

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

12-2011

Peddlers of Hate: The Existence of Norm Entrepreneurs as a Necessary Precursor to Genocide

Lauren Elise Fairbanks
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fairbanks, Lauren Elise, "Peddlers of Hate: The Existence of Norm Entrepreneurs as a Necessary Precursor to Genocide" (2011). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 101.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/101>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Plan B and other Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



Peddlers of Hate:

The Existence of Norm Entrepreneurs as a Necessary Precursor to Genocide

By

Lauren Elise Fairbanks

A Plan B paper submitted in partial fulfillment
Of the requirements for the degree

Of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

In

Political Science

Approved By:

Major Professor
Veronica Ward, PhD

Committee Member
David Goetze, PhD

Committee Member
Christopher Conte, PhD

Department Head
Michael Lyons, PhD

Utah State University
Logan, UT

Introduction

“Any deed that any human being has ever committed, however horrible, is possible for any of us—under the right or wrong situational circumstances” (Zimbardo, 2007).

Over the course of the 20th century genocide has been responsible for the murder of more than 170 million people; it has proven to be four times deadlier than war (Voth, 2007). Although it often appears spontaneous, Genocide is instead a result of certain preconditions. Studies into the causes of genocide ought to aid in the formation of methods intended to keep violence from occurring. Unfortunately, seemingly different factors such as economic crisis, resource scarcity, institutional weakness, and ethnic resentment prove difficult to classify as the ultimate cause. Instead these conditions work collectively to create an atmosphere that is conducive to the emergence of genocidal behaviors. These preconditions can be specific to the cultures in which they arise; however there exists a continuity with which genocide may be characterized. All these conditions may be exacerbated by the common existence of a norm entrepreneur. For the purpose of this paper, a norm entrepreneur is an individual that holds some appearance of power which he/she uses to create or recreate social/societal norms through which polarizing attitudes are formed. In the case of genocide, these individuals may use a variety of methods intended to foster an atmosphere of hate. I argue that norm entrepreneurs are a catalyst to the emergence and growth of specific norms; and in the case of genocide, they are a necessary precursor to group polarization and ethnic violence. While the presence of a norm entrepreneur is merely one of many factors that contribute to the proliferation of polarizing attitudes and behaviors, he/she is the trigger to the emergence of genocidal violence.

To begin I define the role of the norm entrepreneur while also describing how he/she may alter individual and group behavior. Following are a series of studies that demonstrate how a norm entrepreneur may influence an individual or group to commit acts of genocide. For example, the results of Philip Zimbardo's study *Diary of an Abandoned Automobile* speak to the context of anonymity and the role it plays in the appearance of evil behaviors (Zimbardo, 2007). Also, Zimbardo's *Stanford Prison Experiment* illustrates that an individual may single-handedly create an environment in which evil behaviors may arise while simultaneously displays how the arbitrary creation of groups can lead to in-group/out-group polarization and dehumanization (Zimbardo, 2007). Moreover, the results of Stanley Milgram's experiment on obedience indicate that individuals are more likely to participate in evil actions when under the command of an authority figure (Milgram, 1974). This is pertinent in that my hypothesis assumes that norm entrepreneurs must possess some semblance of power in order for their norms to experience the cascading effect necessary for them to become a part of the social fabric (Finnemore, 1998). Although it is difficult to prove the efficacy of a norm entrepreneur to alter group behavior, I discuss these studies in an attempt to further link the possibility of an individual to intensify polarized attitudes to such a point that genocide may occur.

Next I discuss the Rwandan genocide prior to which, the existence of norm entrepreneurs appears to have been a necessary precursor. In Rwanda a series of endorsements made by President Habyarimana clearly condoned the use of violence against the Tutsi population. His lack of concern over the distribution of thousands of machetes indicated that violence was not only the answer, it was appropriate. In fact, many political figures sanctioned the use of violence against the Tutsi population; this allowed for a diffusion

of responsibility among the Hutu participants. Much scholarship exists as to the causes of the Rwandan genocide; however, I argue that the presence of norm entrepreneurs is what exacerbated pre-existing tension caused by ethnic disparity and food scarcity to a point where genocide became inevitable. Accordingly, in his book *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil*, Dr. Philip Zimbardo commented, “Human beings are capable of totally abandoning their humanity for a mindless ideology, to follow and then exceed the orders of charismatic authorities to destroy everyone they label as “The Enemy” (Zimbardo, 2007).

Definition of Terms

Genocide seems easily identified, however time and again the UN has failed to recognize its occurrence. This being the case, the definition of Genocide as stipulated by Article 2 of the Genocide Convention is as follows:

“Genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- a) Killing members of the group;
- b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group”
(Rajadhyaksha, 2006).

Also, throughout this essay the word ‘polarization’ will be used to describe when in-group attitudes become dissimilar and oppositional to the out-group such that one may consider the other an enemy. Additionally, the terms out-group and in-group refer to groups united by similar belief structures, cultures, and/or interests to which an individual may choose to ascribe. The in-group usually experiences preferential treatment for its members, whereas the out-group is generally excluded and viewed as socially subordinate to the in-group. It is also

necessary to define the word 'norm.' I utilize the constructivist definition that, "considers norms to be standards of appropriate behavior for actors with a given identity" (Hoffman, 2000). I study how these norms come to include mass acceptance of ethnic tension and violence, polarizing attitudes to the point that genocide becomes a feasible option.

Unfortunately, little scholarship has been dedicated to norm emergence preceding genocide.

Currently debate centers on the efficacy of using norms as an explanatory political mechanism.

Considering the affect norms are said to have on individual and state behavior, it is essential that academics first study how norms come about and are changed over time (Hoffman, 2000).

Genocide: A Framework

Dr. Gregory Stanton president of Genocide Watch the coordinating organization of The International Alliance to End Genocide (IAEG) puts forth a series of eight stages believed to be indicators of genocide; classification, symbolization, dehumanization, organization, polarization, preparation, extermination, and finally denial (Stanton, 1998). According to Stanton,

"Genocide is a process that develops in eight stages that are predictable but not inexorable... The process is not linear. Logically, later stages must be preceded by earlier stages. But all stages continue to operate throughout the process" (Stanton, 1998).

The following research intends to establish the necessary existence of norm entrepreneurs during the first seven stages of genocide; denial is not included as it is not a precursor to the event. Despite situational factors such as environmental hardship and/or systemic degradation, a norm entrepreneur is the catalyst needed to instigate genocidal attitudes and behaviors. Not only is the norm entrepreneur present during each of Stanton's proposed stages, but his/her involvement exacerbates most recognized causes of genocide.

The Norm Life Cycle

Relevant to the role of the norm entrepreneur is Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink's (1998) description of the norm life cycle. First is the emergence of the norm through a, "norm entrepreneur working from an organizational platform," where he/she may, "present new ideas as potential norms." As with any entrepreneur, this individual is peddling his/her 'social wares' in an attempt to convince an audience of the norm's validity and usefulness. It is important that the audience accepts the norm as appropriate in order to see its emergence. Next a norm experiences a cascading affect whereby more and more of the audience accepts its legitimacy, the norm itself becomes a contagion infecting the masses. Lastly, the norm experiences internalization, where the masses no longer question the norm but accept it as common and every day (Finnemore, 1998). Although this framework is evolutionary, it does not necessarily require a prolonged period of exposure to the norm but can take a more viral route contaminating the masses more quickly than one expects. This can occur when a norm entrepreneur utilizes his/her authority as a means to promote the acceleration of the norms acceptance among the target audience. According to the life cycle put forth by these authors, the presence of a norm entrepreneur is a necessary precondition to norm emergence. In the case of genocide, the attitudes held by the in-group are simply internalized norms that promote the appearance of violent behavior.

Characteristics and Tools of the Norm Entrepreneur

During genocide the role of the norm entrepreneur is to generate ethnic tension through the creation and use of social norms that endorse the poor treatment and subsequent murder of the out-group. It is important that the norm entrepreneur possess certain attributes as well as utilize specific tools at his/her disposal in order to alter in-group behavior. At the least, a norm entrepreneur has to possess the appearance of authority as it allows the in-group to diffuse responsibility among themselves for their murderous actions. Naturally, the desires of the authority carry a commanding quality as the idea of obedience has long been ingrained within human behavior. Consider the average individual, first he/she is expected to be subservient to his/her parents, then to educational figures and his/her boss in a given profession, and finally to the social/societal order that is both systems and institutions. Each person has been indoctrinated to follow some type of rule that has been established and maintained by someone else. In essence, obedience to authority has become a social norm. In the following studies, participant responses will support the idea that a diffusion of responsibility is experienced when an abusive action is perpetrated at the request of an authority figure.

One may also imagine the effect that disobeying rules can have on an individual. Later, Milgram's study on obedience will help to explain the lengths an ordinary person will go to fulfill an order. Moreover, the norm entrepreneur possesses the ability to force compliance to such commands. Coupled with the desire to be obedient is the individual's fear of being disobedient. While some participated out of a distorted and morbid sense of compliance, others took part because there was no alternative, "anyone who hesitated to kill because of

feelings of sadness absolutely had to watch his mouth, to say nothing about the reason for his reticence, for fear of being accused of complicity” (Zimbardo, 2007). Essentially, participants in the genocide had to make a choice between the lesser of two evils, kill or be killed.

Anonymity may be one of the largest predictors of aggressive or inappropriate behavior. Many studies have been conducted on the affect anonymity has upon group and individual behavior. The absence of the ability to be identified allows for the emergence of otherwise unordinary behaviors. This is coupled with the idea that anonymity leads to a lack of consequence, as the criminal cannot be held accountable for his/her actions. In the case of genocide, there is a both a lack of consequence for murderous acts and a sense of deindividuation. This concept is easily applicable to both the in-group and out-group, as members are seen as being interchangeable or lacking in individual distinctness from one another. When a Hutu murdered, the victim was no longer recognized as an individual but rather a part of the Tutsi ‘problem.’ Persons within each of the groups began to relate more to the whole of the collection rather than maintain their individuality. The role norm entrepreneurs play in the materialization of anonymity is often their arbitrary creation of in-groups and out-groups. Reiteration of group distinctness solidifies the idea that the individual is merely a part of the crowd. Norm entrepreneurs often utilize hate speech as a means to create such feelings of deindividuation and ethnocentrism.

Most genocide is prefaced by organized hate campaigns; a key aspect of which is the creation of the “scapegoat” as it is necessary to create an Us vs. Them mentality. Mass frustration creates an atmosphere in which scapegoating can arise. Perceived visible and/or conceptual differences such as height, skin color, career choice, ancestral lineage, and level of

education, quickly become clearly demarcated lines across which ethnic groups align. As a political maneuver, the introduction of a scapegoat is welcomed as the ultimate cause for perceived 'hard times' (Zvagulis, 2010). This however proves cyclical as the annihilation of one scapegoat creates a void in which another must arise. This 'solution' seems as ridiculous as it is impractical. As a cure-all, it is ineffectual as all the problems that existed prior were never fully addressed. Often the norm entrepreneur introduces the idea of a scapegoat through the use of hate speech and/or the distribution of hate propaganda.

Furthermore, the goal of the norm entrepreneur is to dehumanize and demonize the out-group as a means to polarize attitudes. Evidence of the power of the norm entrepreneur is embodied in his/her ability to both utilize and promote hate speech. Within such speech the norm entrepreneur creates a set of rules or norms that are then used to frame the actions and attitudes of individuals. A common tactic employed by the norm entrepreneur is to generate euphemistic terms for seemingly aggressive, inappropriate language utilized during their hate campaign. Examples would include the Habyarimana Regime's use of the word 'solution' to refer to the extermination of the Tutsi (Hatzfeld, 2005). This method keeps negatively connotative words and phrases from distracting the in-group from the purpose of the hate campaign. As a result of the necessity to adapt, those who may have in ordinary circumstances objected to such aggressive actions, instead participate in the dehumanization of the out-group as a means to, "suspend his or her usual emotional response in an emergency, a crisis, or a work situation that demands invading the privacy of others" (Zimbardo, 2007). As an aspect of hate speech the norm entrepreneur also promotes ethnocentrism among the in-group as a means to draw the group together, encouraging the in-group to act as one.

Research Studies: The Ability of the Norm Entrepreneur to Affect Group Behavior

Diary of an Abandoned Automobile

“Internalized anonymity needs no darkness for its expression” (Zimbardo, 2007)

Introduction and Methods

If a norm entrepreneur is to be considered a primary cause of genocide than his/her ability to affect group behavior must be discussed. What follow are a series of studies that when taken cumulatively speak to the ability of individuals to affect group behavior to the point that genocide may occur. To begin, Dr. Philip Zimbardo orchestrated an observational study titled, *Diary of an Abandoned Automobile* in which a car of similar make and model was left ‘abandoned’ across the street from each of the city’s respective college campuses. The vehicles were left with their hoods open and their plates removed. As a result, ordinary people did unordinary things.

Results and Implications

There were differences in the results between the two locations. Over the course of a few days the Bronx vehicle was entirely stripped and had experienced, “23 separate destructive incidents,” all of which occurred in broad daylight. In comparison, there was not one act of vandalism perpetrated upon the Palo Alto vehicle (Zimbardo, 2007).

“The message of this little demonstration is that conditions that make us feel anonymous, when we think that others do not know us or care to, can foster antisocial, self-interested behaviors” (Zimbardo, 2007).

According to Zimbardo the vandals were “...adults who, under other circumstances, might demand more police protection and less coddling of criminals and would ‘very definitely agree’ with the opinion poll item about the necessity for more law and order” (Zimbardo, 2007).

Zimbardo's reasoning for the geographical inconsistency had to do with the idea that anonymity was near impossible in Palo Alto. As a result, the findings from this study may be relevant to the concept of the norm entrepreneur as they support the argument that anonymity can aid in the emergence of evil behavior. Inherent in the concept of anonymity is also knowledge of a lack of consequence. If one cannot be singled out as having committed a criminal act, then one cannot be punished. Leading up to and during the Rwandan genocide, norm entrepreneurs exacerbated feelings of anonymity thereby contributing to an environment that was conducive to the materialization of evil behavior.

Stanford Prison Experiment

Introduction and Methods

No study clearly indicates the manipulative capabilities of authority than in the case of Dr. Philip Zimbardo's Stanford Prison Experiment (SPE). Zimbardo was interested in studying what he coined the Lucifer Effect, "The Lucifer Effect is my attempt to understand the processes of transformation at work when good or ordinary people do bad or evil things" (Zimbardo, 2007). The SPE was set up to mimic an actual prison environment. College students volunteered and were randomly selected to act out the role of either prisoner or guard. The volunteers were then placed in a mock 'prison' where they were meant to live and work over the course of two weeks. Within a day, the guards began to abuse the prisoners. Previous studies had established that deindividuated persons more readily participated in violence against others in comparison to those who were individuated. In other words, although the groups were made rather arbitrarily, the mere classification between guards and prisoners

created an 'Us vs. Them' mentality. The cohesion that each group began to feel and would later act upon is similar to group cohesion brought on during instances of genocide.

Results and Implications

The results of this study demonstrate how feelings of anonymity can lead to the emergence of evil and often violent behaviors. The group's participants were deindividuated and as the experiment suggests, this left them more susceptible to their environment and more likely to participate in aggressive behaviors. The guards began by instilling a set of rules meant to restrict the freedom of the prisoners. These rules would later become a set of torturous norms. Punishment for non-compliance consisted of a stint in the "hole," a dark closeted space in which there was barely enough room to stand. Rules stipulating the maximum number of hours a prisoner could spend in the hole were repeatedly ignored. One guard recalls "I saw the guards as a group of pleasant guys charged with the necessity of maintaining order among a group of persons unworthy of trust or sympathy –the prisoners" (Zimbardo, 2007). The guards, like the murderers in Rwanda, internalized their roles until it became a part of their identity. "As I got angrier and angrier, I didn't question this behavior as much. I couldn't let it affect me, so I started hiding myself deeper behind my role. It was the only way of not hurting yourself. I was really lost on what was happening but didn't even think about quitting" (Zimbardo, 2007). Zimbardo commented, "role playing has become role internalization; the actors have assumed the characters and identities of their fictional roles" (Zimbardo, 2007).

The guards began to seek out reasons for their dislike of the prisoners as a means to rationalize their continued abuse. Justification for their mistreatment was often a result of the prisoner's unsanitary living conditions; of which, the guards were the cause. For example, the

guards repeatedly restricted access to sanitation facilities and as punishment required that the prisoners clean out the toilets with their bare hands. One guard recollects, "I got tired of seeing the prisoners in rags, smelling bad, and the prison stink" (Zimbardo, 2007). This is indicative of genocide during which the in-group begins to blame the out-group for its sorry condition which is often a result of their harsh treatment by the in-group. As with any war, the in-group has to disassociate itself from the out-group so as to keep from feeling guilty for their actions. Some guards mentioned, "there were a few times when I had forgotten the prisoners were people...Also I [made] an actual try of my will to dehumanize them in order to make it easy for me" (Zimbardo, 2007).

Dr. Zimbardo set up a situation and established norms that inevitably led to this disturbing scenario. Systems of power are ever prevalent "institutions create mechanisms that translate ideology into operating procedures." The men and women with this perceived power are as instrumental to the behavior of the masses with their inaction as they are with their action. The implications of this study are that given the right parameters, groups will polarize to the point where abuse of an out-group will occur. Sadly, this study was cut short due to the abhorrent events that transpired in as little as five days time. In fact, what was experienced during the SPE is strikingly similar to those atrocities photographically documented at Abu Ghraib. The participants were everyday male college students that had tested well within the normal range in a series of psychological assessments administered prior to the experiment. However, the environment that was created lent itself to the evolution of abusive behaviors. Zimbardo, as the creator of the experiment, played the role of norm entrepreneur and inevitably produced a situation in which violent behaviors and polarized attitudes arose.

Jane Elliott's Brown-Eyed, Blue-Eyed Experiment

Introduction and Methods

Another equally compelling study was conducted by Jane Elliott, a 3rd grade elementary school teacher. Her intent was to make real the problem of segregation and the affects racial subjugation had on African Americans. The study itself was conducted the day after Martin Luther King. Jr. was assassinated, April 5, 1968. On that day, Elliot arbitrarily assigned the children in her class to groups based upon the color of their eyes; she then established an in-group of 'blue-eyed children' and an out-group of 'brown-eyed children.' Next Jane Elliott informed her class of the parameters of the study;

"The brown-eyed people do not get to use the drinking fountain. You'll have to use the paper cups. You brown-eyed people are not to play with blue-eyed people on the playground, because you are not as good as blue-eyed people. The brown-eyed people in the room today are going to wear collars. So that we can tell from a distance what color your eyes are. Blue-eyed people are smarter than brown-eyed people. They are cleaner than brown-eyed people. They are more civilized than brown-eyed people" (Eye of the Storm, 1985).

This excerpt is indicative of how the day went. The following day, Mrs. Elliott switched the roles of the groups. A video documentation of the results was recorded entitled, "A Class Divided" which was produced and directed by William Peters, the journalist who first ran the story in 1970 for ABC.

Results and Implications

This study emphasized the power of groupthink and the affect of the unfair creation of groups on both in-group and out-group attitudes. Soon the supposedly more superior blue-eyed children were dehumanizing the brown-eyed children, turning the term 'brown eyes' into

a derogatory descriptor for the members of the out-group, “John: Russell called me names and I hit him... Jane Elliott: What did he call you? John: Brown eyes” (Eye of the Storm, 1985). The rapidity with which the children began to associate the negative characteristics with the proposed out-group is astounding. For example, when asked why the brown-eyed children were not allowed to go back for seconds during lunch the blue-eyed children responded, “They’re not smart...[We’re] afraid they’ll take too much” (Eye of the Storm, 1985). Similarly, when asked what was wrong with being called brown-eyes a child responded, “It means that we’re stupider” (Eye of the Storm, 1985). Such distinctions were readily assimilated by the children and the groups began to take on the attributes that Jane Elliott, as the norm entrepreneur, had introduced.

An interesting outcome of the experiment was seen when the children were administered a phonics test,

“I use phonics. We use the card pack, and the children, the brown-eyed children were in the low class the first day and it took them five and a half minutes to get through the card pack. The second day it took them two and a half minutes. The only thing that had changed was the fact that now they were superior people” (Eye of the Storm, 1985).

These results demonstrate that dehumanization may be a self-fulfilling prophecy whereby the out-group begins to assimilate the role of a less than superior people; this in turn validates the negative opinions held by the in-group towards the out-group. This study emphasizes how polarized an atmosphere can become with even the most arbitrary creation of an in-group and out-group (Eye of the Storm, 1970). This argument is further supported by research conducted by Tajfel (1982) and Turner (1987) which concluded that, “the mere categorization of people

into groups can lead to favoritism toward the in-group and discrimination against the out-group in order to maintain a positive social identity” (Tajfel, 1982; Turner, 1987; Leets, 2002).

“I watched what had been marvelous, cooperative, wonderful, thoughtful children turn into nasty, vicious, discriminating, little third-graders in a space of fifteen minutes” (Eye of the Storm, 1985)

-Jane Elliott on the transformative nature of her experiment.

Stanley Milgram’s Experiment on Obedience

Introduction and Methods

Dr. Milgram’s intentions were to research the affect of authority on obedience. He began by running an advertisement in the newspaper asking for volunteers drawn from the local population. Those who responded were paired with an actor provided by the researchers. The respondent was unaware that his/her pairing was planned and assumed the other participant was as naive to the proceedings as he/she was. Upon arriving, the respondent was led to believe that he/she was randomly selected to play the role of ‘teacher’ in the experiment. The implanted participant was given the role of ‘learner.’ The teacher was under the impression that the experiment was to study the effects punishment had on how a person comes to learn. The study required that the teacher induce shocks for incorrect answers given by the learner in response to a predetermined set of questions. However, what the experimenters were more interested in was whether a person would obey when commands from an authority figure ran contrary to the participant’s moral conscience (Milgram, 1974). The intentions of the study were to decipher how everyday individuals came to participate in the murder of the Jews during the Holocaust. The premise assumed that the teacher would respond to an authority figure such that they would increase the voltage delivered to the learner to the point of abuse (Milgram, 1974). The reactions of the learner were structured to

create a basis for measure; for instance, at 285 volts the learner was instructed to make an “agonized scream” (Milgram, 1974). Also important was that the learner was strapped down to the chair so that he could not escape the shocks without the aid of the researcher. Results were tabulated in a variety of situational circumstances.

Results and Implications

Over the course of the experiments an unnerving number of participants, almost 2/3, continued to obey the requests made by the researcher regardless of perceived resistance by the learner (Milgram, 1974). Although the pressure for disobedience mounted, participants continued to comply with the requests of the authority figure. Even some of the strongest protests were met with total obedience. Many participants shocked the learner until the researcher concluded the experiment, administering shocks that would have proven fatal to the learner had they been real (Milgram, 1974).

At the culmination of the shock experiment, the teachers were asked questions regarding their participation. Their responses proved extremely telling of the power of authority. One respondent, when asked who was at fault had the learner been hurt responded “I say your fault for the simple reason that I was paid for doing this. I had to follow orders. That’s how I figured it.” The researcher observed, “obedient subject asserts that he had no autonomy in the matter of shocking the victim and that his actions were completely out of his own hands” (Milgram, 1974). The ‘teacher’ exuded a lack of responsibility for their own actions. Participants voiced concern at continuing the experiment but still they were obedient,

“...I had about eight more levels to pull and he [the learner] was really hysterical in there and he was going to get the police, and what not. So I called the professor three times. And the third time he said, ‘Just continue,’ so I give him the next jolt. And then I don’t hear no more answer from him, not a whimper or

anything. I said, ;Good God, he's dead; well, here we go, we'll finish him, And I just continued all the way through to 450 volts" (Milgram, 1975).

Results suggest that it was merely the presence of authority that gave the requests such a commanding quality. When asked if he had been bothered by his having to administer the shocks this same participant replied,

"No...I figured: well, this is an experiment, and Yale knows what's going on, and if they think it's all right, well, it's all right with me. They know more than I do...I'll go through with anything they tell me to do" (Milgram, 1975).

The fact that the study was associated with Yale University lent the researchers an appearance of authority and superior knowledge. The results indicated that the presence of a requesting authority figure was necessary to the administration of increased shocks, as when offered the opportunity to choose the level of shock, most participants rarely went above the lowest of levels. Even rarer were those participants that traversed the entirety of the scale. Still, those who showed extreme confidence in their inability to punish or hurt continued to shock the learner when commanded by an authority figure.

The relevance of this study to the role of the norm entrepreneur is that an individual with the appearance of authority may induce responses similar to those seen in this experiment. Ordinary citizens administered fatal shocks in the face of obvious distress at the request of an authority figure. Not only did participants voice a sense of duty, but they also indicated a diffusion of responsibility for their actions. Also, the perceived consequences for their disobedience, i.e. return of payment for services rendered, was enough to encourage their participation to the point of learner distress. These responses are strikingly similar to those given by participants in the Rwandan genocide.

Mathew Hoffman: Exploring Norm Emergence and Evolution

Introduction and Methods

Hoffman's study is evidence of the ability of a norm entrepreneur to alter group behavior. The study was set up so that participants were asked to pick a number between 0 and 100, "and the 'winners' [were] those closest to the average 'pick' from the whole population" (Hoffman, 2000). Each simulation included 10 participants. Those participants were asked to base their decision on what they believed would be the average choice among all other participants in their simulation. Prior to their choosing, participants were instructed to use three out of seven rules provided to them to aid in their prediction. The participant then made three predictions based upon each of the three rules they had chosen. Then the agent presented her choices to the whole population. The outcome of the experiment was an average of these numbers across the entire population with an addition of noise. 'Noise' is an intervening variable that accounts for any confounding factors that may affect the outcome of the experiment. Correct responses were rewarded and incorrect responses were punished, establishing an expectation that most closely resembles a community norm.

The study assumed the following:

- 1) Agent actions (or predictions in this model) are driven by internal models or hypotheses—the rules available to the agents.
- 2) Agents have finite calculation capabilities—they can only 'follow' the possible implications of a few rules at a time.

- 3) Agents are goal seekers—they have a built in desire to match their predictions with the outcome.
- 4) Agents are adaptive—they change their active rule when it ceases to allow them to meet their goal and they keep it when it performs well. (Hoffman, 2000)

In the study there were seven rules from which the agents could choose to determine their predictions.

- 1) Pick a random number between 0 and 10.
- 2) Pick a random number between 15 and 25.
- 3) Pick a random number between 30 and 40.
- 4) Pick a random number between 45 and 55.43
- 5) Pick a random number between 60 and 70.
- 6) Pick a random number between 75 and 85.
- 7) Pick a random number between 90 and 100.

“Each of the rules is a hypothesis or prediction about the future action of the population as a whole.” In other words, if the agent chose to use rule number 6, she was predicting that the whole of the population would choose a number that falls within the numerical confines of 75 and 85. Each of the rules was given a score between 1 and 100 depending on the responses of the population. Each of the predictions, considering how closely they appeared to the average, resulted in the addition or subtraction of a point to the score associated with the rule that was used.

Next respondents were allowed to re-evaluate their rules and alter their rule endowment by removing a poorly performing rule and having a randomly selected rule take its

place. According to the researchers, “this can be thought of as akin to a change in domestic politics or an internal policy entrepreneur” (Hoffman, 2000). In order to evaluate the affect of a norm entrepreneur, half of the simulations were run with the involvement of a norm entrepreneur and half without. Respondents were periodically offered a replacement to their most poorly performing rule by the norm entrepreneur. Again the newly acquired rule started out with a score of 100. Multiple simulations were run so as to account for different noise variables.

Results and Implications

A lack of a norm entrepreneur in the simulation led to either chaos or stability. Low ‘noise’ levels eventually led to a consensus of the most dominant rule 4. In contrast, when a norm entrepreneur was present, the rule that became most dominant was number 5, thereby altering the natural inclinations of the control group. Accordingly, Hoffman’s results demonstrate that norm entrepreneurs can play a role in norm emergence. Unsurprisingly, it is difficult to prove in an experimental setting the causes of societal change. This being the case, Hoffman’s study helps to validate the ability of an individual to alter a group’s choices and behaviors. These results are relevant in that, even on the most basic of levels, it is an attempt to support the norm entrepreneur’s ability to alter group conduct.

Triggers of In-Group/Out-Group Polarization

In 2011, I along with other political science graduate students conducted a study into how groups polarize. Our intentions were to observe whether or not exposure to certain treatments negatively affects individual’s attitudes towards particular out-groups. Following is a description of the study along with our preliminary results.

Introduction and Methods

As researchers we developed a study meant to distinguish precursors to polarized attitudes. Students were offered extra credit in return for their participation. On a pre-selected day, 347 students were randomly separated into three groups. Those groups were then taken to separate locations and each was exposed to a different treatment. One group was shown a hate speech given by British media personality Pat Condell, the second group was exposed to a clip on the events of 9/11, and the last was shown nothing. The clips themselves were accessed via YouTube at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vjS0Novt3X4> for the Pat Condell speech and <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y1Dg2eEhB30> for the video montage on 9/11. Following their exposure to the treatments each participant was given a questionnaire to be used for comparison with the control group. The questionnaire measured an individual's feelings towards what were considered three out-groups, Al Qaeda, Muslims, and undocumented immigrants. Next, respondents' questionnaires were compared with the control and results were drawn. In an attempt to better validate results the experiment was re-run at a later date with a total of 144 subjects, the results of which are not included in this paper.

The treatments were meant to study first the affects of hate speech on attitudes towards out groups, as well as the affects a traumatic event has on those same attitudes. The non-treatment participants were meant to play the part of the control group. The first treatment was a clip of a hate speech given by Pat Condell, British media elite, concerning the building of a mosque adjacent to ground zero. His intentions were to develop negative attitudes

towards the building of the mosque as well as the nation of Islam. He drew a clear connection between the perpetrators, Al Qaeda, and everyday Muslims. The second treatment was a video montage of the events of 9/11. For the purpose of this paper results from this treatment will not be discussed as they are not relevant.

The questionnaire itself was a series of statements meant to measure whether or not respondents' experienced polarized attitudes towards the out-group in response to the treatments. Attitudes that are implicated in the process of polarization include dehumanization, fear, and moral depravity. Responses were measured on a seven point Likert scale with 0 equal to a strong agreement with the statement and 6 equal to strong disagreement with the statement. A high score indicated a more polarized attitude towards the out-group. For those questions that did not exactly correlate, answers were re-coded to follow this directionality. The questions were placed in a random order to avoid question bias. For a detailed listing of the questionnaire refer to Appendix A.

Dehumanization as a Measure

There is a plethora of scholarship surrounding the definition of dehumanization. According to Nussbaum (1999) objectification is a key component of dehumanization, and there are seven elements that constitute Nussbaum's theory; "instrumentality, ownership, denial of autonomy, inertness, fungibility, violability, and denial of subjectivity." Instrumentality, ownership, and fungibility reflect the belief that one person is easily interchangeable with another, i.e. each lacks an individual distinctness that would make them unique from others of their kind. Denial of autonomy and inertness assume that the individual lacks agency (Haslam, 2006; Nussbaum, 1999). Violability has to do with a belief that the individual fails to possess a

sense of moral integrity. This is particularly important if the in-group is to perceive the out-group as evil and deserving of poor treatment. Finally, a denial of subjectivity assumes that the feelings of the out-group can be completely disregarded (Haslam, 2006; Nussbaum, 1999). This attitude is a necessary precursor to genocide as it allows the in-group to avoid feelings of guilt over their murderous behavior.

Equally important is a form of dehumanization that involves the animalization of the individual (O'Brien, 2003). According to Bar-Tal (2000), dehumanizing beliefs are where,

“extremely negative characteristics are attributed to another group, with the purpose of excluding it from acceptable human groups and denying it humanity...[it involves] labeling a group as inhuman, either by reference to subhuman categories...or by referring to negatively valued superhuman creatures such as demons, monsters, and satans” (Haslam, 2006; Bar-Tal, 2000).

As a part of dehumanization, an individual's identity is denied and he/she is no longer considered a part of the community, almost to the point of non-existence (Kelman, 1976; Opatow 1990). As a means to measure the dehumanization of the out-groups considered in this study, certain questions involved terminology similar to that which is included in these definitions.

Moral Depravity as a Measure

As an aspect of dehumanization, it is important also to gauge how the participants feel about the out-groups' morality, or lack thereof. According to Nussbaum's concept of violability, the dehumanized individual is perceived as having no moral integrity. Whether or not the out-groups were believed to ascribe to certain ideas of justice and/or fairness was important to those aspects of dehumanization we wished to measure. The statement included in the survey that directly related to this concept was, “Muslims lie, steal, cheat, and kill to achieve their

goals.” As an aspect of what Bar-Tal refers to as dehumanizing beliefs, it is imperative to study whether or not the in-group views the out-group as not participating in acceptable human behaviors. Those statements that addressed these attitudes were, “[the out-group] is... very corrupt, somewhat corrupt, etc.” Each statement was intended to measure attitudes of moral depravity directed towards the out-groups.

Fear as a Measure

According to Mark Warr (2000) fear is, “an emotion, a feeling of alarm or dread caused by an awareness or expectation of danger” (Warr, 2000; Kohm, 2009). This would account for the study’s attempt at measuring worry as an aspect of fear. Conversely, Garofolo (1981) believes that the two are distinct in that fear is, “an emotional response to an imminent threat,” whereas worry is more of a psychological response to some perceived future threat. More recently, Vincent Sacco in *When Crime Waves* (2005) established a three part definition of fear that involves a cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dimension (Kohm, 2009; Sacco, 2005). The cognitive dimension, “focus[es] on individuals’ subjective estimates of their likelihood of victimization” (Sacco, 2005; Kohm, 2009). The emotional dimension relates to how people feel; whereas the behavioral dimension relates to what people do in response to fear (Sacco, 2005; Kohm, 2009). This is pertinent to the questionnaire that was administered as it supports the validity of those questions chosen to measure fear. Questions relating to fear included the statements “I feel safe around,” and “I worry that.”

Hate Speech the Tool of the Norm Entrepreneur

Hate speech is an emotional contagion and a key characteristic of any hate campaign; features of which often include the dehumanization and demonization of the out-group

coupled with the ethnocentrism and siege mentality of the in-group. By definition, hate speech is typified by, “irrational, unsubstantiated, and unjustified antagonism toward a group or a representative of a group, frequently entailing consistently disapproving, hypercritical, and reiterated generalizations” (Vollhardt, 2007). Such speech usually, “denigrates persons on the basis of their race or ethnic origin, religion, gender, age, physical condition, disability, sexual orientation, and so forth” (Leets, 2002). Most importantly, hate speech is a punishable offense particularly when in conjunction with genocide. According to a U.N tribunal, hate speech can be a direct incitement to genocide depending on the tone and context of its transmission (International, 2003). Surprisingly, in order to be convicted of incitement to genocide, “proof of actual causation,” is not necessary (International, 2003.)

Despite the fact that hate speech is utilized in a myriad of differing geographical locations and cultures, there is underlying unity with which such speech can be deconstructed. First and foremost, the speaker must expound upon already existing, “stereotypes, societal beliefs, cultural meanings, and other preconceptions about the targeted groups,” in an effort to create and/or recreate societal norms (Vollhardt, 2007). Detection of hate speech as put forth by the authors of “Deconstructing Hate Speech in the DRC: A Psychological Media Sensitization Campaign,” include that, “the communication contains instigating elements of the continuum of violence; the communication is derogatory and violates standards of (argumentative) integrity; and the suggested strategies do not offer real or constructive solutions to the existing problems, and serve self-interests of the speaker and/or his or her group only while harming another” (Vollhardt, 2007). Below is a graphical representation of the differences between hate speech and what the authors consider neutral speech.

Hate Speech	Neutral Speech
Arguments can be shared/supported by only one group	Arguments can be shared/supported by many groups
Biased view, one-sided and distorted perspectives	Balanced view, multiple perspectives
Destructive spirit and solutions	Constructive spirit and solutions
Focus on blame, personal attacks (on the integrity of one person or group)	Focus on issues and facts
Solutions benefit only one person or group	Solutions benefit all of society
Exclusive/excluding of others	Inclusive of all
Simple	Complex
Derogatory Language	Neutral, respectful language
Emotionally charged (especially anger, fear)	Neutral and objective communication

Using this deconstruction framework, fellow researchers analyzed the Pat Condell speech as a means to identify dehumanizing, fear inducing, and demoralizing statements towards the out-group. The results of the analysis are documented in Appendix B.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study that are most relevant to the investigation of the ability of a norm entrepreneur to polarize attitudes are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Individuals exposed to hate speech during which the out-group is portrayed as the enemy will demonstrate more negative dehumanizing attitudes towards the out-groups than those not exposed to a similar treatment.

Hypothesis 2: Individuals exposed to hate speech during which the out-group is portrayed as the enemy will demonstrate attitudes towards the out-groups that are more morally depraved than those not exposed to a similar treatment.

Hypothesis 3: Individuals exposed to hate speech during which the out-group is portrayed as the enemy will demonstrate more negative fear based attitudes towards the out-groups than those not exposed to a similar treatment.

Results and Implications

Table 1. Means by Treatment Group and Polarization Attitudes

	<u>Fear</u>		<u>Dehumanization</u>		<u>Moral Depravity</u>	
Treatment Group and Variable	Mean ^a	SD	Mean ^a	SD	Mean ^a	SD
Control Group (N=68)						
Al Qaeda	3.7451	1.2994 7	2.2610	1.4445 2	3.5699	1.0951 4
Muslims	2.0980	1.3133 6	.9449	.73409	1.5356	.92845
Undocumented Immigrants	2.0343	1.4283 8	1.3078	.97991	2.1471	.94950
Condell Speech Group (N=115)						
Al Qaeda	3.9855	1.1972 9	2.8022	1.4240 6	3.6777	1.1076 3
Muslims	2.8232	1.3753 1	1.5500	1.2549 0	2.2217	1.2061 5
Undocumented Immigrants	2.4203	1.1831 2	1.7804	1.1490 6	2.1965	.97660

^aThe score ranges from 0-6; higher mean scores indicate a more negative attitude (Dawson, 2011)

Above is a table representing the attitudinal means across all out-groups in association with both the control and the treatment group exposed to the Pat Condell clip. A higher mean indicates a more negative attitude towards the represented out-group. Understandably, attitudes associated with the out-group Al Qaeda were the most negative across both treatments. Directly following were those results concerning Muslims as they were considered the second most feared, dehumanized, and morally depraved. Lastly, undocumented immigrants experienced the least negative attitudes regardless of exposure to the treatments. Although it is interesting to view the average response in relation to the control, the following tables indicate whether or not such changes were in fact statistically significant across the three attitudes and in association with each of the out-groups.

Table 2. Changes in attitudes towards out-groups resulting from exposure to Condell Clip

Exposure and Target Group	Mean Change ^a	T-Score	N
Condell Speech all groups	-0.42**	-3.19	183
Condell Speech Al Qaeda	-0.30*	-1.78	183
Condell Speech Muslims	-0.67**	-4.50	183
Condell Speech Und Immigrants	0.30**	-2.07	183

*significant at the .10 level

**significant at the .05 level

^aA negative number indicates that exposures have generated more negative or derogatory attitudes towards the group or groups involved

This table is a total of all attitudes in response to the Condell speech in relation to the control group. In comparison to the responses given by the control group, the Condell speech significantly altered attitudes in a negative direction towards both Muslims and undocumented

immigrants (significant at the .05 level). In total, attitudes towards all groups were negatively affected and were statistically significant again at the .05 level. This indicates that hate speech can change attitudes even in relation to out-groups that are not directly the target of the speech. There appears to be a negative emotional contagion inherent in what one would consider hate speech.

Table 3. Changes in dehumanizing attitudes directed towards out-groups resulting from exposure to Condell Clip

Exposure and Target Group	Mean Change ^a	T-Score	N
Condell Speech all groups	-0.55**	-3.46	183
Condell Speech Al Qaeda	-0.54**	-2.47	183
Condell Speech Muslims	-0.61**	-4.12	183
Condell Speech Undoc Immigrants	-0.47**	-2.83	183

*significant at the .10 level

**significant at the .05 level

^aA negative number indicates that exposures have generated more negative or derogatory attitudes towards the group or groups involved

The above table reflects changes in dehumanizing attitudes directed towards the out-groups following exposure to the Condell clip. It appears that all attitudinal responses were statistically significant at the .05 level in relation to all of the out-groups. This table supports Hypothesis 1 in that dehumanizing attitudes became more negative following exposure to the Pat Condell clip or hate speech. This implies that dehumanization, an important contributing factor to genocide, can be caused by the mere exposure to hate speech. Equally disturbing are the results that indicate that these attitudes are then associated with out-groups that are not even the target of the speech.

Table 4. Changes in moral depravity attitudes directed towards out-groups resulting from exposure to Condell Clip

Exposure and Target Group	Mean Change ^a	T-Score	N
Condell Speech all groups	-0.28**	-2.19	183
Condell Speech Al Qaeda	-0.11	-0.64	183
Condell Speech Muslims	-0.67**	-4.31	183
Condell Speech Undoc Immigrants	-0.05	-0.33	183

*significant at the .10 level

**significant at the .05 level

^aA negative number indicates that exposures have generated more negative or derogatory attitudes towards the group or groups involved

These results are interesting in that Muslims were considered so morally depraved so as to raise the statistical significance of all groups to a .05 level. However, there was no statistical significance involved in questions regarding Al Qaeda and undocumented immigrants. Observers must consider that these responses are in relation to the control group. All this table is indicating is a change in attitudes. It could be that having already felt that Al Qaeda was morally depraved, the hate speech had little negative effect on pre-existing attitudes. Also, the fact that undocumented immigrants were not the target of this speech may have had an effect on the association of such attitudes to the more distantly related out-group. This table supports Hypothesis 2 only in relation to attitudes associated with Muslims. This hate speech was more significantly directed towards Muslims than Al Qaeda, although a comparison between the two was being made.

Table 5. Changes in fear attitudes towards outgroups resulting from exposure to Condell Clip

Exposure and Target Group	Mean Change ^a	T-Score	N
Condell Speech all groups	-0.45**	-2.85	183
Condell Speech Al Qaeda	-0.24*	-1.27	183
Condell Speech Muslims	-0.73*	-3.50	183
Condell Speech Undoc Immigrants	-0.39**	-1.88	183

*significant at the .10 level

**significant at the .05 level

^aA negative number indicates that exposures have generated more negative or derogatory attitudes towards the group or groups involved

Fear attitudes experienced a statistically significant negative change following exposure to the Condell clip. These results support Hypothesis 3. Particularly interesting is the high significance of the attitudinal changes surrounding undocumented immigrants (.05 level). Apparently the fear invoked by the speech translated to other less relevant out-groups. Results indicate that fear attitudes directed towards both Al Qaeda and Muslims experienced a statistically significant negative change as well at the .10 level. In relation to genocide, fear as a promoter of aggression can lower violent inhibitions, priming a group to perpetrate otherwise unlikely acts.

Although these are simply preliminary results, this study demonstrates a disturbing propensity for the development of polarized attitudes following exposure to hate speech. In those aspects of polarization that were included in this study, attitudes became more negative particularly in relation to Muslims. Interestingly, Muslims were not the perpetrators of 9/11 as it was caused by an extremist from of Islamic terrorists, Al Qaeda. Yet, the association drawn by

Pat Condell between the two clearly bolstered negative attitudes directed towards Muslims. This being the case, the power of hate speech to polarize groups, particularly in a situation of genocide must be discussed. Implications for such findings would be a development of techniques to counteract the effects of such speech. Vollhardt et. al (2007) discusses the necessity for distribution of education that runs contrary to the disinformation delivered in hate speech. Simply the expressed indication of a distinction made between the perpetrators of Al Qaeda and everyday Muslims could have counteracted the negative attitudes drawn from this experiment.

Case Study: Rwanda

A History

The Ethnic Distinction: Us vs. Them

Historically, the delineation made between Tutsi and Hutu was first a political maneuver fashioned by the colonizing powers. In 1921, a mandate by the League of Nations left Rwanda under Belgian rule (Hatzfeld, 2005). According to the Belgians, the light skin and height of the Tutsi likened them to a superior race such as themselves. This was supported by the fact that the Tutsi also held positions of power within the countryside; the mwami himself, the King in Rwandan tribal society, was a Tutsi. Additionally, the Tutsi were cattle herders while the Hutu were predominantly agriculturalists, which created a class disparity (Taylor, 1999). However, despite obvious differences, such characteristics were not always easily discernable. In fact, before colonization, the Hutu and Tutsi lived rather harmoniously and intermarriage was not uncommon. A shared religion and culture further complicated ethnic distinctness and in the years leading up to the genocide, it became difficult to distinguish one from another. Despite

obstacles to categorizing the two groups, in 1931 the Belgians visually profiled the Rwandan population, measuring their height and the length of their noses as a means to determine each individual's ethnicity. Thereafter, Rwandans were issued an identification card meant to label them as being Tutsi, Hutu, or Twa (Mamdani, 2001).

Following the issuance of ID cards, the Belgians began to indoctrinate the masses with the idea of Tutsi superiority and privilege. The accepted religious ideology of the time was that of European biological supremacy or the 'Great Chain of Being' (Taylor, 1999). The theory postulated that Europeans were, "closer to God and the angels whereas Africans occupied a position closer to lower animals" (Taylor, 1999). This being the case, Europeans were naturally the dominant people. However, as a means to explain the existence of clearly more civilized persons in Africa, the Hamitic hypothesis was formed. Accordingly the 'Hamites' were, "responsible for bringing the rudiments of civilization to the region [of Africa]" (Taylor, 1999). According to the Belgians, the Tutsi were believed to be descendants of the biblical Ham, or Noah's southerly banished son (Taylor, 1999). Therefore, Hamites were persons of white foreign descent disguised under a black skin (Mamdani, 2001). This explains why the lightness of the Tutsis' skin played such a substantial role in the determination of their preeminence. The strength with which the Hypothesis took hold was largely due to its religious nature. The Tutsi and Hutu themselves ascribed to their own religious classism under which the mwami had to be of Tutsi origin. The idea that the Tutsi were somehow religiously destined to be a ruling class was somewhat understood and easily accepted. In response, the Hamitic Hypothesis was taught in schools and Hutus were often denied certain educational and employment opportunities, further limiting their likelihood for class mobility. Hutus were also kept from

holding political positions of power and not long after, all the Hutu chieftains were replaced by Tutsis (Mamdani, 2001). The effect of such methods was the creation of ethnic tension between the Tutsi and Hutu that had not previously existed.

In the year 1959 unrest as to the current situation of the state led to talk of a revolution. The Tutsi elites were interested in removing the colonial power and the Hutu were interested in regaining some semblance of equality. Following the death of the last mwami, the Hutu peasantry massacred, forcing the mass exodus of hundreds of thousands of Tutsi (Hatzfeld, 2005). In response, in 1961 the Belgians endorsed a political maneuver meant to quell Hutu and Tutsi revolutionary thought, open elections. It was quite obvious to all who the winner of such an election would be; the Hutu majority guaranteed the election of the Hutu candidate successfully ousting the Tutsi regime. This began a new period in which the Tutsi experienced similar acts of repression as was previously perpetrated upon the Hutu. As a result, the Tutsi were given little political representation and educational opportunity. The situation was so bad as to require the use of affirmative action policies which only worsened the inequity between the two groups and strengthened their sense of otherness (Mamdani, 2001).

In 1961 the switch in political power allowed the Hutu to seek social reparations for historical wrongdoings; in 1963 the Rwandan army carried out the mass execution of approximately 10,000 Tutsi (Hatzfeld, 2005; Prunier, 1995). This was in response to the return of Tutsi exiles that had launched a military operation against the newly elected regime. This same group of exiles was later referred to as Inyenzi or cockroaches by the Hutu. These attacks only resulted in increased support for the Kayibanda regime, an outcome that the President would try to reproduce in the early 70's with the massacre of even more Tutsi (Prunier, 1995).

Approximately 700,000 Tutsi fled Rwanda in response to political persecution by the Kayibanda regime (Prunier, 1995).

In 1973, Major Juvenal Habyarimana overthrew the Kayibanda regime in a military coup d'état. This was followed by his election to the presidency in 1978. At the beginning of his rule, Rwanda and the Tutsi experienced a moment of reprieve at the ousting of the Kayibanda regime. Yet, the political repression of the Tutsi continued, "there would not be a single Tutsi bourgmestre or prefet, there was only one Tutsi officer in the whole army, there were two Tutsi members of parliament out of seventy and there was only one Tutsi minister out of a cabinet of between twenty-five and thirty members" (Prunier, 2005). Although violence against the Tutsi subsided, Habyarimana mostly maintained the status quo originated by President Kayibanda. Many of the quotas involving Tutsi employment and opportunities in education remained. In the early 90's Habyarimana's inaction would lead to a series of military attacks by the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), a group of politically radical Tutsi mercenaries. In response, the Habyarimana regime organized the Interahamwe, an extremist Hutu militia. Ensuing violence between the two groups led to the signing of the peace agreement, the Arusha Accords, in 1993 between the governing regime and the RPF. However, subjugation of the Tutsi continued, and ethnic tension and political unrest escalated. In April of 1994, President Habyarimana's plane was shot down via a missile, reportedly by Hutu extremists, and the genocide officially began.

Proposed Causes of the Rwandan Genocide

Over the years researchers have explored the causes of the Rwandan genocide. There are three widely accepted explanations for what occurred; a focus on external influences, both

colonial and neo-colonial; a focus on domestic causes, including demographic factors and ethnic conflict; and a psychosocial account based on the presumed social conformism and obedience of Rwandans (Hintjens, 2009). Author Jared Diamond hypothesizes that difficult circumstances can lead to individual and group polarization, particularly instances of drought and/or famine (Diamond, 1999). According to his piece, "Malthus in Africa: Rwanda's Genocide," food scarcity in Rwanda may have been a leading cause of the Genocide as Hutu participants viewed the murder of the Tutsi as a means to bolster their prosperity (Diamond, 2005). Africa's burgeoning population and its relation to the continent's inability to produce food cannot be ignored. Africa's population growth is much like compound interest, where each generation is building upon the previous one so the population is increasing exponentially with every new birth. Soon it will become Malthusian in that it is unable to produce enough sustenance in keeping with its dramatic growth in population (Diamond, 2005). As one of the highest ranked in population density for the continent, Rwanda is and was no exception. Moreover, despite having utilized the more productive of food crops such as corn and beans, the World Bank cited Rwanda as one of the poorest producers of food in the Sub-Sahara (Mamdani, 2001). Regrettably, Rwandans failed to advance their productive capabilities; using methods that were often counterproductive to the maintenance of their agricultural output. Oftentimes plants were not rotated and the soil quality became so poor as to threaten the success of entire crops. This left the populace hungry, and hunger could have proven a strong impetus for violent behaviors.

According to a study conducted by Catherine Andre and Jean Platteau, there was a large population of Rwandan youth left with little choice to move out and start anew. At the time,

the average farm size in Rwanda was .89 acres in 1988 and by 1993 it decreased to .72 acres. This was coupled with a population of over 1740 people per square mile. An unfortunate consequence was a high number of men and women between the ages of 20-25 still living at home with their parents. Between the years of 1988 and 1993 the estimated percentage of these men living at home rose from 71% to 100% this is in comparison to women who during that same period rose from 39% to 67%. Further investigation by Andrea and Platteau unearthed a propensity for conflict surrounding the acquisition of land. On average, households reported at least one conflict a year that required the help of an outside arbiter. Interestingly, 43% of those total conflicts were disputes over land (Diamond, 2005). This was no surprise as the land had proven to have a decreasing return as each new generation of crops only exacerbated the problem of soil quality. This being the case, the murder of a Tutsi often led to the acquisition of his her property by the Hutu perpetrator. Oftentimes, particularly during the genocide, Hutu killers were not only allowed the spoils of the kill but also were doubly rewarded by the government. Therefore, land and property acquisition could have proven to be a serious motivation to murder (Gourevitch, 1998). However, critics would agree that there is little proof that people were strictly killing out of greed. Although it is understandable that food scarcity may breed aggressive behaviors, it still fails to address something as dramatic as genocide.

Allison Desforges, one of the most popular authors of the Rwandan genocide hypothesizes that politicians pursued ethnic violence in response to a perceived threat to their power. Concerns over the lack of food and political unrest led to the creation of a scapegoat, a contributing factor to the emergence of genocidal behaviors that was first introduced and

perpetuated by the political powers of the time. Portraying the Tutsi as the scapegoat helped to re-direct political discontent and introduced genocide as the ultimate solution. Ironically, genocide during the planting season only succeeded in decreasing the food production capability of the country, further deepening the problem of scarcity (Hintjens, 1999). Not to mention, the Rwandan's possessed an unquestioning obedience, as the mwamis of old had a particular leadership style that assumed, "When the ruler gives an order, he must be obeyed, not because his order falls into the sphere over which he has authority, but simply because he is the ruler" (Prunier, 1995). Deforges' theory is supportive of the concept of a norm entrepreneur, as she postulates that the political authority pursued the genocide in response to political instability.

Another proposed cause of the Rwandan genocide was the culmination of ethnic hatreds. Clearly, the separateness with which the groups operated coupled with the domination of first the Hutu and then the Tutsi lead to polarized attitudes and the emergence of violent behaviors. However, similar conflicts have not resulted in such an extreme as was the Rwandan genocide. Arguments could be made that ethnically based class distinctions have existed for centuries and genocide is largely a historical rarity. The actions of the Belgians only succeeded in widening the difference in class between the Hutus and the Tutsis. Prior to colonization such a distinction was not so clearly made. This set the state for the breeding of class disparity. Although the ethnic division between Hutus and the Tutsis was not the sole cause of the genocide, it was a significant contributing factor to its creation. The aforementioned causes helped to form an atmosphere that was conducive to the emergence of

genocide; however, it took the introduction of norm entrepreneurs in order to intensify ethnic polarization to the point that genocide occurred.

Genocide Begins with the Introduction of the Norm Entrepreneur

In 1994 there was a 6 week period during which over 800,000 or 11% of the Rwandan population was murdered (Mamdani, 2001). The motivations behind such an atrocity may never be fully understood. Clearly, as history indicates, the atmosphere was primed for the emergence of genocidal behaviors. Ethnic tension and disparity had been mounting since Belgian colonial rule in the early 1920's. I argue that each of these causes played a role, however it was the norm entrepreneur that was the key to the exacerbation of said causes and inevitably the catalyst needed for genocide to occur. Following, are the first seven of the eight stages of genocide as put forth by Dr. Gregory Stanton of Genocide Watch and the role the norm entrepreneur played in Rwanda in either creating or worsening ethnic polarization during each of those stages.

Stage 1: Classification and Stage 2: Symbolization

According to Dr. Gregory Stanton, classification is the act of creating groups along ethnic, religious, national, or racial lines. Symbolization is applying names or symbols to those classifications. As such, both stages are integrally tied. For instance, in Rwanda the issuance of ID cards coupled with such visible markers as skin color, would later be the primary way in which persons were identified for murder during the genocide. Quick and easy, there was no discussion over an individual's ethnicity as the cards indicated his/her racial identity. The ID cards not only signified ethnic distinctness but also symbolically created a marker with which individuals could be recognized for dispatch. Additionally, such myths as the Hamitic Hypothesis

that had worked in favor of Tutsi rule inevitably resulted in their death. The Hypothesis came to symbolize that the Tutsi were not indigenous to the area, the “Hamitic discourse was reversed: from the status of *race superieur* to that of *minorite d’envahisseur*, or foreigners in their own country” (Branstatter, 1997). According to Gerard Prunier in *The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide*, “The newly redefined Rwandese Tutsi aristocracy was particularly sensitive to the ‘scientific’ guarantees which could be found for its’ ‘nobility’. Even today, among exiled Tutsi, the myth of Egyptian origins still survives in the heads of people who are now its victims after having thought they were its beneficiaries” (Prunier, 1995). Interestingly, Prunier (1995) observes that there is little evidence of the existence of violence between the Tutsi and Hutu prior to colonization by the Belgians. In both cases, the Belgians played the role of norm entrepreneur. Their authority in these matters, gave such declarations a commanding quality.

The idea that the Tutsi were alien to Rwanda was utilized in a hate speech given by Leon Mugesera, a Hutu political authority and vice president of the National Republican Movement for Democracy and Development (MRND), during which he demanded that the Tutsi be, “sent back home to Ethiopia where they supposedly came from. Their destination was to be reached ‘via [the] Nyaborongo [river] on an express trip” (Chretien, 1995; Article 19, 1995). Ironically, during the genocide, “tens of thousands of Rwandans’ dead bodies did float down the Nyaborongo river, almost all of them Tutsi or part Tutsi” (Chretien, 1995). As a norm entrepreneur, Mugesera indicated that the Tutsi were unwanted and were different from the Hutu majority, “We the people are obliged to take responsibility ourselves and wipe out this scum. Their home is Ethiopia” (Mugitoni, 2010). Mugesera’s words took on a commanding quality, especially if one were to consider the Rwandans propensity to obey. His words relieved

the Hutus' of any and all reasons not to kill the Tutsi. This phenomenon is similar to that experienced in both Milgram's shock experiment and Zimbardo's SPE. As a politically powerful individual, Mugesera, took on the role of norm entrepreneur. He not only indicated there was a difference between the Hutu and Tutsi, but also signified the necessity of their expulsion from Rwanda. By demonstrating a tangible dissimilarity between the Hutu and Tutsi, i.e. the Tutsis' foreign status, a wedge was driven between the two groups that allowed for the development of polarized attitudes as was seen in Jane Elliott's experiment as well as Zimbardo's SPE.

The myth surrounding Tutsi superiority would be the basis upon which the Tutsi conspiracy was created. According to President Habyarimana, the "little man" or Hutu were constantly being oppressed and exploited by the "parasitic traders and misguided intellectuals" or Tutsi (Newbury, 1992; Van der Meeren, 1996; Hintjens, 1999). Habyarimana blamed the economic crises on these "traders, merchants and intellectuals," professions in which the Tutsi tended to specialize (Hintjens, 1999). Words such as these became symbolic of the Tutsi, all of which were negatively connotative descriptors (Hintjens, 1999). By creating such terminology, Habyarimana was able to euphemize the idea of elimination. He successfully removed the concept of the individual and created a group which he could then scapegoat. Habyarimana felt close to the agriculturalist Hutu peasantry and often romanticized himself as one with the people. In contrast, he believed the Tutsi were more closely related to the colonizing Belgians, and as such he associated them with the feudal class. He saw them as "petty bourgeois" (Verwimp, 2000). In a speech made at the National University in Butare President Habyarimana stated:

"The coup d'état that we did, was above all a moral coup d'état. And what we want, and we would consider our action as failed if we do not reach this goal,

what we want, is to ban once and for all, the spirit of intrigue and feudal mentality. What we want is to give back labor and individual yield its real value. Because, we say it again, the one who refuses to work is harmful to society” (Habyarimana, 1973).

An analysis of this excerpt is provided by the author Verwimp (2000),

“(1) he says he did not engage in a coup d’etat, but a moral coup d’etat. Something of a higher, divine order. He sees himself as a person of historic importance. (2) His coup d’etat has a goal, an objective. Habyarimana literally says that he would consider his coup d’etat to have failed if he did not reach that goal. This speaker clearly has embarked on a mission. (3) In the next part one learns what the objective is, namely to ban, once and for all, the spirit of intrigue and feudal mentality. This is the most important part. These are exactly the words the regime used when it was talking about the Tutsi. The Tutsi were considered the feudalists, the former masters of the Hutu peasants. You cannot trust them, the Hutu ideology accuses (intrigue); they are always plotting against the Hutu and working for the benefit of their own ethnic group” (Verwimp, 2000).

However subtle, Habyarimana’s statements fulfill the definition of hate speech as discussed in the article by Vollhardt et. al (2007). Following is a deconstruction of Habyarimana’s speech in relation to the framework set forth by the authors:

1. Contains instigating elements of continuum of violence
 - a. Distinction between us and them. People referred to by group membership, information about origin used to label them as foreigners. Achieved by pointing out affiliation with region, nationality, religion, or language group different than the majority of listeners
 - b. Individuals/group blamed for misfortune of country (historical/present difficulties)
 - c. Accused of disloyalty, treachery, alliance with other countries (particularly with the enemy) or the previous regime, implying threat and appealing to emotions of listeners (Vollhardt et. al (2007).

Habyarimana clearly creates an Us vs Them mentality with his comment, “...what we want, is to ban once and for all, the spirit of intrigue and feudal mentality...Because we say it again, the one who refuses to work is harmful to society.” This statement euphemistically references the

Tutsi as the 'feudal mentality' which he wishes to ban. Next he scapegoats the Tutsi as a problem that is "harmful to society." As established in earlier paragraphs, Habyarimana believes only that the agriculturalists or Hutu are contributors to the economy. Since a distinction has been made that the Tutsi are generally the "traders, merchants and intellectuals" it is implied that they are the ones hurting society and subsequently Rwanda's potential to flourish. This idea is directly tied to Vollhardt et. al (2007) concept of scapegoating, as the Tutsi are seen as a problem for which a solution must exist. Also, the connection made between the Tutsi and the early colonizing powers' 'feudal mentality' essentially accuses the group of "disloyalty, treachery, [and] alliance with other countries" (Vollhardt et. al, (2007).

After further deconstructing Habyarimana's speech it is clear his words fall under the category of hate speech and are punishable as they are inciting genocidal action. Upon further review, Habyarimana's speech fulfills many of the authors' requirements.

1. Suggested strategies do not offer real/constructive solutions to existing problems, and serve self-interests of speaker and/or his group while only harming another group
 - a. Speaker attains direct political gain and increase in power by harming target
 - b. Focus on individuals/groups rather than issue
 - c. Focus on alleged source of problems and blaming targeted group/individual, accuser offers simplistic solutions and doesn't take into account complexity/multi-faceted nature of societal problems. Promised solution not a real solution
 - d. Offered solutions destructive rather than constructive in nature, based on exclusion of certain individuals/group from political power/society in general
 - e. Communicated ideas/suggested solutions for problems not inclusive of all society, but instead benefit a specific group while excluding others

Habyarimana's comments do not offer a constructive solution to the problems he describes. In fact, his solution is to, "ban once and for all, the spirit of intrigue and feudal mentality." This is a direct attempt to focus the problems of the economy on the Tutsi as a group rather than

address solvable issues. Another obvious result of the elimination of the Tutsi is a strengthening of the Habyarimana regime, “speaker attains direct political gain and increase in power by harming target” (Vollhardt et. al, 2007). During this time there is a democratization movement going on in Rwanda that demands the inclusion of minority political groups such as the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF). By eliminating the Tutsi, he thereby eliminates his competition. He also succeeds in creating a scapegoat, a tactic utilized by many administrations when support seems to wane due to issues of economic crisis, resource scarcity, and/ or institutional weakness. The solution seems simple enough; eliminate the Tutsi ‘threat.’

As a primary norm entrepreneur, Habyarimana’s attempts to symbolize the Tutsi conspiracy allowed the Hutu to distance themselves from the impending genocide. In keeping with methods utilized during other genocides, creating euphemistic terms for concepts such as murder and ethnic polarization allowed the Hutu to focus on the ‘final solution’ rather than get caught up in the conflicting morality of taking a life. Symbols also allowed quick recall of emotions that had come to be attached to said words or images. By repeatedly referring to the Tutsi as ‘feudal’ or ‘traders, merchants, and intellectuals,’ the Tutsi were immediately called to mind without the norm entrepreneur having to fully divulge his/her actual intentions. On the surface, the speech seems innocent enough; however, one must consider that Habyarimana was under the microscope that was the Arusha Accords, an internationally publicized event intended to bring peace among the Hutu and Tutsi. The study I helped to conduct on hate speech supports the claim that such techniques may cause the development of dehumanizing attitudes towards the out-group while promoting an atmosphere of fearfulness, which in the case of genocide may lead to the emergence of violent behavior.

The composition of the groups, as arbitrary as they were, created polarizing attitudes similar to those that resulted from both Jane Elliott's *Blue-Eyed Brown-Eyed Experiment* and Zimbardo's *Stanford Prison Experiment*. Such division created anonymity among individuals within the group, and participants in the genocide were most likely affected by a perceived lack of consequences similar to those experienced in Zimbardo's study, *Diary of an Abandoned Automobile*. The efforts put forth by the Belgians to establish Tutsi superiority gave the norm entrepreneurs of the genocide ample ammunition with which to turn the Hutu against the Tutsi. The stage was set for the exacerbation of already polarized attitudes leading up to and during the Rwandan genocide.

Stage 3: Dehumanization

An important aspect of any genocide is the dehumanization of the out-group. The in-group, composed of mostly normal everyday people, needs some impetus to commit mass murder. This is where a norm entrepreneur, as an authority figure, introduces examples of how an individual may behave. For instance, Pauline Nyiramasuhuko, the national Minister of Family and Women's Affairs, ordered the rape and murder of Tutsi women and children after luring them into a trap with the promise of safety. These rapes were perpetrated in front of an audience as if to say this is the way Hutus are to behave and Tutsis are to be treated. Nyiramasuhuko went as far as to order her son Shalom to join in. A child at the time, he later recounted that his mother gave him "permission" to rape the Tutsi women (Zimbardo, 2007). This demonstrates the power of obedience to authority, a response similar to those recorded in Milgram's experiment. The political authority held by Nyiramasuhuko helped to intensify the view that mistreatment of the Tutsi would have no consequences; in fact the government

encouraged it. Her endorsement of such dehumanizing actions as sexual torture allowed the Hutu to suspend their feelings of humanness towards the Tutsi and encouraged their violent behavior. Such responses were also apparent in the SPE. The guards, like the participants in the scenario above, were drawn into their roles, at times exceeding expectations. It is evident that the dehumanization that took place helped to disengage the feelings of the in-group towards the out-group, "I had taken the life of a neighbor. I mean, at the fatal instant I did not see in him what he had been before; I struck someone who was no longer either close or strange to me, who wasn't exactly ordinary anymore, I'm saying like the people you meet every day. His features were indeed similar to those of the person I knew, but nothing firmly reminded me that I had lived beside him for a long time" (Hatzfeld, 2005). As with any warlike situation, murder was expected therefore those in the in-group had to desensitize themselves so as to overcome their natural moral conscience.

In 1991, Habyarimana faked an attack on his men and blamed it on the RPF. He then used the attack as an excuse to massacre Tutsis. When civilians and investors started to voice concern at the amount of killing, Habyarimana's response as a norm entrepreneur was to hold meetings during which the Tutsis were described as being devils (Hilsum, 1994). In addition, persons at the meeting were often given the order to kill Tutsis as part of a government assignment (Hilsum, 1994). This seems strikingly analogous to the experiences in Milgram's shock experiment. It is easy to see the correlation between a government that extols the killing of Tutsis and the populace's propensity to kill. The Hutus had no fear of reprisal as the government was condoning the murder of Tutsis.

Still other successful attempts at the dehumanization of the Tutsi would include President Habyarimana's creation and endorsement of propagandist institutions. For instance, the presidentially created newspaper "Kangura" extolled the killing of the Tutsi. Following the release of the newspaper's editor Ngeze from prison, the newspaper took on an even more propagandist approach to the Hutu/Tutsi conflict. With the support of the administration the newspaper ran stories "proving" a Tutsi supremacist conspiracy. It published the top ten rules in dealing with the Tutsi. The "commandments" decried marriage to a Tutsi, the employment of a Tutsi, and the participation in financial dealings with a Tutsi (Gourevitch, 1998). This newspaper was run in conjunction with a politically supported radio station called *Radio Television Libre des Mille Collines* (RTLM) or One Thousand Hills Free Radio (Hilsum, 1994). Both of these media outlets were found guilty of incitement to genocide (International, 2003). RTLM espoused hate messages condemning the Tutsi as "cockroaches that have infested Rwanda and must be eliminated" stating, "You cockroaches must know you are made of flesh! We won't let you kill! We will kill you!" (Ahluwalia, 1997; Ransdell 1994). This illustrates the animalization of the Tutsi, a form of dehumanization that truly delineates human and non-human. The broadcasts outright discussed the murder of the Tutsi as it demanded the, "filling [of] the graves that are still half-empty," stating that "the children must also be killed" (Destexhe, 1994). Wilson Rutayisire, director of the new Rwanda government information service stated, "The message was that a Tutsi can be killed and you have nothing to lose. In fact, you have everything to gain" (Ransdell, 1994). Endorsement of murder by such prestigious persons as were these norm entrepreneurs indicated it was a command and the Hutus were meant to comply. Once again, the similarities in the studies mentioned previously and the

attitudes and responses of the Hutus are apparent. In the case of Milgram's experiment, respondents seemed to agree that the harming of the learner was out of their control. It is not unlikely that this same opinion was held by many of the Hutu.

Stage 4: Organization

Prior to the extermination of the Tutsi it was important to organize how the mass murder would occur. Habyarimana controlled two political groups, the MRND and the Committee for the Defense of the Republic (CDR) (Hilsum, 1994). Both were Hutu dominated extremist groups that were trained by both the Presidential Guard and the Rwandan Army at the request of Habyarimana himself (Ransdell, 1994). These organizations then established two militias, the Interhamwe (those who attack together) and the Impuzamugambi (those who have the same goal); together their participants numbered approximately 50,000. (Ahluwalia, 1997). Again, each group received instruction and arms from the Rwandan Army. Such arms included grenades, AK-47 assault rifles, knives, clubs, bows and arrows, and machetes (Hilsum, 1994). The arming of the militias was perpetrated by the President himself as he endorsed the distribution of over 581,000 machetes (Diamond, 2005).

The Interhamwe and Impuzamugambi played important roles in the organization of the genocide. In fact, Interahamwe's chief, Kajuga, transformed the CDR into a "boys' club-cum-death squad" (Ransdell, 1994). Directly following the news that Habyarimana's plane was shot down, these groups organized a series of roadblocks intended to capture fleeing Tutsi and murder them. In preparation for the genocide caches of weapons were hidden with their whereabouts disclosed only moments following the President's death (Hilsum, 1994). The endorsement of each of these organizations by the Habyarimana regime was no secret. Many

were aware that the CDR was the extremist right hand of the President himself. His inaction at their acts of dehumanization and murder indicated that such behavior was to be mimicked. The creation and maintenance of such organizations indicated the further dehumanization of the out-group, as their role was clearly the elimination of all Tutsi. The affects of leading by example were experienced during Jane Elliott's experiment. Her comments clearly dehumanized the out-group and were seen as an introduction of a norm and an example of what was appropriate. The statements she made allowed the children to suspend their current reality such that they began to take on the roles of both the in-group and out-group. This is similar to what many Hutu may have experienced as Habyarimana and others endorsed the extermination of the Tutsi population.

Stage 5: Polarization

With the bloodless coup and the induction of the Habyarimana regime in 1978, it seemed the Tutsi would experience a reprieve from the harsh treatment of the Kayibanda administration. On the contrary, the Tutsi were instead subjugated to even harsher treatment, and inevitably the attempted genocide of their people (Verwimp, 2000). In an effort to keep himself from close examination, Habyarimana would turn the attention of the Hutu populace towards the subjugation of the Tutsi minority. Following a failed attempt at invasion into Northern Rwanda by the RPF, Habyarimana responded with the mass murder of Hutu dissidents and Tutsi from all over the country (Verwimp, 2000). Again in 1990 Habyarimana faked an attack on the capital in an attempt to further drive the Hutu and Tutsi apart. He successfully created a supposed Tutsi threat (Verwimp, 2000). This technique creates a scapegoat of the out-group such that the murder of said individuals appears to be the solution. As a norm

entrepreneur, Habyarimana clearly played an important role in the polarization of the Hutu and Tutsi.

There was also the revival of a myth concerning the Bahima conspiracy called the Simbinaniye/Micombero plot which stated that the Tutsi intended to kill off the Hutu in order to ensure a Tutsi political majority (Hintjens, 1999). RTML ran numerous broadcasts stating that the Tutsi were a political threat (Hilsum, 1994). The Hutu were equated with a democratic majority or “majority people (rubanda nyamwinshi) and the Tutsi with an aristocratic and feudal minority” (Brandstetter, 1997). The attempt by the regime to alienate Tutsi from the community was deemed the Demokarasi project and Rwanda was termed the “Land of the Hutu” (Brandstetter, 1997). This was further supported by the distribution of a government pamphlet entitled,

“Livre blanc sur l’agression armée dont le Rwanda a été victime à partir du Octobre 1990 (White book concerning the armed aggression which Rwanda has suffered since October, 1990) which mentions that the Ugandan President Museveni belonged to the ‘Hamitic’ Hima and lists the true motive of the aggressors: [To] set up an extended Hima-Tutsi kingdom in the Bantu area of the Great Lakes region” (Brandstetter, 1997; Chretien, 1991).

Much like the SPE, the creation of such a polarized atmosphere allowed for the emergence of dehumanizing attitudes and genocidal behaviors.

Moreover, Presidential endorsement of the MRND and CDR clearly indicated to the masses Habyarimana’s feeling towards the RPF, and subsequently the Tutsi. During the Arusha Accords the MRND was a signatory while the CDR rejected the agreement entirely. This allowed the President to appear to want peace on the surface, while his militias operated outside the political system to bring the agreement to a standstill. Hutu and Tutsi alike were well aware of the message his actions portrayed, Tutsi were unwanted and attempts at a peaceful agreement

were not only unlikely, they were not a part of his agenda. Polarizing documents circulated throughout the military as well. Authored by the Army chief of staff, the memorandum defined all Tutsi and moderate Hutus as the enemy (Ransdell, 1994). In fact, military officers were strictly denied the opportunity to marry Tutsi women by the political authority (Prunier, 1995).

Stage 6: Preparation

Preparation for the genocide began long before its actual occurrence. The ID cards generated by the Belgians were used as identifying markers; yet this required little effort on the part of the administration and the militias. However, the making and distribution of death lists along with the locations of the individuals required much pre-planning. These lists were in circulation long before the downing of President Habyarimana's plane. The lists identified Hutu moderates, opponents to the Habyarimana administration, human rights activists, and of course politically influential Tutsi. The speed with which the genocide was executed clearly indicates that it was premeditated, reportedly by a group of people close to the President (Destexhe, 1994). Over and over again, the Habyarimana regime endorsed the murder of the Tutsi. In fact, many persons of power were involved in the crime of incitement to genocide. Individuals such as the prefect of Kibuye, three bourgmestres, two councilors and two prominent businessmen were all tried for their criminal involvement (Thronton, 1999). One Rwandan recalls, "The thoughtfulness of the authorities ripened it naturally, and then it was proposed to us. As it was their only proposal and it promised to be final, we seized the opportunity. We knew full well what had to be done, and we set to doing it without flinching, because it seemed like the perfect solution" (Hatzfeld, 2005). Again, participants of the

genocide may have experienced reactions similar to those exhibited in Milgram's shock experiment. Obedience to the Rwandan authority was second nature.

Stage 7: Extermination

The Rwandan genocide resulted in the death of hundreds of thousands in as little as three month's time. Later recognized as genocide, academics are unable to come to a consensus as to its cause. It should be considered that instead of one ultimate cause, the Rwandan genocide was a result of many interworking pre-existing conditions that were primed such that with the introduction of norm entrepreneurs genocide occurred. The existence of the aforementioned stages created a polarized atmosphere. Norm entrepreneurs exacerbated such stages which created an environment conducive to the appearance of violent behaviors. Responses documented by participants in the genocide support the existence of norm entrepreneurs. These responses, in conjunction with the studies previously discussed, help to indicate that actions perpetrated by norm entrepreneurs during and preceding the genocide had an effect on individual and group behavior.

Some who participated did so out of a morbid sense of duty, "We were doing a job to order. We were lining up behind everyone's enthusiasm. We gathered into teams on the soccer field and went out hunting as kindred spirits" (Zimbardo, 2007). These participants often made comparisons between the completion of a job and the killing of Tutsis, "They would give us orders about the killings and our itineraries for the day, and off we went... We got on fine, except for the days when there was a huge fuss, when Interahamwe reinforcements came in from the surrounding areas in motor vehicles to lead the bigger operations. Because those young hotheads ran us ragged on the job... Everyone was hired at the same level for a single

job—to crush all the cockroaches” (Hatzfeld, 2005). Such responses parallel those documented in Milgram’s study. There existed a need to be obedient to the authority, the Interahamwe, as one Hutu recalls, “misinformed guys had come to the meeting without bringing a machete or some other cutting tool. The Interahamwe lectured them: they said it would pass this once but had better not happen twice” (Hatzfeld, 2005). Even more disturbing was the use of a whistle to signify the end of the ‘work’ day, it started at approximately 9am and ended around 5pm.

Others murdered out of fear, “Jean-Baptiste, if you want to save the life of your wife Speciose Mukandahunga, you have to cut this man right now” (Hatzfeld, 2005). Those who remained killed out of a misplaced sense of blame,

“Our Tutsi neighbors, we knew they were not guilty of no misdoing, but we thought all Tutsis at fault for our constant troubles. We no longer looked at them one by one, we no longer stopped to recognize them as they had been not even as colleagues. They had become a threat greater than all we had experienced together, more important than our way of seeing things in the community. That’s how we reasoned and how we killed at the same time” (Zimbardo, 2007).

Clearly, the Hutu had entirely dehumanized their victims, “We no longer saw a human being when we turned up a Tutsi in the swamps. I mean a person like us, sharing similar thought and feelings. The hunt was savage, the hunters were savage, the prey was savage—savagery took over the mind” (Zimbardo, 2007).

The ease with which any individual may perpetuate actions of evil is evidenced by this quote by a surviving Tutsi woman,

“Before, I knew that a man could kill another man, because it happens all the time. Now I know that even the person with whom you’ve shared food, or with whom you’ve slept, even he can kill you with no trouble. The closest neighbor can kill you with his teeth: that is what I have learned since the genocide, and my eyes no longer gaze the same on the face of the world” (Zimbardo, 2007).

Such reactions seem to support Dr. Zimbardo's Lucifer Effect. In mass, ordinary people participated in unsubstantiated acts of evil. The events in Rwanda, coupled with many other instances of genocide, are merely a study in the banality of evil on a countrywide scale. Unfortunately, the lack of intervention at earlier stages of the genocide may have resulted in the death of hundreds of thousands.

Summation and Future Implications

The creation of ethnic and racial disparity between the Hutu and the Tutsi was a precipitating factor to the genocide. It was important that a distinction was made so that an Us vs. Them mentality could prevail. This difference was exacerbated by the social elevation of one group above the other. The suppression of first the Hutu and later the Tutsi only rigidified the tensions between the ethnic groups. This was a direct result of the Belgians and their successful manipulation of both Hutus and Tutsis in an attempt to ensure demobilization of the colonized masses. The Belgians played the role of norm entrepreneur during the earlier stages of polarization between the ethnic groups.

The problem of ethnic and racial difference was only escalated by the conditions of Rwanda and its inability to sustain such a sizable population. It is not unlikely that people, having been told there were no consequences, saw genocide as a means to bolster prosperity. Clearly there was a severe economic strain and scarcity was not a possibility but a certainty. Hunger was coupled with fear as there was also a likelihood that if you were Hutu or Twa you could just have easily been killed having been labeled a dissident. Although such instances such as ethnic disparity and food scarcity created a super charged atmosphere, it was the norm

entrepreneur that lit the spark that ignited the materialization of murderous behaviors. As a counter to polarization, leadership should have intervened in an attempt to create a more unified state; instead such attitudes were reinforced through speeches made by the local authorities, particularly President Habyarimana. There has historically been tension between many ethnic and racial groups; however there has not always been the occurrence of genocide. What makes people accept the murder of a group as a potential *modus operandi*? The studies cited were intentionally meant to create a base upon which the theory of a norm entrepreneur might rest. Clearly such experiments have demonstrated the likelihood of an individual or individuals to drastically alter group behavior. Matthew Hoffman attempted to study the theory itself at its most simplistic of form. His experiment supported the ability of a norm entrepreneur to affect group choice at its most basic of levels.

The concept that authority figures can have an effect on group attitudes prior to and during genocide is not necessarily novel; however, my research postulates that the existence of a norm entrepreneur is possibly common among all genocide. Regardless of the underlying causes, the norm entrepreneur aids the creation of norms that make murder an acceptable alternative. Genocide is not something that arises out of the blue, but is rather a suggested and evolutionary ideology that requires mass acceptance. Hopefully, the indication that a norm entrepreneur is necessary, coupled with an established framework for how such an individual operates, will allow institutions such as the UN to more efficiently intervene in pre-genocidal situations. This thesis calls to question; do we sacrifice one for the benefit of all?

Although this paper does not fully address the necessity of a norm entrepreneur in all instances of genocide, that would require extensive research spanning genocide throughout the

century, it does introduce the hypothesis. Future study would require that a case be addressed in which conditions such as those experienced in Rwanda are evident with the exception of the norm entrepreneur however genocide fails to occur. A possible example would be the internment of the Japanese during WWII. Japanese Americans were corralled, denied basic civil rights, dehumanized through mass distribution of hate propaganda, and largely treated as subhuman, yet genocide did not occur. The circumstances seemed primed for the emergence of violence; however the possible inaction of prominent political norm entrepreneurs failed to create the necessary parameters that would have allowed the anonymity and lack of consequence needed for such evil to manifest.

Works Cited

- Ahluwalia, Pal. 1997. "The Rwandan genocide: Exile and nationalism reconsidered." *Social Identities*. 3.3: 499-520.
- Arendt, Hannah. 2006. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. 1st. New York: Penguin Classics.
- Article 19. 1996. *Broadcasting Genocide: Censorship, propaganda & state-sponsored violence in Rwanda*. October, London: Article 19.
- Bandura, A. 2002. "Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency." *Journal of Moral Education*. 31: 101-119.
- Barnard, A. 2001. "On the relationship between technique and dehumanization. In R. C. Loesin Ed. *Advancing technology, caring, and nursing*. Pp 96-105. Westport, CT: Auburn House.
- Bar-Tal, D. 2000. *Shared beliefs in a society: Social psychological analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brandstetter, Anna-Maria. 1997. "Ethnic or Socio-Economic Conflict? Political Interpretations of the Rwandan Crisis." *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*. 4: 427-499.
- Chretien, J. 1991. "Presse libre' et propande raciste au Rwanda: Kangura et 'les 10 commandements du Hutu." *Politique Africaine*. 42: 109-120.
- Chretien, J. 1995. *Rwanda: Les medias du genocide*. Paris: Karthala.
- Dawson, Kristen. 2011. "War, Gender, and the Polarization Process: Gender as an Intervening Variable in Attitude Formation toward Outgroups." Utah State University.

- Diamond, Jared, 2005. "Malthus in Africa: Rwanda's Genocide." *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. NY: Viking. Pp 313.
- Diamond, Jared. 1999. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: W. Norton and Company.
- Destexhe, Alain. 1994. "The third genocide." *Foreign Policy*. 97: 3-18.
- "Eye of the Storm." 1970. *ABC News*. ABC. Television. 11 Oct 2011.
- Ferraro, Kenneth. 1995. *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization and Risk*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* . 59.4: 887-918.
- Garofalo, James. 1981. "The fear of crime: Causes and consequences." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*. 72.2: 839-857. Print.
- Gourevitch, Philip. 1998. *We wish to Inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families: Stories from Rwanda*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux. Pp 94-95
- Habyarimana, J. 1973. *Discours, Messages et Entretiens*. Kigali: ORINFOR.
- Haslam, Nick. 2006. Dehumanization: An Integrative Review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 10.3: 252-264.
- Haslam, Nick, Yoshihisa Kashima, and Stephen Loughnan. 2008. "Subhuman, Inhuman, and Superhuman: Contrasting Humans with Nonhumans in Three Cultures." *Social Cognition*. 26.2 248-258.
- Hatzfeld, Jean. 2005. *Machete Season: The Killers in Rwanda Speak*. 1st . New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

- Hilsum, Lindsey. 1994. "Settling scores." *African Report*. 39.3: 13-18.
- Hintjens, Helen M. (1999). Explaining the 1994 genocide in Rwanda. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 37(2), 241-286.
- Hintjens, Helen. 2009. "Reconstructing Political Identities in Rwanda." *After Genocide: Transitional Justice, Post-Conflict Reconstruction, and Reconciliation in Rwanda and Beyond*. Ed Philip Clark and Zachary Kaufman. 1st. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hoffman, Matthew. 2000. "Entrepreneurs and Norm Dynamics: An Agent-Based Model of the Norm Life Cycle." *Workshop on Political Theory and Policy Analysis*. Indiana University. Web. 25 Sep 2011.
<<http://www.indiana.edu/~workshop/papers/hoffman091200.pdf>>.
- International Law – Genocide – U.N. Tribunal Finds That Mass Media Hate Speech Constitutes Genocide, Incitement to Genocide, and Crimes Against Humanity. Prosecutor v. Nahimana, Barayagwiza, and Ngeze (Media Case), Case No. ICTR-99-52-T (Int'l Crim. Trib. For Rwanda Trial Chamber I Dec, 3, 2003).
- Kelman, H.C. 1976. "Violence without restraint: Reflections on the dehumanization of victims and victimizers." In G. M. Kren and L. H. Rappoport Eds. *Varieties of psychohistory*. Pp. 282-314. New York: Springer.
- Kohm, Steven. 2009. "Spatial Dimensions of Fear in a High-Crime Community: Fear of Crime or Fear of Disorder?." *Revue canadienne de criminologie et de justice pénale*. doi:10.3138/cjccj.51.1.1: 1-31.
- Leets, Laura. "Experiencing Hate Speech: Perceptions and Responses to Anti-Semitism and Antigay Speech." *Journal of social Issues*. 58.2: 341-361.

- Mamdani, Mahmood. 2001. *When Victims Become Killers*. 1st. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Metzl, Jamie F. 1997. "Information Intervention: When Switching Channels Isn't Enough." *Foreign Affairs*. 76.6: 15-20.
- Milgram, Stanley. 1974. *Obedience to Authority*. 1st. Harper & Row: New York.
- Mugitoni. 2010. "River Nyabarongo and the Hamitic hypothesis: A whirlwind." *New Times* n.d. 14181 n. pag. Web. 8 Nov. 2011. <<http://www.newtimes.co.rw/print.php?issue=14181&print&article=6299>>.
- Nussbaum, M. C. 1999. *Sex and social justice*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- O'Brien, G. V. 2003. "People with cognitive disabilities: The argument from marginal cases and social work ethics." *Social Work*. 48: 331-337.
- Opotow, S. 1990. "Moral exclusion and injustice: An introduction." *Journal of Social Issues*. 46: 1-20.
- Prunier, Gerard. 1995. *The Rwandan Crisis: History of a Genocide*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rajadhyaksha, Meghna. 2006. "Genocide on the Airwaves: An Analysis of the International Law Concerning Radio Jamming." *Journal of Hate Studies*. 5.99: 99-118.
- Ransdell, Eric. 1994. "The wounds of war." *U.S. News & World Report*. 117.21: 67-72.
- Sacco, Vincent. 2005. *When Crime Waves*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Stanton, Gregory. 1998. "Genocide Watch." *The 8 Stages of Genocide*. The International Alliance To End Genocide. Web. 25 Sep 2011. <<http://genocidewatch.org/home.html>>.

- Staub, Ervin. 1989. *The Roots of Evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. (Ed.). 1982. *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, Christopher. 1999. *Sacrifice as Terror: The Rwandan Genocide of 1994*. New York: Oxford International Publishers Ltd.
- Thornton, Brenda Sue. 1999. "The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda: A Report from the Field." *Journal of International Affairs*. 52.2: 639-648.
- Turner, J. 1987. *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Verwimp, Philip. 2000. "Development ideology, the peasantry and genocide: Rwanda represented in Habyarimana's speeches." *Journal of Genocide Research*. 2.3: 325-361.
- Vollhardt, Johanna, Marie Coutin, Ervin Staub, George Weiss, and Johan Deflander. 2007. "Deconstructing Hate Speech in the DRC: A Psychological Media Sensitization Campaign." *Journal of Hate Studies*. 5.1:15-35.
- Voth, Ben, and Aaron Noland. 2007. "Argumentation and the International Problem of Genocide." *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate*. 28: 38-46.
- Warr, Mark. 2000. "Fear of Crime in the United States: Avenue for Research and Policy." In D. Duffee Ed. *Measurement and Analysis of Crime and Justice*. Washington DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Zimbardo, Philip. 2007. *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil*. 1st. New York: Random House.

Zvagulis, Peter. 2010. "Blaming the Scapegoat." *Genocide and Oppression*. Autumn: 7-15. Nb

Appendix A

Questionnaire: We would like to ask you a number of questions designed to find out your attitudes towards three groups: Al Qaeda, Muslims, and undocumented immigrants. Please circle only one response for each statement. The numbers next to the different responses are there just to facilitate coding of the answers. When you are finished, bring the form to the front and exit the room.

About Al Qaeda, I consider myself

- Very well informed-0 Moderately informed-1 Poorly informed-2 Not informed at all-3

About Muslims, I consider myself

- Very well informed-0 Moderately informed-1 Poorly informed-2 Not informed at all-3

About undocumented immigrants, I consider myself

- Very well informed-0 Moderately informed-1 Poorly informed-2 Not informed at all-3

Compared to other groups, undocumented immigrants are:

- Very inferior -0 Inferior-1 Slightly inferior-2 Of equal status-3 Slightly superior-4 Superior-5 Very superior-6

My feelings towards members of Al Qaeda can best be described as:

- Love-0 Strong like-1 Like-2 Neutral-3 Dislike-4 Strong dislike-5 hatred-6

Muslims are demons.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Muslims make choices based on moral principles even though those principles may differ from my own.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Members of Al Qaeda should be denied basic human rights if it means our society is better protected.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Muslims lie, steal, cheat, and kill to achieve their goals.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Members of Al Qaeda lie, steal, cheat, and kill to achieve their goals.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I feel safe around Muslims.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Members of Al Qaeda have no respect for human life.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I worry that members of Al Qaeda may harm me or my family.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I would trust a Muslim to watch my children.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Undocumented immigrants should be entitled to basic human rights.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I worry that Muslims will harm Americans somewhere around the world.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Compared to other groups, Muslims are:

- Very inferior-0 Inferior-1 Slightly inferior-2 Equal in status-3 Slightly superior-4 Superior-5 Very superior-6

Muslims are

- Very corrupt-0 Corrupt-1 Somewhat corrupt-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat honest-4 honest-5 Very honest-6

Undocumented immigrants and members of my own group are equally human.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Compared to other groups, members of Al Qaeda are:

- Very inferior-0 Inferior-1 Somewhat inferior-2 Of equal status-3 Somewhat superior-4 Superior-5 Very superior-6

Undocumented immigrants make choices based on moral principles even though those principles may differ from my own.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Undocumented immigrants should be denied basic human rights if it means our society is better protected.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Members of Al Qaeda and members of my own group are equally human.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Muslims have no respect for human life.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I worry that Muslims will harm non-Americans somewhere around the world.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Members of Al Qaeda should be entitled to basic human rights.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I worry that undocumented immigrants will harm non-Americans somewhere around the world.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Members of Al Qaeda are no more inherently good or evil than anyone else.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Undocumented immigrants are

- Very corrupt-0 Corrupt-1 Somewhat corrupt-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat honest-4 honest-5 Very honest-6

Members of Al Qaeda are demons.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I would trust an undocumented immigrant to watch my children.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I worry that members of Al Qaeda will harm non-Americans somewhere around the world.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I would feel safe having Muslims as neighbors.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I worry that Muslims may harm me or my family.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I worry that undocumented immigrants may harm me or my family.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I worry that members of Al Qaeda will harm Americans somewhere around the world.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Members of Al Qaeda make choices based on moral principles even though those principles may differ from my own.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I worry that undocumented immigrants will harm Americans somewhere around the world.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Muslims and members of my own group are equally human.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Undocumented immigrants lie, steal, cheat, and kill to achieve their goals.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

My feelings towards undocumented immigrants can best be described as:

- Love-0 Strong like-1 Like-2 Neutral-3 Dislike-4 Strong dislike-5 Hatred-6

My feelings towards Muslims can best be described as:

- Love-0 Strong like-1 Like-2 Neutral-3 Dislike-4 Strong dislike-5 Hatred-6

Undocumented immigrants have no respect for human life.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I would feel safe having undocumented immigrants as neighbors.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Muslims are no more inherently good or evil than anyone else.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Undocumented immigrants are demons.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

I feel safe around undocumented immigrants.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Undocumented immigrants are no more inherently good or evil than anyone else.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Muslims should be entitled to basic human rights.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Muslims should be denied basic human rights if it means our society is better protected.

- Strongly agree-0 Agree-1 Somewhat agree-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat disagree-4 Disagree-5 Strongly disagree-6

Members of Al Qaeda are

- Very corrupt-0 Corrupt-1 Somewhat corrupt-2 Neutral-3 Somewhat honest-4 Honest-5 Very honest-6

What is your age?

- Under 18 18-21 22-25 26-30 31-40 41 and over

What is your gender?

- Female Male

What is your religious affiliation?

- Latter-Day Saints Catholic or Protestant Other None

Appendix B

Deconstruction of the Pat Condell Speech based on a framework set forth by Vollhardt, Coutin, Staub, Weiss, and Deflander (2007) (Dawson, 2011)

2. Contains instigating elements of continuum of violence
 - a. Distinction between us and them. People referred to by group membership, information about origin used to label them as foreigners. Achieved by pointing out affiliation with region, nationality, religion, or language group different than the majority of listeners
 - b. Individuals/group blamed for misfortune of country (historical/present difficulties)
 - c. Accused of disloyalty, treachery, alliance with other countries (particularly with the enemy) or the previous regime, implying threat and appealing to emotions of listeners
3. Derogatory and violates standards of (argumentative) integrity
 - a. Personal attacks/insults on integrity of individual, communication is defaming and derogatory
 - b. Arguments unbalanced and not objectively verifiable with facts from other sources
 - c. Legitimacy/ability of individual/group to hold political power and influence is questioned, or it is claimed that this person/group has too much power
 - d. Targeted group/individual denied distinct characteristics of human nature
 - e. Individual/group is threatened, for example with revenge
4. Suggested strategies do not offer real/constructive solutions to existing problems, and serve self-interests of speaker and/or his group while only harming another group
 - a. Speaker attains direct political gain and increase in power by harming target
 - b. Focus on individuals/groups rather than issue
 - c. Focus on alleged source of problems and blaming targeted group/individual, accuser offers simplistic solutions and doesn't take into account complexity/multi-faceted nature of societal problems. Promised solution not a real solution
 - d. Offered solutions destructive rather than constructive in nature, based on exclusion of certain individuals/group from political power/society in general
 - e. Communicated ideas/suggested solutions for problems not inclusive of all society, but instead benefit a specific group while excluding others

(Vollhardt et al., 2007: 29-30)

Transcript of the Pat Condell speech (a transcript taken from listening to the speech on youtube:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vjS0Novt3X4>)

All you Americans who have been following the islamization of Europe from afar, with horrified incredulity, if any of you are still nursing the cozy illusion that it could never happen in your country, it's time to wake up and rub those sleepy eyes because the moment of truth has arrived.

In case you haven't heard, there's a plan afoot to build a thirteen story islamic center and mosque a few yards from Ground Zero in New York. A plan that's been enthusiastically welcomed by politicians and civic leaders, eager to show how tolerant they are at other peoples' expense. 2c Is it possible to be astonished but not surprised?

Apparently, it's not enough that nearly 3,000 innocent people had to lose their lives in a hideous act of religious mass murder, but now their memory has to be insulted as well, and the religion that murdered them allowed to build a towering triumphalist mosque on the ground where they died. 1a, 1b, 1c, 2d

Is America losing its mind?! It says a lot about the people behind this scheme that they have the bad taste even to propose building a mosque in such a place, but to describe it as they have as a tribute to the victims is beyond bad taste, and shows a profound contempt for those who died. 2c It would be hard to imagine a more provocative gesture short of standing on their graves and burning the American flag. 2d, 1a, 1c Yet, how typical of Islam, with its own hair-trigger sensitivity to the slightest imagined insult, to do something so arrogant and so insensitive. 2a, 1a, 3b

It's going to cost \$100 Million dollars to build this thing, but nobody is prepared to say where the money's coming from. We do know that the Saudis fund a lot of mosque building in the West, when they are not busy trying to stamp out free speech at the United Nations or telling Fox News what to broadcast, so I guess we'll all be paying for it every time we start the car. 1a, 1c, 2c, 3b

You know, it seems to me a much more appropriate place for a mosque in New York would be the United Nations building itself, because that organization has become so islamofriendly in recent years that frankly I'm surprised it doesn't already have a minaret. 2c, 3b, 1a, 1c, 2a

You know, I'm not even American but it makes me sick to my stomach to think that Islam is going to be allowed anywhere near Ground Zero because 9.11 could never have happened if not for Islam and its teachings and its doctrine of jihad, and its false promise of an impossible afterlife without which none of those gullible lunatics would have been persuaded to carry out such an insane act. 1a, 2a, And also because, it wasn't just an attack on America, but on all of us in the civilized world. As were the bombings in London, in Madrid, in Barley, the shootings in Mumbai, and everywhere else that the religion of peace decides it doesn't like the way people do things. 1c, 2d, 2a, 3b, 1b

Any religion that endorses violence is incapable of delivering spiritual enlightenment. 1a, 2d, 3b, 1b How obvious does that have to be? And it has no right even to call itself a religion. 2d, 1a, 2b Without the shield of religion to hide behind, Islam would be banned in the civilized world as a political ideology of hate, and we have no obligation to make allowances for it anymore than we do for Nazism. 1c, 2d, 2b, 3b It's a bigger threat to our freedom than Nazism ever was. 1b Yes,

both are totalitarian, and both divide the world unnecessarily into us and them, the pure and the impure, and both make no secret of their desire to exterminate the Jews, but we were all, more or less, on the same side against the Nazis, whereas the islamo-nazis have got plenty of friends among people in the West, who ought to know better. 2d, 2c, 3b, 1a, 1c American politicians now regularly make the kind of dhimmi noises about diversity as an excuse for islamization, 1c, 2c, 2b the same kind of thing that we've become so depressingly familiar with in Europe. It's true that diversity has been good for America; it's been the making of that country, but American diversity has always been grounded in respect for the values, the individual liberties that make America what it is. Islam rejects those values and that's the difference, and it's a very important difference. 2d, 3b

Islam despises what America is; it rejects everything America stands for, including freedom and diversity, and any Muslim who denies that, is a liar. 1c, 1a, 2a, 2b, 2d, 3b,

The organization behind this scheme is called "The Cordoba Initiative", and the building is to be called "Cordoba House". And this is because Cordoba or Cordo-ba is the city in southern Spain where Muslims built their first great mosque at the start of, and as a symbol of, their conquest of Spain. 2b, 3b, 1b The Ground Zero mosque is intended to serve the same purpose in America. 1b

Building mosques on conquered, sacred ground is standard practice. It's what Islam has always done to assert its supremacy, and that is what's happening here. 1a And, of course, they know how insulting it is, how offensive it is. 2a, 2d Are you kidding? Why do you think they chose a site as close as possible to Ground Zero, or do you think that that was just an accident? And they also know that once it's built, it'll be there forever as a permanent affront to all Americans, gloating in triumph and a major bridgehead in the ongoing stealth jihad. 1a, 1c, 2d, That's how the Muslim world will see it, and that's how they will be encouraged to see it, and to be fair to them, that's exactly what it will be, confirming what they always suspected, that America is a soft country, a decadent country, crippled by political correctness, confused and guilt ridden with no backbone and no pride. 2c, 1c, 1a, 3b,

They plan to open it next year on September the 11th, the tenth anniversary of the atrocity. Is that tasteless enough for you? I'm surprised they haven't organized a 757 flight past.

But you know, it doesn't have to be this way. Here in London, we had a similar situation just recently where they wanted to build a gigantic mosque to overshadow the Olympic Games. Public opinion put a stop to that, and Public opinion can put a stop to this disgraceful plan as well, and it can tell this group, and the politicians who support them, that enough is enough, and that this is one insult too far, and that America is a big country and there is plenty of room for them to build their offensive mosque if they have to, somewhere else. 3c, Somewhere perhaps more appropriate to the spirit of their religion, like the Arizona Desert, or Death Valley. 3d Peace, and God Bless the Kafa(?)