrust in their communities. When this was later discussed in focus groups, those who listened to *Musekeweya* were much more likely than participants in the comparison groups to express this view, countering a cultural tendency to hold such opinions privately.

## The Effect on Empathy

In individual interviews, people who listened to *Musekeweya* expressed more empathy for varied groups of Rwandans: people in prison because of their role in the genocide, survivors, poor people, and political leaders. This is consistent with what we found in our earlier study, that members of community groups guided by facilitators we trained in our approach, on which the radio drama was based, had a more positive orientation to people in the other ethnic group.[25]

It is likely that one source of empathy and positive orientation to others was increased understanding of the influence of events on people, their psychological impact and effects on behavior. Understanding how personal experiences, the conditions in the society, and the influence of other people jointly lead to actions, including extremely harmful ones, is a form of cognitive empathy that can foster at least some openness to harm doers—whether direct perpetrators or leaders—and to passive bystanders. The programs also showed the trauma and psychological wounds resulting from the attacks, this presumably increasing empathy with survivors of the genocide. Perpetrators, and many passive members of a perpetrator group, stop thinking about the victims' suffering. They tend to minimize what they (or their group) did and its harmful effects.[26] The radio drama increased awareness of pain and suffering created by violence, as people in the village that was attacked struggled with anxiety, sexual difficulties, and intimacy.

Understanding the influences leading to and the effects of violent actions presumably joined with identification with positive characters in the story and the values they expressed in creating empathy.[27] A Penal Reform International (PRI) report on rescuers in Rwanda concludes that "belief in values that affirm the humanity of the victims, creating a deep empathy with them ....as well as the existence within their social environment, particularly within the family, of positive examples of interethnic coexistence" were the primary characteristics of the "righteous" who saved Tutsi lives during the genocide.[28] Their feelings of empathy, beliefs, and values enabled them to deviate from then dominant norms of conduct.



## Other Changes

The changes I just described and those that follow suggest that the radio drama affected beliefs and values, that listeners came to see certain outcomes (such as less dependence on and subservience to authorities) and actions (speaking what one believes) as desirable. This is an especially impressive finding in that during the first year of the radio drama the words and actions of active bystanders did not stop hostility and violence. In some cases there were negative consequences to them.

Research studies have shown that the example of models can lead to imitation, even if their actions are not rewarded. This does not happen, however, if the models' actions lead to negative consequences for them, and it is unlikely to happen if their behavior is evidently ineffective. But in the radio drama the active, positive bystanders were guided by strong values that served positive ends. The rewards to them were intrinsic, as they lived up to these values. They were also "rewarded" by good relationships to each other, even across village lines. And they acted in the context of understanding the importance of resisting influences that move people to violence.

The radio drama also showed trauma. The invaders intruded into people's houses during the night, attacked them, and stole their crops. One character later struggled with giving testimony at a trial, finding it difficult to talk about her experience, as traumatized individuals often do, the difficulty intensified by an initially insensitive judge. Another character began to avoid his wife, avoiding intimacy and sexual relations. She began to suspect that he had another woman in his life. Slowly she learned that his behavior was the result of the attack, which created difficulty in his sexual functioning; this made him ashamed and led him to avoid her. Educational radio dramas need to entertain to be effective. The writers have infused the story with a great deal of humor, for example, when the wife follows the suggestions of a village healer to regain her

husband's affections by stealing one of his pubic hairs—before she understands that he has been traumatized. In this and other cases of trauma, other characters invite traumatized people to talk about their experiences. Those who listened to the program were more likely to believe that one should talk about painful, traumatic experiences (see Chapter 19).

Rwandans experienced great violence in their society, in spite of intermarriages, and neither evaluation group believed that marrying across group lines contributes to peace, although listeners to *Musekeweya* believed slightly more that it does. However, while in a small number of instances participants talked about intermarriages ending in bloodshed, more often they mentioned Tutsis who were saved through their connection to Hutus. The PRI report about rescuers found that a majority of those who saved Tutsis were connected to them through intermarriage.[29] Asked about their personal preferences, reconciliation group
p. 376 members were more likely than health group members to believe ↳ that intermarriage should be allowed in their family and that children should not be advised against it. In individual interviews and focus groups, they said that it can be a force for good, creating bonds and reducing division and discord between groups. Both the discrepancy between their belief based on past experience that intermarriage does not contribute to peace and their belief that it should be allowed and can create bonds, and some other findings suggest that the program has generated hope, an expectation and belief that people can take effective action to make the future better. Both values that motivate people and such positive expectations are necessary for people to take action.[30]

While the majority of the participants in both groups believed that trust can be rebuilt in their communities, a compelling difference was in the ways people thought about rebuilding trust. For those in the reconciliation group, interaction was one avenue, such as engaging with people, socializing, and sharing resources. Another was mutual forgiveness, asking pardon, and establishing the truth about the past. Those in the health groups emphasized these less, and government policies more, such as government information programs (called sensitization in Rwanda) and laws prohibiting divisionism and political favoritism.[31]

The differences between groups in beliefs, values, and behavior showed substantial changes in listeners. But there was no difference on some dimensions. One of them was that neither group agreed with the view that violence evolves gradually. One explanation is participants' own experience, the way they perceived the genocide. Although they could see the progressive increase in tension and hostility in the country, they experienced the beginning of the genocide as sudden and surprising. This was also reported by others.[32] People get accustomed to gradually increasing hostility and violence and are surprised when there is a great shift in intensity. There was also no difference, probably again due to the constraining effect of personal experience during the genocide, in reactions to the statement, "If I stand by while others commit evil actions, I am also responsible." Members of both groups agreed somewhat with this statement. But they said that during the genocide it was not possible to intervene. Once the genocide began, intervening did mean significantly endangering one's life.

The lack of difference on some items at the end of the first year could also be due to members of the comparison groups actually listening to a limited extent, which brought them some knowledge but not enough to change deeper attitudes and actions. Even more likely was the spread of the effects of the educational radio drama through public discussion. Past research has found that the effects of programs about HIV/AIDS and reproduction spread through discussion between spouses and in the community.[33] Both participants in the reconciliation groups and others who were interviewed in the second year reported extensive discussion of the programs. Reconciliation group members talked about them to others, and they were discussed in families and among community members. Children and adolescents, who have been avid listeners, often initiated discussion with their parents.[34]

p. 377 People in the community in Rwanda often listen to the radio together; their discussion of the programs is likely to enhance their effects. This was probably the case with people listening together in the evaluation study. In the second year, elites in the communities where the study took place reported that members of these groups continued to have strong ties, and that the study had a positive effect on their communities.

Another explanation for the absence of some differences may be that, depending on particular issues, creating change may require more exposure to influential content. This is especially so if change goes contrary to recent powerful experience, such as the perceived sudden beginning of the genocide. In the second-year evaluation, there was again no difference between the two groups on the question about the evolution of violence. But people from either group who listened more to the radio drama, as measured by the number of characters they could name, disagreed more with the view that violence comes about suddenly.

Participants expressed views about a couple of matters contrary to what we expected. This was most likely due to actual program content. Contrary to our intention to communicate that violence is a societal process and the importance of followers, people who listened to *Musekeweya* agreed more that "evil people cause violence." Given the strong prevailing view in Rwanda that genocide was the result of bad leaders, and given the cultural emphasis on authorities, our attempt to change the perspectives of the writers of the radio drama, through training and editing their work, proved difficult. In the first year the writers continued to emphasize the role of the bad leader in the poor village, and his mother who exerted a strong negative influence on him. But the way they depicted the character of the bad leader, and the role of his personal/family relations in his actions, helped moderate respect for authority, as the behavior of listeners showed.

The joining of cultures, as external and internal parties work together, can be challenging. At a staff meeting a member of our academic team realized that the writers resisted the concept of moderating authority because they thought it meant that children need not obey their parents. We clarified that what we meant was that children and adults should learn to judge if their elders, leaders, or society engages in harmful, immoral action, and people should speak out against and attempt to correct such actions.

On another item, those who listened to *Musekeweya* were less likely to believe that trauma recovery is possible. The radio drama was planned to last for a number of years, with evolution in its content. Some of the items in the evaluation assessed the program's intended effects as indicated by communication statements, not its likely effects based on its actual content. The radio drama in the first year showed people traumatized by conflict and attacks, and others encouraging them to talk about their painful experiences. We did not yet show healing and recovery, in part because we were intent to truthfully represent what Rwandans also know from personal experience, the difficulty of recovering from the trauma of victimization (see message 12 in Table 16.1).

p. 378 ## The Effects of the Radio Drama in the Second Year

In the second year, when everyone could listen to the program, some of the differences between reconciliation and health group members disappeared. For example, all groups said that they supported intermarriage, and that they would speak up if they disagreed with something someone did or said. But the amount of listening was important. Regular listeners believed more in speaking what they believed and expressed their views and concerns more.

The major conclusion suggested by the research findings in the second year is that people who listened more to *Musekeweya* were more ready, willing, and able to express their views. Reflecting a widespread cultural fear in Rwanda about poisoning, regular listeners expressed more concern about drinking a beer with a member of a group that has offended them, if this person opens the beer out of their sight. They were

more likely to say that there is mistrust in their village, in keeping with what both observers and surveys authorized by the Unity and Reconciliation Commission indicated—that there is mistrust in Rwanda, due to the genocide and reawakened by the *gacaca*. They expressed more concern about the return of prisoners who perpetrated violence and who were released into their communities. Given the other effects of listening to Musekeweya, it is unlikely that listeners developed a more negative view of the world. It is much more likely that *Musekeweya* contributes to people using their judgment and expressing their views.

Everyone in the second year reported that they participated in reconciliation activities; those who were in the reconciliation group during the first year participated in these activities slightly more, and regular listeners substantially more. Members of the former health groups reported more that they encouraged others to reconcile: helping neighbors resolve conflicts at home, encouraging forgiveness, or talking to people about the *gacaca.* Regular listeners reported more directly engaging in activities promoting reconciliation. They shared land with people who killed their family, talked to returned prisoners who killed members of their family, returned goods stolen by a son to a survivor and asked for forgiveness. The evaluator concluded that" The actions of Musekeweya listeners are exceptionally personal."[35]

## The Value of Public Education

Public education can take many forms: trainings in seminars and workshops, courses in schools and universities, radio and television programs, and information disseminated in newsprint and on the Internet. Longer exposure matters, especially when the goal is to change deep-seated beliefs, attitudes, norms, and behavior. As these change, slowly the culture changes, including the standards of acceptable conduct. The
p. 379 idea of changing another group's culture may seem ↳ arrogant. But Rwandans themselves agree that there is too much respect for authority, not enough pluralism, and a history of devaluation. To moderate orientation to authority requires a focus on the merits of authorities, and reevaluation of the relationship between leaders and citizens.

The trainings we conducted with groups in Rwanda, described in Chapter 12, affected understanding of the roots of the genocide, created more positive orientation by members of the two groups toward each other, and conditional forgiveness.[36] The radio drama seemed to contribute to a "critical consciousness" by listeners, to their use of their own judgment, and greater willingness to engage in discussion and publicly express views. It also affected behavior, some self-reported, some observed. There are public education projects of many kinds, and they show that public education can have what seems not only a statistically significant but also a practically significant impact. In the complex and difficult social world of post-genocide Rwanda, the changes our programs produced provide hope for more active bystandership on behalf of reconciliation and peace.

### Audience Feedback

At some point audience members began writing letters with their thoughts and feelings about the programs, and when LaBenevolencija provided a telephone number, they began to call in large numbers. Their reactions were highly positive and also informative about program content. Later, to further involve the audience, there were poetry competitions with themes related to *Musekeweya*, with small awards given to the winners. Starting in 2008, some letters that reinforced program messages were read on the radio. I quote and paraphrase a few letters in one week in early May 2009, some responding to the preceding week's drama episode:[37]*

- "Hello you teachers of hearts filled with hatred…you have not stopped teaching us in Rwandan society. The importance of *Musekeweya* is inexpressible." Speaking to Zaninka, the mother of the bad leader, the

writer admonishes her for her bad behavior in relation to her daughter and wants to exile her. "Good riddance." He also advises Shema to let his wife, Batamuliza, go work in the village that now has problems. "That will bring good results."

• "The seed you have planted has begun to grow. The intelligence and wisdom that you have used to teach us is of great value. *Musekeweya* is a boat, where all of us who are listening are together. Shema, Batamuliza, (Kigingi, Hirwa—other characters in the drama) have the techniques rowing us, and we are sure to arrive at a good port." This writer also speaks directly to the characters and says to Zaninka,
p. 380 "Where has your soul gone?" He also admonishes Shema not to get angry at Batamuliza, ↳ if she goes to the other village to help—"You and others have much to gain, and you can also go to help.... I am resolved to be your ambassador among us."

• "... the seed you have sown in the heart of the afflicted ...has given the fruits of humanism, tolerance, love, and unity. In the fashion of Shema and Batamuliza, we are ready to give testimony of what we have pulled from this tree."

• "I am thanking you for showing the hearts of people directed by hatred, rancour, and wrath..."

• "Please read this message to the listeners.... For those who have not won a prize in the poetry competition, try to find some reward for them—they have participated. That would make them happy."

• One letter asked that the programs cover rape (which has been done in the radio dramas in Burundi and the Congo but not in Rwanda) and that Batamuliza be a counselor to rape victims.

## Ongoing Program Development

In developing the radio programs there has been an increasingly deep and equal relationship between internal and external parties. There are training workshops on the underlying conception and approach, and design and storyline development workshops. These bring local staff, producers, and some members of the academic team and the executive team together. Stakeholders—representatives of local organizations and leadership groups—are often included for part or all of them.

In February 2009, at one of these workshops, there was discussion of the communication messages that the programs would focus on in the following year. One of these was "establishing the complex truth about past group relations and about conflict and violence and developing a shared view of history are important for reconciliation." In the course of the discussion, participants commented that the notion of "shared history" should reflect not only two versions of what happened in Rwanda, as represented by the two main groups, Hutus and Tutsis, but many versions. In real life there are not only the two primary groups but also divisions by region, status and wealth, and others, each with their own perspective on history. (One of these other divisions is between Tutsi survivors and "returnees," Tutsis whose families were refugees in neighboring countries and returned after the genocide. It was primarily refugees in Uganda who fought the civil war and then ended the genocide.)

The educational content aims to promote knowledge, attitudes, and actions in relation to each communication message. The following guidance to producers and writers (and for evaluators) for the message described earlier was drafted by a member of the "academic team" and then developed further in
p. 381 the January workshop. It specifies the aims of the programs that are to be developed. ↳

> KNOW:
>
> • That establishing the complex truth about past group relations is a difficult task, since the two parties in the conflict have different perspectives

> • The importance of having a shared history, including both sides' experiences, the two versions of the conflict, rather than having a history presenting the perspectives of one side
>
> DO:
>
> • Have an overall view of the past, always engage to confront one-sided versions of history
>
> • Continue to discuss the past conflict with others, with a mind open to various perspectives and ready to understand that those various visions can complete each other (even when there are disagreements)
>
> HAVE AN ATTITUDE OF:
>
> • Eagerness to understand the past conflict between the two groups
>
> • Willingness to make others question their exclusive version of history[38] *

p. 381

## A Grassroots Project and Further Evaluation of Musekeweya

Using the radio drama as a base, LaBenevolencija created a companion project to engage citizens in reconciliation. It trained "agents of change" in communities to notice and address problems between people before they become severe, help resolve conflicts, and foster peaceful relations. Thirty-seven communities were identified that were especially strongly impacted by the genocide, and where recovery, in terms of social cohesion, the absence of conflict, and economic activity, was slow. With the help of local officials, LaBenevolencija staff selected, for training as agents of change, highly diverse groups of people in each community, with varied backgrounds and positions in society. They included genocide survivors, prisoners returned to the communities, poor people, people with some "deviant" behaviors, elected and appointed officials, pastors and teachers, and agricultural and health advisors. The aim was not to duplicate the activities of local officials, but to help people with social cohesion, with problems that affect people's everyday relations.

Those selected received 5 days of training in the Staub-Pearlman approach, by staff that was previously trained in and had been using the approach in creating the radio programs. The training focused on the
p. 382 communication messages, used segments from *Musekeweya*, and included role playing. After the ↳ training, local and national coordinators worked with the local agents. The team engaged by LaBenevolencija to evaluate the effects of the program wrote: "The grassroots programme has the objective to amplify the messages through a direct intervention on the ground in localities that encounter serious problems in the domain of conflict resolution, prevention and reconciliation."[39]

This team first evaluated whether the agents of change understood the communication messages. When shown varied segments from *Musekeweya*, they were substantially better at identifying their meaning—for example, a segment showing passivity by bystanders—than other people from the same communities. They were then asked to describe the type of conflicts they encountered and identify the most important ones. Theft and internal household problems were frequent. Land redistribution was in progress and the government had people stop growing their customary crops and replace them with different crops. Land conflict, and conflict related to the *gacaca*—both in a general sense and specifically in terms of returning property—were both frequent and described as the most important.

The evaluators compared communities with change agents to others in the same area. They concluded that while "gacaca-related conflicts receive the highest ranking overall …(they) are not ranked highest in the grassroots sites…." They speculated that "this might be due to the grassroots activities since they have the

objective of conflict resolution (especially related to issues dealt with in gacaca) and fostering social cohesion and reconciliation issues that are apparently most negatively affected by the introduction of the gacaca in rural life."[40]

People have become less fearful of cohabitation, living their everyday lives together—sharing a beer, attending a wedding, helping to take a sick person to the hospital. But interpersonal reconciliation, a "matter of the heart," trust and confidence in neighbors, in members of the other ethnic group, is more challenging. The evaluators regard this as the realm of social cohesion. In open questions, when people can say whatever they want, community respondents identified *Musekeweya* (25%), or LaBenevolencija in general (23%) and activities organized by it, and the agents of change in particular (10%) as sources of increasing cohesion over the past 2 years. In this open format, 54% of respondents identified LaBenevolencija-initiated activities as sources of social cohesion. Local community gatherings organized by officials were identified by 25% of the respondents. When asked a direct question, "Did LaBenevolencija play a role in the increase of social cohesion in your community over the past 2 years?" 96% said it did.[41] *

In 2008, to create cohesion among the change agents and make their activities more sustained, the coordinators helped them develop associations around agricultural activities, initiated by small grants to the groups. People who normally would have little contact coming together in associations, especially after the genocide, seemed to have special value. However, in an in-depth look at two associations, the evaluators found that only one had a highly mixed ↳ membership. In that community, agents of change were highly active. Not surprisingly, in that community they received more credit for social cohesion.

p. 383

Reconciliation activities have often focused on national processes, such as truth commissions, tribunals to bring about justice, or political arrangements. But reconciliation at the local level, between parties who have harmed each other and now have to rebuild their lives living next to each other, such as former prisoners living next to survivors in Rwanda, is crucial. Mozambique has moved from violence to relative peace without a national reconciliation process, but with reconciliation activities at local levels.[42] The aim of Musekeweya was to reach the population, and the grassroots project, engaging with people directly, seemed to have enhanced its influence.

## Musekeweya and the Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR)

We began to hear reports that members of the FDLR in the Congo, the militia led by former genocidaires, have been listening to *Musekeweya*. Some of them left their group and returned to Rwanda, and according to these reports, they were influenced by *Musekeweya.* LaBenevolencija commissioned the same researchers who evaluated the grassroots project, and they conducted interviews in Rwanda with ex-rebels in a demobilization and reintegration camp and on a rural hill. They interviewed 101 ex-rebels in the course of several weeks.[43]

The FDLR members in the Congo have listened a great deal to radio stations such as the BBC, Voice of America, and Radio Rwanda. They listened to Radio Rwanda to keep up with the developments in the country and to understand what might be the situation of family and friends. The most popular programs were *Urunana* and *Musekeweya*, both radio dramas. Most of 101 ex-rebels followed the weekly broadcasts of *Musekeweya*, and according to them most of the Kinyarwanda speakers in the Congo, regardless of ethnicity, listen to the program. For the former members of FDLR, the theme of reconciliation between the villages was especially striking. The change in Rutanagira, the bad leader, made a strong impression on them, as he became active in working for reconciliation and peace.

Coming to learn about the changing nature of Rwanda, mainly from telephone conversations with family in Rwanda and visitors from Rwanda played a role in their return. So did issues within the FDLR, such as lack of objectives, conflicts and incompetence of leaders, the hard life in the Eastern Congo, and separation from families in Rwanda. While *Musekeweya* is an educational radio drama, a story, the researchers write that "It is evident that radio broadcasts have played a major role in the spread of" a new image of Rwanda. "The theme of reconciliation underlies a great number of the striking episodes mentioned by the ex-rebels."
p. 384 Although there is no evidence that it "played a decisive role in their ↳ final decision to return home... the radio soap is somehow at work in a dynamic of competing ideologies and mindsets."[44] Interestingly, in addition to getting trustworthy information about Rwanda, a main obstacle to return was a practical one, finding demobilization points in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

## Other Radio Programs

Like all forms of prevention and reconciliation, to be effective educational efforts must be informed by the actual conditions of group conflict, history, and culture. The radio dramas for Burundi and the Congo were guided by the same conceptual approach as *Musekeweya*, but their content was adjusted according to differences in conditions from Rwanda. The differences are especially great with the Congo, where more groups are involved in the conflict and in addition to tribe or ethnicity, conflicts over local (and national) power and material resources have significant roles.

Broadcasting from October 2004 until 2008, another radio program engaged in direct education in Rwanda. Called *Kuki* (Why?), it provided information about the concepts embodied in the communication messages. This program meant to reach Rwanda's educated population and leaders. Journalists posed questions and local experts answered them on the air. A weakness of this program was that while the journalists leading the broadcasts were trained in our approach, the local experts were not, and most of them were not scholars of genocide.

Nevertheless, an evaluation showed positive effects. People who listened to the programs did not change their opinions related to the content of the messages in comparison to people who agreed not to listen for a year. However, everyone was sympathetic to the messages, and listening affected behavior. Those who listened discussed the messages with family and friends. They became more inclusive, inviting members of the community to a public dialogue on reconciliation and the healing of trauma.[45] Increased engagement by opinion leaders with the larger community on these issues is a valuable outcome.

p. 385

**Summary**

Public education, especially if it involves extensive exposure, can and has been found to change attitudes, beliefs, and behavior. It can include lectures and workshops, literature, various media, and the Internet. Public education has to consider local conditions, as we did in applying the same conceptual approach to Burundi and the Congo. Listening to our educational radio drama in Rwanda, developed on the basis of the Staub-Pearlman approach, made it more likely that people use their judgment about the meaning of events and act on their beliefs. The grassroots projects, building on the radio drama, and other radio programs, also had positive effects.

A striking real world effect of Musekeweya was reported to me in August 2010. Members of a predominantly Hutu village, many of whom were perpetrators of violence against the inhabitants of a predominantly Tutsi village living on another hill, approached the Tutsi survivors. They came with their implements to help work the field. After a while the survivors engaged with them, the two groups created a ceremony of forgiveness and have increasingly reconciled. Both groups reported that they were inspired by Musekeweya. (As one man said, it was messages on the radio that led him to ask for forgiveness.)[46]

p. 385

# Notes

1 Biton & Salomon, 2006

2 Salomon, 2004

3 Dweck, 2009, describing studies by Halperin, Russell, Dweck, & Gross on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

4 Staub et al., 2005; Staub & Pearlman, 2006

5 Aderman & Berkowitz, 1970; Stotland, 1969

6 Pyszczynski, Rothschild & Abdollahi, 2008, p. 320. See this article for an overview of such research 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2008.00598.x

7 Ibid 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2008.00598.x .

8 Horgan & Braddock, 2010; Kruglanski, Gelfand, & Gunaratna, 2010, in press

9 Kruglanski et al., in press

10 Kruglanski et al., 2010; Horgan & Braddock, 2010

11 Kruglanski et al., 2008, p. 118

12 Kruglanski et al., 2010, p. 21

13 See, for example, Tetlock et al., 2000

14 Kruglanski et al., 2010

15 Horgan, 2009

16 Hosenball & Thomas, 2010

17 Shorto, 2010

18 Nadler & Shnabel, 2008

19 For a detailed description of the radio drama and its development, see Staub, Pearlman, Weiss, & van Hoek, in press; see also Staub, 2008a; Staub & Pearlman, 2006; Staub, Pearlman, & Bilali, 2010.

20 The listening groups were designed and organized by Suzanne Fisher, the first local producer of Musekeweya.

21 The evaluation research was done by Elizabeth Levy Paluck, at the time a graduate student in psychology at Yale, working with an advisor who specialized in evaluation research. We (Staub, Pearlman, and LaBenevolencija) invited applications by individuals and organizations to do the evaluation and selected her from several interested parties. The findings of the
p. 386 first year evaluation is described in Paluck & Green, 2005, the second year evaluation in Paluck, 2006. The results of ↳ the first-year evaluation were published in Paluck, 2009a. See also Staub & Pearlman, 2009; Paluck, 2009b.

22 Paluck, 2006

23 Paluck, 2009a, b; Staub & Pearlman, 2009

24 This is the version of the statement that is reported in the original evaluation report for LaBenevolencija by Paluck & Green, 2005. In Paluck, 2009a, the statement reads: “If we disagree with something that someone is doing or saying, we should keep quiet.” I assume the original version was used in the study. We disagree with Paluck’s interpretation of the findings; she sees the changes in listeners as indicating that their beliefs about what are the social norms in their society have changed (Paluck, 2009a, b). This seems highly unlikely to us; instead we interpret the results as changes in individuals’ understanding, personal beliefs, and values, which are then expressed in some behaviors. Changes in norms

would follow as a sufficient number of people in the group express or enact change. See Pearlman & Staub, 2009, and later discussion in this chapter.

25 Staub et al., 2005

26 Baumeister, 1997

27 Paluck, 2009a, b; Staub & Pearlman, 2009

28 PRI, 2004. p. 3

29 Paluck & Green, 2005; PRI, 2004

30 Staub & Pearlman, 2009

31 Paluck & Green, 2005

32 Ilibagiza & Erwin, 2006

33 Bandura, 2006; Staub et al., in press

34 Paluck, 2006

35 Ibid, p. 42

36 Staub et al., 2005

37 The letters were translated from Kinyarwanda into French, and then English, and paraphrased in part. Some of their content may be motivated by the hope that they will be read on the radio

38 From Musekeweya workshop, February 16–21 2009. Design, storyline and message sequencing document for Rwanda. Episodes 247–300, March 2009–April 2010. Prepared by Johan Deflander.

39 Ingelaere, Havugimana, & Ndushabandi, 2009a

40 Ibid.

41 However, such a direct question can elicit the tendency of people in Rwanda to say what they think others expect.

42 Broneus, 2008a

43 Ingelaere, Havugimana, & Ndushabandi, 2009b 10.1080/17531050903273735

44 Ibid 10.1080/17531050903273735, pp. 1–2

45 Paluck, 2008

46 Aimable Twahirwa, the producer of LaBenevolencija in Rwanda in, 2010 was approached by the villagers who told him about this. Maggie Ziegler, who in 2010 worked at the Kigali Genocide Memorial and visited the villages with him, sent me the draft of a story she is writing about it.