



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

Domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict in Rwandan and Banyamulenge refugee communities in Rwanda

Berckmoes, L.H.; Kwaks, J.; Mukeshimana, V.; Tuyishimire, B.; Jansen, S.; Rutembesa, E.; ... ; Kanazayire, C.

Citation

Berckmoes, L. H., Kwaks, J., Mukeshimana, V., Tuyishimire, B., Jansen, S., Rutembesa, E., ... Kanazayire, C. (2025). Domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict in Rwandan and Banyamulenge refugee communities in Rwanda. *Conflict And Society*, 11(1), 147-170. doi:10.3167/arcs.2025.110110

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4287809>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Domestic Pedagogies of Peace and Conflict in Rwandan and Banyamulenge Refugee Communities in Rwanda

Lidewyde H. Berckmoes, Juul Kwaks, Verena Mukeshimana, Benjamin Tuyishimire, Stefan Jansen, Eugène Rutembesa, Theoneste Rutayisire, Reverien Interayamahanga, and Clémentine Kanazayire

■ **ABSTRACT:** This article investigates domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict, as teaching and learning about violence in families affected by genocide and war may contribute to how ordinary people break cycles of conflict or enable its continuities. We draw on focused ethnographic research with two communities affected by genocide and violence: Rwandans and Banyamulenge refugees living in Rwanda. We found distinct patterns in respective communities, with Banyamulenge teaching concrete knowledge about past experiences and its implications for identity and survival; and Rwandans largely avoiding sharing of knowledge about the genocide within families but warning for general carefulness. In both communities, children interpreted the teachings in their own ways. We argue that domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict may shape war–peace dynamics, though not in linear ways.

■ **KEYWORDS:** Banyamulenge, children, cyclical conflict, domestic pedagogies, families, genocide, intergenerational transmission, Rwanda

Transgenerational Effects of Mass Violence

Mass violence has a deep impact on people and societies, often with transgenerational effects. In this study, we investigate how experiences of mass violence can become part of the intergenerational transfers of knowledge in family homes. Specifically, we focus on how experiences of mass violence inform lessons about war and peace, which are taught by parents and other caregivers and learned by children who come of age in the aftermath of genocide and war. Understanding these teachings and learnings in intimate home environments is critical, we argue, to gain a deeper understanding of how the next generations may become engaged in future cycles of violence or, conversely, become actors that try to break the cycle of violence. This question is particularly pressing as Paul Collier and colleagues (Collier and Hoeffler 2002, 2008; Collier et al. 2003) and others (Hegre et al. 2011, 2017), focusing on nation-level statistics, have shown that countries that experienced conflict in the past are statistically much more likely to experience conflict again. While attention to national-level factors increases our understanding of the behavior of complex social systems that have been affected by conflict and may experience relapse (De Coning 2018), the significance of micro-dynamics—or “the everyday”—for violent conflict and peace formation has only begun to receive more systematic attention in the last two decades (Kalyvas 2008; Mac Ginty 2014).



To identify teachings and learnings in family homes, or “domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict,” we draw on three fields of literature: literature concerned with intergenerational trauma, literature about (peace) education, and the cross-cultural study of childhood and socialization. We further enrich the discussion by contrasting teaching and learning in domestic environments in families from two distinct communities: Rwandan citizens and Banyamulenge refugees, who are both living in Rwanda. Our findings on domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict in these communities show that the objectives and means of caregivers’ teachings are diverse. We argue that this can be partially understood by how knowledge about mass violence is made available outside the domestic environment, which differs in refugee and home communities; and by the anticipation of concrete future violence or the absence thereof. Our data also reveals that the way children make sense of these teachings may be different from what is intended by their parents and other caregivers and can lead to a distancing between the generations.

In what follows, we provide a description of the literature that most informed our work. This section is followed by an outline of our methodological approach to the ethnographic research in Rwanda and a description of the cycles of mass violence, including the genocide against the Tutsi experienced in Rwanda and the violence against the Banyamulenge in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). In the subsequent sections, we explore the findings from the two communities separately, followed by a discussion that highlights and tries to explain the contrasts. In the conclusion, we argue that domestic pedagogies do inform the perspectives, affects, and practices of next generations that may feed into complex peace-and-conflict dynamics, yet not necessarily in linear and predictive ways. We also call for further research on domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict to learn from other communities and further explore the interactions of domestic pedagogies with teachings in other (micro-)systems. Such studies would enable a more systemic understanding of how pedagogies of peace and conflict inform how the next generations learn to contribute to conflict and peace formation.

Domestic Pedagogies of Peace and Conflict

Our argument builds on a long tradition of research on intergenerational trauma, which examines the psychic afterlives of mass violence. Research on the intergenerational transmission of trauma developed in the aftermath of the Second World War. In this period, children of Holocaust survivors were found to suffer from psychopathological symptoms similar to their parents (Rakoff 1966). A large number of studies on intergenerational trauma among Holocaust survivors and their descendants followed (Kellerman 2001). Since the late 1990s, researchers started to expand on these studies by including populations affected by mass violence elsewhere in the world, and an increasing number of disciplines engaged with the topic (Alexander et al. 2004; Argenti and Schramm 2010; Both 2017; Braga et al. 2012; Danieli 1998; Catani 2010; Dickson-Gómez 2002; Ferme 2001; Rydstrom 2006).

The body of scholarly work that thus emerged has helped to identify important mechanisms of transmission, including biological, psychological, familial, and societal mechanisms (Berckmoes 2022a; Weingarten 2004). For example, researchers identified how survivor parents unconsciously use their children as a means of psychic recovery (Rowland-Klein and Dunlop 1997); and more recently, much attention in the field has been directed to epigenetic transmission of trauma (e.g., Lehrner and Yehuda 2018; Musanabaganwa 2023; Rudahindwa et al. 2020), thus elucidating how trauma experienced by parents can have an effect on the biological expression or suppression of genes in their offspring. Yet an important limitation is that many of these studies tend to neglect people’s agency. Agency concerns “how people perceive

and intentionally act upon themselves, others and the world” (Reis et al. 2020: 42). Yet if we do not also explore agentive practices, intergenerational transmission in the aftermath of mass violence risks emerging as an elusive process with people as hapless victims of troubled pasts. Ethnographically informed work has long signaled the importance of agency for understanding legacies of violence (e.g. Berckmoes et al., Introduction to this special issue; Das 2007; Ferme 2001; Nordstrom 2004). Building upon these studies, we seek to recognize agentive practices in the intergenerational transfers after mass violence, which we achieve with the concept of pedagogies of peace and conflict.

The concept of pedagogies of peace and conflict is inspired by the work of Yxta Maya Murray (2011), who conducted research among violent gangs and proposed looking at violence not as a “contagious” disease but instead to investigate “the ways that we teach each other to be violent” (537). Looking at the transmission of violence in pedagogical instead of epidemiological terms, she argues, prevents de-humanizing offenders as “vectors of pestilence” and can instead identify how specific practices and emotions underlie teachings and why these “stick” (539). The focus on pedagogical dimensions of transmission highlights agentive practices. Pedagogies, generally, refer to knowledge transfers whereby the knowledge transferred is assumed to be shared and novices learn the knowledge as generalizable along some relevant dimension to other objects, occasions, or individuals. Pedagogies of peace and conflict, then, can be understood as the communicative demonstrations that convey generalizable knowledge about conflict or peace.

In genocide and war-affected countries, there have been some explorations of pedagogies of peace and conflict, but so far these have focused primarily on teachings in institutional settings like schools. The latter category of studies have been concerned with representations of past conflict in history curricula and books and with curricula for peace education, for instance (Bentrovato et al. 2016; Bush and Saltarelli 2000; Davies 2010; Ide et al. 2018; Kuppens and Langer 2016). Some studies have also explored how teachers teach these official curricula in classrooms and how that may affect children’s perspectives and practices (Bentrovato and Buhigiro 2020; Van Ommering 2015). The studies reveal that education may include transfers of explicit as well as implicit knowledge in a variety of forms. Moreover, the findings show that pedagogies in school environments can have a positive influence on children’s learning for peace, but may also “act as weapon of war, sustaining hostilities and obstructing youth in pursuing a better future” (Van Ommering 2015: 200). Kenneth Bush and Diana Satarelli (2000) have referred to this duality as the two faces of education.

Children’s teaching and learning evidently also takes place outside the school, with the domestic environment, or the family micro-system (Bronfenbrenner 1979), being particularly significant (Masten et al. 2012). Teaching and learning in the domestic environment is often implicit and involves participating in everyday interactions with the social and material world (Lancy et al. 2010; LeVine and New 2014; LeVine et al. 1994). Yet also here, teaching is informed by culturally specific ideas on desired learning outcomes and by what are viewed to be effective means to achieve these outcomes (LeVine et al. 1994). Indeed, since the first studies on socialization by anthropologists (LeVine et al. 1974; Mead 1928; Whiting and Whiting 1975), there has been wide recognition of the importance of the cultural context in shaping the goal-oriented activities by parents and others that inform child socialization. Children’s agency also matters in these processes of teaching and learning. As developmental psychologist Arnold Sameroff argued in 1975: “The child alters his environment and in turn is altered by the changed world he has created” (Sameroff 1975: 281). In other words, domestic pedagogies of conflict and peace come into being through an intersubjective process whereby caregivers as well as children influence the outcomes.

Ethnography in a Team

We conducted ethnographic research in a team to investigate the intergenerational transfers of explicit and implicit knowledge on conflict and peace in verbal, embodied, and material form. The team consisted of researchers from Leiden University in the Netherlands and the University of Rwanda in Rwanda. Involved were three junior researchers, two senior researchers, and four senior board members who acted as a sounding board throughout the project.¹ The project was conceived by the first author, while ethnographic fieldwork was carried out by Verena Mukeshimana and Benjamin Tuyishimire. These junior ethnographers secured access to the households and interacted with the children in a playful way, which allowed them to participate and observe intimate daily family life. Bringing in a senior board of advisors was key to embedding the documented conversations and observations in the broader context. The mentorship around the field activities of the senior advisors was also helpful in negotiating the many sensitivities surrounding the topic of peace and conflict in the families, allowing the research team to probe the issues in more depth without causing offense.

In total, we conducted six months of ethnographic fieldwork research with 20 families, both Rwandans and Banyamulenge refugees living in Rwanda. We employed snowball sampling techniques to identify families, building on the suggestions of community leaders from the respective communities. Approaching families through community leaders was considered essential in the Rwandan context to ensure that our participants understood that our presence and research activities were endorsed by local authorities, which in turn increased trust in the project and researchers. For the Banyamulenge community, we included only families who identified as refugees to ensure significant structural contrasts between the included communities.² Mindful of the potential influence of the developmental stage of children in shaping pedagogies of peace and conflict, and wanting to increase comparability across the families, we included only families who had at least one child of primary-school age (roughly between 5 and 13 years). Children in this age category are considered relatively more dependent on and close to their caregivers compared to children at later life stages. (For characteristics of participating families, see Tables 1 and 2.)

Fieldwork consisted of interviews, informal conversations, and participant observation, including play with children during family visits, as well as visits with families to places such as the church and hospital. Interviews were conducted in their mother language, Kinyarwanda. The junior researchers, Mukeshimana and Tuyishimire, worked with interview guides that were meant to provide an inspiration and guide for interviews and conversations with caregivers and children. Whereas the first more formal interview with a caregiver pertained to parenting goals and style, the second interview aimed to garner more information about the family's conflict history. In the interviews with children, the junior ethnographers started off with questions regarding significant caregivers and how children experienced care in the family. Subsequently, children would be shown a drawing of an umbrella and raindrops while being told that these symbolized protection (umbrella) from challenges (rain). This allowed Mukeshimana and Tuyishimire to ask about challenges and the ways in which these were or were not addressed within the domestic, family environment. Importantly, as the interviews were open ended, we regularly had the opportunity to learn about and probe further following (unexpected) remarks, including in relation to silences, omissions, and embodied practices. Besides these interviewing activities, Mukeshimana and Tuyishimire visited and called families regularly to exchange greetings or for additional participant observation activities. Some families were visited more often than others, but regular contact was maintained with all families over the course of several months.

Table 1. Overview of Rwandan families participating in the research

Family Pseudonym	No. of Caregivers; Age	No. of Children (+Grandchildren): Age Range	Occupation of Caregivers	Caregivers' Backgrounds in Relation to Genocide
Karori	2: 47, 50	3 (+2): 5–32	Both work in the non-profit sector; (grand)mother also active as community leader.	Grandmother is a survivor. She lost her husband during the genocide and remarried (his background is unknown to us).
Karasira	2: 35, 38	3: 2–12	Father is a healthcare worker. Mother is unemployed.	Father identified as belonging to the group that was not targeted during the genocide; mother has mixed parentage. She lost family members.
Mazimpaka	2: 38, 40	3: 6–14	Mother works as tailor, father as roadside trader.	Unknown to us
Habimana	2: 31, 41	2: 9–12	The couple runs a small tailoring business.	Mother's family was displaced to Nyaruguru. She lost uncles and aunts. (Father's experiences unknown to us.)
Hitimana	2: 38, 45	3: 4–10	Both are employed in healthcare.	Father is a survivor. He fled from eastern to southern provinces. (Mother's experiences unknown to us.)
Zaninka	1: 48	4 (+1): 2–23	Mother owns land and is farming.	Mother is sole survivor of nuclear family. She married while displaced, and later separated and returned to Huye.
Mukamana	1: 71	(5): 6–17	Grandmother farms for sustenance; parents migrated for work.	Grandmother is survivor and lost several children during genocide.
Gaspard	2: 44, 45	7: 6–20	Parents rely on labor-intensive farming for survival.	Mother is a survivor. After 1994, she was displaced to Huye. (Father's experiences unknown to us.)
Mugabo	2: 36, 41	4: 4–12	Father is employed in healthcare; mother is a tailor.	Experiences not known to authors.
Mugwaneza	2: 66, 82	2 (+3): 5–33	Mother works as agricultural laborer. They paid reparations and lost part of their land.	Both were members of the non-targeted group. Father has been in prison for participation in the Genocide against Tutsi.

Table 2. Overview of Banyamulenge families participating in the research

Family Pseudonym	No. of Care-givers: Age	Children (+Grand): Age range	Occupation/Economic Status	Flight Period
Kanyana	2: 37, 42	4: 0–8	Father lives and works as a teacher in a secondary school in Congo, traveling back and forth; wife works in a non-profit in Rwanda.	2000
Runezerwa	2: 49, 52	5 (+1): 4–30	Parents are unemployed; 20-year-old daughter stopped studies to support the family with low-paid job.	Mother and children fled in 2018, father in 2019
Nyambuga	2: 51, 63	3: 11–30 (4 outside household)	Father is a teacher; mother stays at home.	1996
Nkobwa	2: 53, 57	9: 6–29	Unemployed. Supported by Rwandan friends and Banyamulenge who fled before them.	2019
Kayobe	2: 42, 45	5: 6–23	Father works in the health sector; mother runs a small business selling vegetables.	2000
Kadabagizi	2: 39, 45 (+ 2 grand-parents)	5: 2–23	Father works as a public servant; mother has a small milk trade.	Father was in Rwanda as a student. Mother fled in 2007. Grandparents fled in 2018.
Nyirankema	2: 35, 40	7: 2–17	Mother has trade in clothing. Father's employment unknown to us.	Parents fled in 2005, grandmother in 2018
Mugeneka	2: 30, 70	3: 2–7	Unemployed; family is supported by children from father's first marriage.	2018
Nyamute-gerwa	2: 35, 40	4: 4–20	Father is a public servant. Mother is not employed.	1998
Mutegetsi	2: 49, 55	7: 11–23	Father is a teacher at a secondary school; mother is a tailor.	2003

Because of our long-term engagement, we were able to build trust over time and observe and interact with caregivers and children repeatedly and in different situations. We believe that these sustained activities helped mitigate some of the social desirability bias that may play a role in the answers and behavior of participants during researchers' visits.

We obtained ethical clearance from the Research Ethic Review Board at both Leiden University and the University of Rwanda, and during our first meetings with potential participants, we explained the research purpose and methods. If caregivers agreed to participate, we asked

them to sign informed consent forms (in Kinyarwanda). For interviews and conversations with minors, we sought the verbal consent of both caregivers and children.³ For reasons of anonymity, we have used pseudonyms instead of family or individual names in all fieldnotes and publications, including this article.⁴

War and Genocide in Rwanda and DRC

In recent history, people in the Great Lakes region in Africa have been plagued by “multiple confrontations” inspired by struggles for economic and political inclusion, often framed and fought along contested ethnic identity lines (Lemarchand 2005: 26). Most confrontations were extremely violent and involved the targeting and participation of many civilians (Fujii 2008; McDoom 2021; Strauss 2004). While occurring within specific national contexts, they resounded regionally, not least because of cross-border displacement (Lemarchand 2005).

In Rwanda, after decades of colonialism during which a racist ideology was installed describing Tutsi as superior and naturally suited for leadership, the “social (Hutu) revolution” during the period of Independence sought to reverse power structures and, with Belgian support, brought the extremist party PARMEHUTU to power. The violence in 1959 led to a mass exodus of Tutsi. Subsequent periods of violence, including in 1961, 1963, and 1967, caused further killings and displacement. Many Tutsi fled to neighboring countries, including during subsequent pogroms. In 1990, exiled Rwandans formed a liberation movement to return to the country they or their parents had fled. These cascading events and the subsequent genocide are intertwined (Mamdani 2010), “but it is indefensible that the [RPF insurgency] caused the latter ... The genocide was the creation of ideologues in the Rwandan government and other elites who lit a fire that many downtrodden Rwandans fanned, some eagerly and others because they had no choice” (Lombard, in Dumas 2024: xvii-xviii). The genocide against the Tutsi claimed over one million lives, more than one in eight of the population at the time (Rwanda Ministry for Local Government 2002). Due to the massive involvement of the population in the violence, more than two million individuals have been tried in ordinary and grassroots *Gacaca* courts as part of the transitional justice process (Ingelaere 2016). Over 300,000 people have been re/incarcerated or sentenced to community service as an alternative penalty to imprisonment, and many others were required to pay restitution to victims or their families (for specific numbers, see Holá and Brehm 2016: 64).

The events in Rwanda spilled over to neighboring DRC, where *génocidaires* effectively came to run the refugee camps hosting the population that fled Rwanda. The situation escalated into a regional war, involving many of DRC’s neighbors. The First Congo War (1996–1997) began in the wake of the genocide against the Tutsi and in 1998, the Second Congo War broke out. Between 1998 and 2006 more than four million people are estimated to have perished in DRC (Lemarchand 2005). Moreover, high levels of ongoing insecurity and large-scale violence against civilians leave more than 5.6 million people displaced, including four million in the eastern provinces and over 990,000 refugees and asylum-seekers across the African continent (UNHCR 2023⁵). These numbers recently increased with the overtaking of large parts of eastern Congo by the rebel group M23, threatening to plunge the region into another regional war (Titeca 2025).

A notable population group caught up in the war violence in DRC are the Banyamulenge. The community likely settled in South Kivu in eastern DRC before the end of the nineteenth century. They were a pastoralist, isolated community, yet due to their cattle were relatively well off. Their different social identity and lifestyle contrasted with the neighboring Bavira, Babembe, and Bafuliuro communities, who were mainly involved in farming, and hindered

peaceful coexistence (Vlassenroot 2002). Previously known as part of the larger “Banyarwanda community” (literally, “people from Rwanda,” referring to the people speaking Kinyarwanda), they changed their name to “Banyamulenge” (“people from Mulenge”) to counter accusations of being “foreigners” and “Tutsi from Rwanda.” Since the 1990s, Banyamulenge have endured persistent violence—some say a slow genocide (Ntanyoma and Hintjens 2022)—and they partook in the two regional wars mentioned before, some reportedly fighting alongside Rwandan forces (Rotberg 2004). Many Banyamulenge have been forced to flee their homeland and seek refuge abroad (Verweijen et al. 2015), including in Rwanda.

Domestic Environments: Learning without Teaching

In the following sections, we share findings on domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict among Rwandan and Banyamulenge refugee families living in Rwanda as separate case studies. In each community we explored the interactions concerning conflict and peace in the domestic environment, inquiring about caregiving objectives and means of instruction and how children relate to and interpret the teachings.

Our research with Rwandan families took place in Huye, a semi-urban district in Rwanda’s Southern Province, in 2023. In 1994, many Tutsi in Huye, then Butare prefecture, were arguably among the worst affected by the genocide against the Tutsi. Many Tutsi were tortured and killed, particularly in locations like churches, public buildings, and gathering places. Today, Huye is known as an important economic, educational, and health center in southern Rwanda. The local economy relies mainly on small-scale coffee, tea, and banana farming and trade. Huye is also home to several faculties of the University of Rwanda. The district further serves as a gateway to Burundi.

The Rwandan families who participated in the study came from diverse economic and historical backgrounds. They consisted of four to nine household members, including between two and seven children. In most families, both mothers and fathers partook in child-raising, in two families the grandparents were designated caregivers, and two families had a single caregiver. (See Table 1 for more details).

Overall, when we asked parents and other caregivers how they conveyed the history of mass violence to their children, most explained that they generally tried to avoid the topic. Some caregivers shared that they did not want to burden their children with knowledge of their own traumatizing experiences, while parents like Zaninka and Habimana expressed worry that sharing their knowledge of the past might amount to “giving poison” to the children. See for instance, Habimana’s reasoning:

I remember one day my daughter told me that “I heard on the radio people talking about genocide against the Tutsi, I am wondering about who we are: Are we Tutsi or not?” I replied to her that we are all Rwandans except that during that period of genocide Satan had changed people’s minds and they started to kill their relatives. I could not tell them that we are from this ethnic group, it’s like giving them poison. They could grow up hating people with whom they do not share the same ethnic group. Sincerely speaking, that was also what my parents used to tell me.
(Habimana family visit)

We also met caregivers who expressed hesitation about sharing their past personal experiences with their children. They were concerned that their children might unwittingly discuss and share their own interpretations of what was said with neighbors or others, which could potentially lead to the impression that they are teaching their children something that could

foster hatred and negatively impact Rwandan unity (e.g., Karasira and Zaninka). Additionally, some made explicit efforts to avoid their children's potential questions about the topic. For instance, the eldest daughter and breadwinner (therefore, considered "head" of the family) of the Mugwaneza family refused permission for us to talk to the children about their experiences growing up. She explained that she was worried that the children might come to her asking questions about their parents' absence (we had been told that they were in prison): "They may come back to me after the interview and ask me many questions of which I think I could not have answers for them. ... Don't you think it's going to put me in troubles? How will I explain such stories?" (Mugwaneza family visit). Concurrently, children learned not to ask questions about the past, in order to not cause harm, provoke anger, and because they did not expect a truthful answer:

"Which kind of question do you think parents avoid to answer?", I [Verena] asked. She replied: "For example, you can ask your parents about how they survived the 1994 genocide but because they have gone through difficult times and they don't want to repeat the same, they prefer just to tell you that 'we hid ourselves,' only that. And when you feel you are not satisfied with that answer you can ask your neighbor or any other older person who might even tell you lies."

(13-year-old girl, Zaninka family)

Yet caregivers also recognized that it was challenging to *not* speak to their children about the past at all. On a visit to the Mugabo family, for instance, the father narrated a recent conversation he had with his four-year-old son. While he and his son walked around the community, his son told him that he had seen "the genocide." Apparently, the boy had seen a memorial banner displaying the annual commemoration theme. The father explained to us that, despite the boy's young age, he had felt compelled to tell his son more, as a banner misconstrued as genocide itself was also "not helpful."

Despite the overall absence of explicit conversation, the troubled past was very much palpable in the family environment. In most families that participated in this study the presence of the past could be perceived, for instance, through structural features such as the absence of a relative due to death or imprisonment, the location of residence on a family plot cut in half after the Gacaca ruling for reparation (cf. Leegwater 2015), a faraway residence of a divorced parent after the other parent had returned from displacement, or through the ongoing experience of harsh living circumstances as livelihoods lost in the genocide against the Tutsi were never recovered (cf. Berckmoes et al. 2017).

In addition, for most children we met, the ways in which the past reinserted itself in the domestic environment was through subtle indexes. In the Zaninka family, a song about the genocide that served as the mother's telephone ringtone served as such an index. Additionally, the name of the old dog of the neighbour, as Zaninka's neighbor explained to us in the presence of Zaninka's children, served as a reminder of a lesson drawn from the genocide crimes: "I gave it the name Tubana Mbazi ['We coexist, yet I am aware that they are my enemies'] because ... I saw people who pretended to be good to me yet they had participated in the death of my sister and two brothers" (Zaninka family visit). In the Karori family, similarly, the nine-year-old son found a picture of a family member who was killed during the genocide, raising his curiosity about who the person in the picture was and what had happened to him. The picture had been found stowed away in one of the cabinets in his mother's bedroom.

Finally, children learned about the past mass violence through more spontaneous calls for caution and emotional outbursts. For instance, children mentioned how they saw their parents

leave to visit the genocide memorial site and then return full of sadness. One participating mother who held a community leadership position had scolded the child of her neighbors for not fixing the lanterns on their plot. She explained her irritation by referring to the need for vigilance given the past experiences of the genocide:

[She yelled:] “Where is the security lamp? Why don’t you switch on the light? It means that you do not have this security lamp. Tell your mother that if we enter April without having this security lamp she will be punished.” ...

Verena Mukeshimana [reflection]: The mother was saying “if we entered April?”, yet we were on April 2nd. Perhaps for her April starts on April 7th [the day that marks the beginning of the commemoration period] ...

(Karori family visit)

Another example of such an emotionally charged interruption can be found in the Gaspard family: the grandfather, who had been convicted of looting (wood) during the genocide, recounted an incident with his grandchildren whereby he felt prompted by anger to tell the children “something” related to the past:

Once the grandchildren brought home *that* kind of tree [elephant grass, *pennisetum purpureum*, which he had been convicted of looting]. I asked them again and again “where have you collected those trees?” Though I did not tell them the reason why I don’t want those trees in my home, they should know that I don’t like those trees.

(Gaspard family visit)

In addition, several children explained to us that their parents had scolded them for fetching a ball that had accidentally landed in a neighbor’s compound, when this neighbor’s reputation was tainted because of presumed involvement in crimes (as in Gaspard’s excerpt, the latter was not necessarily made explicit). These caregivers sought to caution their children about potential danger, a practice that we encountered more regularly, even when not necessarily related to the genocide against the Tutsi and its aftermath. For instance, children regularly mentioned to us that they were cautioned about talking to us when we just met, or for accepting a gift, such as candy we brought to celebrate good school marks.

In sum, the lessons children obtained and observed about the past were not intended to teach them about the past (cf. Levine et al. 1994). Rather, the knowledge was often shared implicitly and its messages were marked by gaps in information. At the same time, parents conveyed and displayed strong emotional reactions in connection to particular events or situations, indirectly conveying to their children that the partial knowledge was nonetheless highly significant.

Learning about the Past Outside the Home

The overall avoidance of discussing the past and its implications for the present and future in the family environment stands in contrast with the “presence” of the genocide against the Tutsi in the community environment. This is most explicit, perhaps, during the first week of the 100-day commemoration period, which starts each year on 7 April. In this week, the streets of Huye become quieter and several official commemoration ceremonies take place. Businesses close and all residents are requested to attend the ceremonies, although some people remain at home. Furthermore, institutions and companies decorate their facades with genocide memorial banners, which during our research in Huye stated: “*Kwibuka 29*” (liter-

ally meaning: to remember 29), referring to the 29 years that had passed since the genocide against the Tutsi.

In primary and secondary schools, attention is also given to the (commemoration of) the genocide against the Tutsi, a subject taught within classrooms and beyond (see also Bentrovato 2017). As an example, children of one of our participating families explained how they visited a school that was famous for how pupils of both Hutu and Tutsi background stood together in the face of terror:

During a school visit to the Nyange School, I learned about students who refused to separate by ethnicity, choosing instead to stand united as Rwandans. They stayed together, even in the face of death, and we remember them as heroes. This experience deepened my patriotism, and I now feel that I, too, would be willing to give my life for my country.

(12-year-old girl, Mugabo family)

There are also “school clubs” for after school activities, some of which have the specific aim to support children who are descendants of genocide survivors.

Besides the institutionally organized commemoration activities, now and then more spontaneous interruptions of daily community life signal the open wounds of the past. For instance, once when we were on our way to a research participant, people in the street anxiously perceived what appeared to be a drunken man waving around a machete on his way to his farm. Although no one was near enough to get hurt, the fact that he appeared drunk and displayed this violent gesture during the period of commemoration, when people are expected to display restraint and respect, shocked all onlookers. On another day, we encountered people who were gathered around a tractor, quieter than usual and looking around guardedly. When we asked what was going on, a woman responded that the road constructors had found clothes in a big hole that was almost three meters deep. She whispered that they were concerned that down the hole there might be the remains of victims thrown in there during the genocide against the Tutsi.

For some of the children and youth we met, the knowledge and emotions learned on these various occasions left deep impressions. They could sense the affective states of sadness, worry, and anxiety. See, for instance, the reflection by the eldest sibling in Zaninka’s family:

I usually feel deep sadness whenever I see our elderly neighbor, who gave birth to nearly 14 children, now living alone after they were all lost in the genocide. During the commemoration period, she often faces emotional crises. I also can’t shake the feeling that, whether I’m sitting or walking around the community, it’s as if I’m stepping over dead people too.

(23-year-old daughter of survivor Zaninka)

From what we observed, actors in these institutional environments tried to connect their messages to teachings in the family homes, hoping the latter would reinforce the transmission of knowledge about the past and share views, practices, and affect necessary to prevent the violence from happening again. For instance, schoolteachers told children to pose questions about the past to their parents, and community leaders called on parents to tell their children about the past and attend public commemoration activities together:

On social medias they are spreading genocide ideology messages, I really encourage youth not to let those messages go, you should fight back, we can’t allow those enemies defeat us. We are now resilient, we are ready to fight against anyone who wants to break our peace. Parents also, you are encouraged to share [with] your children all about our past history, mainly the 1994 genocide against Tutsi.

(Fieldnotes of speech issued at commemoration event, Huye, 7 April)

Yet as shown above, for a variety of reasons, messages learned outside the domestic environment did not often receive the space for further interpretation or processing in the family. For instance, during an interview with the children from the Karasira family, the 10-year-old daughter shared a conversation she once had with her father about the genocide against the Tutsi. When she asked how her father had survived, he responded, “No genocide occurred in our area.” Curious, she then asked him about ethnic groups, and which one the father belonged to. The father had replied “[they] no longer exist.” Laughing, the girl then mentioned to us that she had heard about the Abatwa ethnic group from an older person in the community. She continued to enumerate assigned stereotypical features, upon which we asked whether her younger brother could be from the Abatwa. She hesitated and responded, “Maybe, but no one in our family makes pots.” In other families, children tried to “check” their knowledge with us, asking us about the veracity of information they had gathered elsewhere or about our ethnic identity (Fieldnotes, Karasira family visit). In other words, the partial information children obtained outside the home seemed to foster extra curiosity among the children and, sometimes, misunderstandings about the knowledge conveyed.

In brief, in contrast to the domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict, which, as intentional forms of knowledge transmission, appeared largely absent, children were exposed to implicit and explicit teachings about the past in other micro-environments, including the media, community, and school. In response, although some children we met expressed disinterest, many children we spoke with appeared eager to learn more about the past and particularly how they could relate their own family history to this past.

War and Loss in Banyamulenge Refugee Families

Domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict took a quite different shape in the Banyamulenge families participating in our study.⁶ Situated on the border, Huye is host to a significant number of refugees and other migrants, including an estimated 360 Banyamulenge refugee families in Huye City, among whom we conducted ethnographic research.⁷ Many of the Banyamulenge refugees in Huye have arrived during the First and Second Congo Wars, while others came more recently. Their families were often larger compared to the Rwandan families, and sometimes grandparents or other families lived in the same household. In the families we met, the father and mother usually acted as the main caregivers, while older siblings and grandparents would also contribute. (For more details about the participating families in this study, see Table 2.)

In the domestic environment of participating Banyamulenge families, the experiences of loss and war were strongly present. Parents and other caregivers often reminisced about the good life they lived in DRC before fleeing, referencing the abundance in land and cattle and their proximity to other Banyamulenge families. Some parents had been able to flee with objects, such as a stick to herd cattle, or they had pictures of their lost lives on their phones. Kayobe, for instance, showing pictures of his former home, maize, and milk, explained: “With those pictures, I remain attached to my homeland.” The objects served as “repositories of individual, familial, and collective memories of dislocation” (Auslander and Zahra 2018: 15). They also pointed to the decline in economic status many Banyamulenge refugees endured living in Rwanda.

The experiences of war and flight, furthermore, were a regular topic of conversation. With the war ongoing in eastern DRC, exchanges about past experiences of mass violence and displacement were often mixed with updates about current developments in the region. These were widely available on social media, and contact with kin left behind ensured a continuous stream of updates. In the family home, conversations about the violence took place mostly between

adult family members and with visitors. Yet often children overheard, as children were often-times playing at home. Some caregivers, like Kanyana, were proud of their children's awareness of the violent events unfolding in DRC. Others expressed concern about their children's interest in the war violence: "Whenever my children take my smart phone, they open the YouTube app and search for the videos of the killings going on in Congo. I do not want them to continue watching those videos as they are traumatizing" (father, Runezerwa). Children also referred to the violence in play or conversations between themselves. Consider, for instance, these two brothers, who when they heard a plane flying overhead interpreted its presence as an indication of the adjacent war violence:

Boy (five years): Listen, it is a plane.

Brother (seven years) (quiet and attentive): It is going to shoot in the forests in Congo.

Boy (five years): It is going to shoot people.

(Mugeneka's sons)

The war furthermore was reflected in the protective measures caregivers took in Huye. Despite living dispersed over various neighborhoods, most families were mainly connected to other Banyamulenge families. Kanyana, for example, explained that if she wanted to borrow sugar or salt, she would prefer to send her children to a Banyamulenge family rather than ask a Rwandan neighbor. Furthermore, most families rented houses with high fences, sometimes building these fences themselves, and all families we met always locked their doors and windows. Nyambuga (mother) explained, "we teach our children to close the door anytime because of the consequences of the wars," and Mugeneka, after scolding his children for not locking the door, said to us: "*Intambara zibyara ikintu* (wars leave something), we do not leave it open." Some caregivers, like Kanyana, also kept lights on at all times: "It is the way of making sure that I am in control of everything that can come into my house." Additionally, caregivers kept their children inside the compound as much as possible. They let them leave only to go to school and church: "It is a way of protecting my children ... As refugees, we do not trust anybody; something bad could happen to them" (mother, Kanyana).

In brief, the past and ongoing experiences of loss, war, and displacement were conveyed through the various objects that served as symbols of the past life (cf. Peristianis 2024), explicitly in conversations and in comments on social media, and through war-born routines.

Saving Banyamulenge People, Identity, and Culture

Banyamulenge caregivers often stated that transmitting Banyamulenge identity was the most central objective in their domestic teachings. Teaching Banyamulenge identity included historical, genealogical, ethnic, cultural, and religious dimensions, and most of these were affected by the experiences of conflict and flight. These stories are often connected with an imagined return to the homeland of Mulenge, which caregivers explicitly talk about. For instance, Kanyana said that in her family, "[we] sit with children and teach them about Banyamulenge history [*including*] how [*we*] fled to Rwanda. ... This is done through talking openly to the children" (emphasis ours). Other caregivers explained that they taught their children about Banyamulenge identity by referring to difference with other ethnic communities, such as "the Congolese." For instance, they would caution their children about Congolese people by telling them that "Congolese will eat you' ... Through these words [*they*] themselves can know the extent of how dangerous Congolese are" (mother, Nkobwa, mentioning how she tailored messages to young children of "5 or 6 years"). Others forbid potential friendship with Congolese

children: “Do you think I can allow them to be friends with the families that have made me flee?” (mother, Kadabagizi). One father mentioned that he wanted his children to learn “*kwirwanaho*” (to fight back) (Nyirankema). When probing, he said that he would consider his sons to be heroes if they were to join the DRC-based youth militia group *Twirwaneho* (let us fight back) when they grow up.

In addition to reflections on the violence they fled, the Banyamulenge caregivers also regularly mentioned their anticipation of potential future adversity. For instance, one evening, Nyamutegerwa and her Banyamulenge guest openly discussed these fears. The guest ushered her host to be prepared after seeing concerning news on YouTube: “Don’t you hear that Congolese are invading as soon as they can? I saw this on YouTube.” Nyamutegerwa, with a scared voice, reacted: “What will we do, where are we hiding our children? The only problem with Huye is [that there is] no bush.” While Nyamutegerwa felt the children should be shielded from the concern of new violence and flight in order to not “scare” them, others, like her guest, were raising their children to be ready: “Why shouldn’t they know? Don’t you prepare yours? ... Do you remember when we fled? We were thinking that there was peace, but it was their trick to kill us all. So why shouldn’t I prepare my children?” (Nyamutegerwa’s guest).

Caregivers of the latter category described how they taught their children various survival skills, including how to hide. For instance, Mugeneka told us that he simulated scenes of a soldier entering the house to teach his children how to hide: “See, even this table can save you in the wars if you know how to hide yourself. Most of us are still alive because we were able to hide behind chairs and under the tables. Doing so, we want our children to have this knowledge of hiding, as they may need it in the future.” In other families, parents shared that they made their children sleep with their clothes on, while Nyambuga explained that her daughter had to walk the long distance to school to be prepared for potential flight: “Do you think I can pay the school bus for my daughter? She has to learn to walk. We also walked while escaping and she may be obliged to do so. We do not know, but she may need it” (Nyambuga). Furthermore, some caregivers told us that education would serve children well should they have to start over again: “I want my children to be academically successful. Every evening we tell children that we as parents left properties abruptly in Congo and that knowledge is the permanent property that a person goes with everywhere” (father, Runezerwa).

Caregivers also emphasized contrast with Rwandan others. Rwandans were not seen as a security threat but rather as a cultural, existential one. As Kanyana explained: “Our children have to know that they are Banyamulenge, not Rwandans. They have to know how Banyamulenge behave and act.” She and several others emphasized difference by stating that Rwandans are “clever” (meaning deceitful), mistrustful, and have no love for their brothers and sisters, referring to the genocide against the Tutsi and related challenges of reconciliation. Moreover, Rwanda’s promotion of gender equality was seen as against Banyamulenge culture, where early marriage and women’s servitude to men are highly valued: “People here in Rwanda do not want to get married and their children grew like that. ... In Congo, a girl has to get married early and the rest of her life has to depend on the husband. She has to obey and fear the husband. However, here in Rwanda, girls have their own money and properties, and they get married between 23 to 30 years old.” Angrily she asked, “How can a girl with that age, with her money fear her husband? The family is always in quarrels and misunderstandings with children about getting married” (mother, Nyambuga, with agitated voice).

Despite the caregivers’ efforts, however, children seemed to resist the lessons their caregivers sought to transmit about identity and culture. Unlike their parents, their favorite foods were local dishes, they said, and they expressed a desire for more freedom. The younger children (of primary school age) emphasized that they wanted the freedom to play outside and with other,

neighboring children: “We can be happy if our parents and grandparents give us permission to play with other children outside. We are always alone after school” (eight-year-old, younger brothers nod in agreement, born in Rwanda). Nyambuga’s daughter (11 years) thought that this limited freedom was informed by supposedly strained relationships between Banyamulenge and Rwandans: “The life will be better if Banyamulenge parents sit with Rwandan parents to solve their problem.” Children in their teens and twenties emphasized their aspirations for a future in Rwanda. The 12-year-old daughter of Nyirankema, for instance, told us that she feared that she would be pressured into an early marriage, like her 15-year-old sister: “I am Rwandan; I advise them to raise me not as Munyamulenge. I want to first study and be able to have a job in the future.” Similarly, the 21-year-old daughter of Nyambuga said: “You cannot respect all the Banyamulenge rules as a Rwandan . . . They [caregivers] are old and if we respect their advices, we can find ourselves alone in the future.”

The finding that second-generation refugees and other migrants are more inclined to orient to their host country, with intergenerational distance as a consequence, resonates with findings in many other migrant communities (Ayika et al. 2018; Losoncz 2017; McCleary et al. 2019; Weinstein-Shr and Henkin 1999). The disparate orientations towards Mulenge of the different generations caused sadness on both sides. Parents mourned the loss of their culture and identity because the next generation refused to carry this on in the same manner, perhaps more so given the “accusations” they encountered in DRC of belonging in Rwanda. Consequently, they reflected on their children as “shoes tak[ing] on the mud of where they walk” (mother, Nyambuga). Meanwhile, children expressed sadness on account of seeing their parents reminisce and miss their homeland. Nyambuga’s 11-year-old daughter, for instance, said that her parents’ talk about Mulenge always made her sad: “I always think of the deaths, and properties taken. They remind me [of] my grandparents who were killed there.” Children, then, also turned away from their homeland to avoid the sadness associated with it, hoping their parents would also invest in more optimistic futures—in Rwanda.

Domestic Pedagogies and Future Peace?

Drawing on research bridging psychology and anthropology, our focused ethnographic study explored the effects that genocide and war have on the next generations through a comparison of two groups living in Rwanda. Research on the intergenerational transmission of legacies of genocide and mass violence has long received scholarly attention, yet anthropological literature on this theme remains relatively limited (Argenti and Schramm 2010). Inspired by psychology and anthropology, our article proposes exploring “domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict” to highlight how the past is taught and learned in domestic, family environments.

We found, in line with existing literature, that interactions between Rwandan and Banyamulenge caregivers and their children in the domestic environment are deeply impacted by the legacies of the violent past. Resonating with research among other exiled communities elsewhere in the Great Lakes region (Hedlund 2019; Malkki 1995) our findings revealed explicit efforts among Banyamulenge to transmit experiences of violence to the next generation in Rwanda. The Banyamulenge caregivers in our research often explicitly recalled their past lives and the ongoing violence. Furthermore, caregivers held on to an imagined, almost mythical, future return (cf. Hedlund 2019; Malkki 1995). In the family home, the Banyamulenge caregivers’ messages and practices regarding war and peace emerged as relatively consistent, concrete, and explicit narratives, prohibitions, and practices, in which lessons about conflict and danger were strongly intertwined with those on identity and belonging. The caregivers sought to teach

their children to identify and act like them—as “Banyamulenge”—while also seeking to protect them against anticipated renewed violence and flight, for instance by teaching survival tactics and investing in flight-proof capital, such as education. These anticipatory practices for preparedness also resonate with findings among conflict-affected communities in other parts of the world (Golden and Mayseless 2008; Kidron 2009; Yehuda 2022).

In contrast to this rather explicit domestic pedagogy of peace and conflict, teaching and learning about the past wars and the genocide against the Tutsi in the Rwandan families were often marked by avoidance. Caregivers felt reluctant about sharing knowledge of the past with their children, sensitive to the memory shared in the media and public spaces (cf. Mwambari 2021; Otake 2019) and uncertain about how to address the issues in ways to prevent hurt or hatred and instead foster the prevailing peace (cf. Buckley-Zistel 2006).

Like in Rwandan families, Veena Das (2007), in her seminal work *Life and Words*, exploring the aftermath of the 1947 partition of India and Sikh massacres in Delhi in 1974, argued that remembrance of extreme violence in the everyday might only reveal itself through gestures, silence, and rumors. However, silence about the past also communicates knowledge, as Das (2007), Carol Kidron (2009, 2010), and Anja Kublitz (2011) have also observed, in, respectively, Sikh, Jewish, Cambodian, and Palestinian communities. Indeed, to grasp children’s war inheritance, one needs to explore how children learn to inhabit a conflict-affected world, as Han (2020) argues in her auto-ethnography concerning her background as a child of refugee survivors of the Korean war.

From a child’s perspective, it is clear that the Rwandan children came of age in a world deeply affected by the genocide against the Tutsi and its aftermath. In particular, they learned about the past, their identity as Rwandans, and conflict-affected sensitivities in moments when routines of everyday family life were interrupted. For instance, this occurred when they heard the ringtone of their mother’s phone, which sang a famous song about loss in the genocide, observed tears or quietness after a caregiver’s visit to a genocide memorial site, or when children were prohibited from retrieving a ball that had fallen into the yard of one neighbor but not another. These “stolen moments” (Han 2020) in the domestic environment, moreover, resounded in organized and spontaneous events in other micro-environments, such as a school visit to a memorial site, a commemoration gathering, or when witnessing the shocked responses of passers-by upon seeing a drunken man waving with a machete, a sight that in another period of the year might not yield the same public turmoil.

Our findings reveal that the effects on children of the lessons and learnings are not necessarily predictable or linear, as children’s interpretations appeared far from replications of their caregivers’ messages. This finding resonates with a study conducted recently in the Netherlands about the transmission of extremist views from parents to children. The study suggests that transmission of extremist views is shaped in complex ways by other features at play in children’s upbringing, including parental warmth and parenting styles (Van Wieringen et al. 2021; for more studies pointing to non-linear transmission, see Kublitz 2016; Schönplflug 2009; Tize 2025).

In our study, we found that despite consistent pedagogies and warm relationships in Banyamulenge family homes, parental efforts to physically and existentially “save” their children for the future were not interpreted the same way by the children. The latter, apparently incremental with age, interpreted their caregivers’ nostalgia as keeping them all from a better future, leading to sadness and a sense of suffocating their own desires and aspirations. Children, especially the ones in their teens and twenties, said that they aspired a future in Rwanda as “Rwandans.” Among the Rwandan children, where explicit transmission was largely absent and caregiving and caregiving styles differed across families, we found that most children tried to piece together histories of genocide and its aftermath, their own family history, and sought to understand ethnicity as it prevailed before citizens became

“Rwandans.” Moreover, children learned to master a way of not talking and not asking while simultaneously feeling burdened by heavy emotions, and some nurturing a sense of curiosity for the hidden but apparently powerful knowledge. Despite or perhaps because of the largely absent explicit pedagogy on peace and conflict in these families, children, in the process of learning to inhabit a conflict-affected world, seemed to wonder whether the inaccessible knowledge could help them to navigate the palpable but elusive dangers in their environments better. Indeed, often they were cautioned by their caregivers to act with care and vigilance, lest to remain safe.

We propose that the differences between these domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict may be partly explained by the availability of information about the past in the public environment and the strength of prevailing institutional discourses. For instance, in Rwanda, the commemoration of the genocide against the Tutsi in the public environment, such as in schools (Bentrovato 2017; Bentrovato and Buhigiro 2020), political speeches, and the media (Mwambari 2021), ensured that even when caregivers would not discuss the sensitive past, their children would learn about it through these institutional actors, in publicly deemed acceptable ways. Banyamulenge refugees, on the other hand, did not find representations of their experiences in public institutions in their host country. They thus had to rely on their own practices and networks, such as their churches, to relay their histories to the next generation.

A second element contributing to the differences in concreteness and explicitness may relate to the anticipation of potential future mass violence. In DRC, mass violence was ongoing and, as exemplified in the conversation between Nyamutegerwa and her friend above (p. X), caregivers were concerned about a potential spillover of the violence to Rwanda. In addition, in the context of the war, there was a clear narrative about who could be considered enemy or friend. In Rwanda, instead, general security has prevailed for the past 29 years (McDoom 2022), yet caregivers and children we met felt that caution is warranted. Similar to findings in other conflict-affected communities (cf. Dickson-Gómez 2002; Golden and Mayseless 2008; Kidron 2009, 2010), no full explanation is shared with children about who or what can be considered a threat or how to preserve the prevailing peace and security. Interestingly, this contrasts with the narratives in schools and other public environments, where young people are more explicitly taught that (proponents of) genocide ideology pose a threat to long-term peace and that embracing unity is a solution (cf. Bentrovato 2017). Finally, cultural differences in child-raising may be at play as well. For instance, it is well known that in Rwandan families, like in many other (east African) communities, employing implicit means for child education are common in relation to other themes as well (cf. Berckmoes 2022b; Levine et al. 1994;).

Conclusion

Carolyn Nordstrom (2004) argued that violence is not a passing phenomenon that leaves a scar with no lasting effects, but rather shapes “reality as people will know it, in the future” (59–60; see also Introduction to this special issue). In this study, we introduced the concept “domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict” to explore effects of mass violence on future generations. We conceptualized pedagogies of peace and conflict as communicative demonstrations that conveyed knowledge about how to perceive, feel about, and act upon the world in ways that may foster peace or relapse into conflict. While numerous studies have explored the afterlives of genocide and mass violence (e.g., Danieli 1998; Das 2007; Ferme 2001; Han 2020), some even signaling the explicit pedagogical intent (e.g., Hedlund 2019; Malkki 1995),

we propose that this concept may add to theorization about the intergenerational transmission of legacies of conflict by drawing attention to the agentive practices of caregivers and children in learning to contribute to peace and conflict dynamics. While it should be recognized that peacebuilding, as with relapse into conflict, takes shape in a complex system (De Coning 2018), attention to pedagogies of conflict and peace in domestic environments is important for better understanding civilians' efforts to break (or not break) cycles of violence. Questioning domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict is particularly relevant in contexts affected by repeated outbreaks of mass violence, such as Rwanda and DRC, where, historically, successive generations have been drawn into violent conflict as victims or perpetrators of violence.

By contrasting domestic pedagogies on peace and conflict in two communities, the study reveals that there are diverse ways in which war inheritance may take place, showing how both the objectives and means of teaching may differ across war-affected communities, even in relatively homogeneous contexts. The contrasts also help us to ask further questions to advance theorization of pedagogies of peace and conflict. In this regard, our findings suggest critical connections with the pedagogies of peace and conflict at other system levels, including in the school, community, and at the national, state level. Moreover, the "nearness" of potential future mass violence seems influential as well, suggesting that more strongly anticipated mass violence informs more explicit knowledge transfers. This insight has political and practical bearing, we feel, as teachings may be more oppositional when shared at moments of high pressure, thus calling for a dynamic understanding of domestic pedagogies of peace and conflict. In addition, more research is needed to examine culturally specific elements, as violence and their effects take shape in culturally specific contexts (see also the Introduction to this special issue). Finally, while we found that children's interpretation of teachings, whether detailed or marked by avoidance, differed from caregivers' intentions, we should recognize that children's interpretations and orientations may change over time as learning takes place over the life course and in highly complex systems. What changes over time, then, may be "the kind of engagement necessary to sustain peace," (De Coning 2018: 313), whether in the domestic environment, or in other, connected system levels.

To the best of our knowledge, this is one of the first studies to systematically and comparatively explore teachings and learnings in domestic, family environments affected by genocide and war (however, see also Kidron 2010). We hope it will inspire more studies in other communities to expand our knowledge, with a particular focus on how pedagogies in domestic environments interact with other environments. Such research can provide a more holistic understanding of how children learn to inhabit and act within their war-affected worlds, and how this may shape a society's war–peace trajectory.

■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research project received funding through the Aspasia premium 2019 awarded to L. H. Berckmoes by the Dutch Research Council (NWO).

■ **LIDEWYDE BERCKMOES** has a background in anthropology, development, and African studies. She currently works as an associate professor and senior researcher at the African Studies Centre Leiden at Leiden University, where she chairs the collaborative research group Conflict Continuities. Her own research explores the long-term psychosocial effects of war and genocide, specifically on children, young people, and families. Geographically, most of

her work takes place in the Great Lakes region in Africa. Email: l.h.berckmoes@asc.leidenuniv.nl; ORCID: 0000-0001-6378-6504.

■ **JUUL KWAKS** has a background in political science, conflict studies, and African studies. She currently works as a PhD candidate at Radboud University, and was previously employed by the African Studies Center at Leiden University as a junior researcher. Her research focuses on the long-term effects of civil conflict and displacement at the level of the individual and the community. Geographically, she focuses on the Great Lakes region of Africa. Email: juul.kwaks@ru.nl; ORCID: 0000-0003-3509-568X

■ **VERENA MUKESHIMANA** is a clinical psychologist and researcher. She holds a Master in Clinical Psychology and Therapeutics (2024) and a Bachelor of Science (Hons) in Clinical Psychology from the University of Rwanda. Currently a junior researcher at the University of Rwanda, she is involved in a project on intergenerational resilience and anticipation of conflict and natural disaster. She also contributed to the *Pedagogies of Peace and Conflict in the Great Lakes Region* project (2023–2024). From 2020–2023, at Uyisenga Ni Imanzi, she led the rehabilitation of street-connected children using a narrative therapy approach. Email: verenamuksha@gmail.com; ORCID: 0009-0007-7478-9744.

■ **BENJAMIN TUYISHIMIRE** has a background in clinical psychology and therapeutics and is currently working for Shooting Touch, an organization that promotes social change through the mobilizing power of basketball. His previous research experiences focused on the intergenerational transmission of trauma among genocide survivors and their children in Rwanda. Email: benjamin.tuyishimire1994@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0001-7319-3024

■ **STEFAN JANSEN**, PhD, is Associate Professor in Neuroscience and has worked at the University of Rwanda since September 2011. He is the Director of Research and Innovation at the College of Medicine and Health Sciences and heads the Mental Health & Behaviour Research Group. He runs multiple internationally funded and multi-country research projects, with a focus on the mental health and psychosocial consequences of exposures to violence. He is the Chief Editor of the *Rwanda Journal of Medicine and Health Sciences*, Board Member of the Rwanda National Ethics Committee, and Founding Member of the Rwanda Society of Human Genetics, alongside other responsibilities. Email: s.jansen@ur.ac.rw; ORCID: 0000-0001-5293-1673

■ **EUGÈNE RUTEMBESA** graduated from the University Saint-Denis (Paris 8) in Clinical Psychology and Psychopathology. His research focuses on trauma and resilience in post-genocide Rwanda. He is a Vice President of the International Association for the Promotion and Dissemination of Research on Resilience (www.resilio-association.com). Email: eurut@yahoo.fr; ORCID: 0000-0003-3789-3538.

■ **THEONESTE RUTAYISIRE** holds a PhD in anthropology from the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Since then, he has been working for Community-Based Socioterapy

Rwanda (CBS) as a senior researcher. His published works focus on the development of community-based sociotherapy in Rwanda, lived experiences of Rwandan *génocidaire* ex-prisoners and women with husbands in prison, and the assessment of needs of Congolese refugees in Rwanda and Uganda. Email: rutayisiretheo@yahoo.com.

■ **RÉVÉRIEN INTERAYAMAHANGA** is a Rwandan national with over 20 years of experience in university teaching and social research. He holds Master degrees in Development Sociology from the University of Witwatersrand and Gender and Development from the University of Rwanda. He has worked with organizations such as the League for Human Rights in the Great Lakes Region, Kigali Independent University, Institute of Research and Dialogue for Peace, Never Again Rwanda, and Interpeace. His expertise includes teaching, conducting research, project evaluations, and mixed-method studies on reconciliation, resilience, child combatants' reintegration, gender equality, social protection, and participatory governance in post-genocide Rwanda and the Great Lakes Region. Email: revintera@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0001-8155-3317.

■ **CLÉMENTINE KANAZAYIRE**, PhD, graduated from the Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium, in Social Psychology. Her research focuses on identity, reconciliation, collective memory, mental health, intergroup relations and gender equality. Email: kanacle@yahoo.fr; ORCID: 0000-0003-4715-3648.

NOTES

1. Benjamin Tuyishimire and Verena Mukeshimana were embedded at the University of Rwanda in a team led by Stefan Jansen. Lidewyde Berckmoes conceptualized the project and supervised the fieldwork, with support from Juul Kwaks, and with input from all senior members of the team: Clémentine Kanayazire, Révérien Interayamahanga, Eugène Rutembesa, and Theoneste Rutayisire. Berckmoes with Kwaks developed the research tools and training provided during two on-site workshops and in weekly online meetings. To analyze the fieldwork findings, Tuyishimire with Kwaks and Mukeshimana with Berckmoes paired up to develop codebooks for their interpretations of the findings of respective communities. Berckmoes prepared the full draft of the manuscript, to which all other authors contributed with comments and suggestions.
2. Rwandan and Banyamulenge communities have long interacted, particularly the communities living along the Congolese border. This means that some people who identify as Banyamulenge have since long settled and obtained citizenship in Rwanda.
3. In two of the families (Gaspard family and Mugwaneza family), caregivers did not grant us consent to speak with the children. For these families, our findings are based on interviews, conversations, and participant observation with caregivers only.
4. Prior to the fieldwork, the team sought and obtained ethical approval from the review boards of participating institutes: the African Studies Centre Leiden (ASCL) Research Ethics Review Board at Leiden University and the College of Medicine and Health Sciences (CMHS) Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Rwanda. Realizing the importance of including children's perspectives, we later applied for (and obtained permission for) amendment of the permit at the IRB of the University of Rwanda to also interview minors.
5. <https://www.unhcr.org/countries/democratic-republic-congo> (accessed 6 November 2023).
6. Some of the findings presented below were published as part of an article focused on caregiving in

- crisis: Tuyishimire, B., Kwaks, J. M., & Berckmoes, L. H. (2024). "Our Children Are Dead": Past and Anticipated Adversity Shaping Caregiving and Cultural Reproduction among Banyamulenge Refugee Families in Rwanda. *Genealogy* 8 (3): 119.
7. Interview with Banyamulenge community leader and research participant, July 2023.

■ REFERENCES

- Alexander, Jeffrey C., Eyerman, Ron, Giesen, Bernard, Smelser, Neil J., and Sztompka, Piotr., eds. 2004. *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- Argenti, Nicolas, and Katharina Schramm. 2010. *Remembering Violence: Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Auslander, Leora, and Tara Zahra, eds. 2018. *Objects of War: The Material Culture of Conflict and Displacement*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Ayika, David, Tinashe Dune, Rubab Firdaus, and Virginia Mapedzahama. 2018. "A Qualitative Exploration of Post-Migration Family Dynamics and Intergenerational Relationships." *Sage Open* 8: 1–10.
- Bentrovato, Denise. 2017. "Accounting for Genocide: Transitional Justice, Mass (Re)education and the Pedagogy of Truth in Present-Day Rwanda." *Comparative Education* 53 (3): 396–417.
- Bentrovato, Denise, and Jean-Leonard Buhigiro, 2020. "Mediating Emotive Knowledge in the Presence of Historical Trauma: Emotions in History Teachers' Everyday Discourses and Practices Around Genocide Education in Rwanda." In *Teaching African History in Schools: Experiences and Perspectives from Africa and Beyond*, ed. Denise Bentrovato and Johan Wasserman, 124–150. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Bentrovato, Denise, Karina V. Korostelina, and Martina Schulze, eds. 2016. *History Can Bite: History Education in Divided and Postwar Societies*. Göttingen: V&R Unipress.
- Berckmoes, Lidewyde H. 2022a. "In the Aftermath of Atrocities: Research on the Intergenerational Transmission of Trauma and Violence." In *The Oxford Handbook on Atrocity Crimes*, ed. Barbora Holá, Hollie Nyseth Nzititira, and Maartje Weerdesteijn, 555–577. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berckmoes, Lidewyde H. 2022b. "Conflict and Parenting in Burundi." In *Parenting Across Cultures: Childrearing, Motherhood and Fatherhood in Non-Western Cultures*, ed. Helaine Selin, 227–242. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Berckmoes, Lidewyde H., Veroni I. Eichelsheim, Theoneste Rutayisire, Annemiek Richters, and Barbora Hola. 2017. "How Legacies of Genocide Are Transmitted in the Family Environment: A Qualitative Study of Two Generations in Rwanda." *Societies* 7 (3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc7030024>.
- Both, Jonna. 2017. "Conflict Legacies: Understanding Youth's Post-Peace Agreement Practices in Yumbe, Northwestern Uganda." PhD diss., University of Amsterdam.
- Braga, Luciano L., Marcelo F. Mello, and José P. Fiks. 2012. "Transgenerational Transmission of Trauma and Resilience: A Qualitative Study with Brazilian Offspring of Holocaust Survivors." *BMC Psychiatry* 12 (134): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-12-134>.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie 1979. *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buckley-Zistel, Susanne. 2006. "Remembering to Forget: Chosen Amnesia as a Strategy for Local Coexistence in Post-Genocide Rwanda." *Africa* 76 (2): 131–150.
- Bush, Kenneth D., and Diana Saltarelli. 2000. "The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict: Towards a Peacebuilding Education for Children." *UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre*.
- Catani, Claudia. 2010. "War in the Home: A Review of the Relationship between Family Violence and War Trauma." *Verhaltenstherapie* 20 (1): 19–27.
- Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler. 2002. "Greed and Grievance in Civil War." *Oxford Economic Papers* 56 (4): 563–595.
- Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler. 2008. "Post-Conflict Risks." *Journal of Peace Research* 45 (4): 461–478.
- Collier, Paul, V. L. Elliot, Håvard Hegre, Anke Hoeffler, Marta Reynal-Querol, and Nicolas Sambanis.

2003. *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy* (vol. 41181, no. 4). Washington and New York: World Bank Publications.
- Danieli, Yael, ed. 1998. *International Handbook of Multigenerational Legacies of Trauma*. New York and London: New York Plenum Press.
- Das, Veena. 2007. *Words and Life: Violence and the Descent into the Ordinary*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Davies, Lynn. 2010. "The Potential of Human Rights Education for Conflict Prevention and Security." *Intercultural Education* 21 (5): 463–471.
- De Coning, Cedric. 2018. "Adaptive Peacebuilding." *International Affairs* 94 (2): 301–317.
- Dickson-Gómez, Julia. 2002. "The Sound of Barking Dogs: Violence and Terror Among Salvadoran Families in the Postwar." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 16: 415–438.
- Dumas, Héléne. [2020] 2024. *Beyond Despair: The Rwanda Genocide Against the Tutsi Through the Eyes of Children*. Translated by Catherine Porter. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Ferme, Mariane C. 2001. *The Underneath of Things: Violence, History, and the Everyday in Sierra Leone*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2008. "The Power of Local Ties: Popular Participation in the Rwandan Genocide." *Security Studies* 17 (3): 568–597.
- Golden, Deborah, and Ofra Mayseless. 2008. "On the Alert in an Unpredictable Environment." *Culture and Psychology* 14: 155–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X08088553>.
- Han, Clara. 2020. *Seeing Like a Child: Inheriting the Korean War*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Hedlund, Anna. 2019. *Hutu Rebels: Exile Warriors in the Eastern Congo*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hegre, Håvard, Håvard M. Nygard, and Ranveig F. Raeder. 2017. "Evaluating the Scope and Intensity of the Conflict Trap: A Dynamic Simulation Approach." *Journal of Peace Research* 54 (2): 243–261.
- Hegre, Håvard, Håvard Strand, Scott Gates, and Håvard M. Nygard. 2011. "The Conflict Trap." APSA 2011 Annual Meeting Paper.
- Holá, Barbora and Hollie Nyseth Brehm. 2016. Punishing Genocide: A Comparative Empirical Analysis of Sentencing Laws and Practices at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), Rwandan Domestic Courts and Gacaca Courts. *Genocide Studies and Prevention: and International Journal*, 3, 59–80.
- Ide, Tobias, Jakob Kirchheimer, and Denise Bentrovato. 2018. "School Textbooks, Peace and Conflict: An Introduction." *Global Change, Peace & Security* 30 (3): 287–294.
- Ingelaere, Bert. 2016. *Inside Rwanda's Gacaca Courts: Seeking Justice After Genocide*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Kalyvas, Stathis N. 2008. "16 Promises and Pitfalls of an Emerging Research Program: The Microdynamics of Civil War." https://stathiskalyvas.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/kalyvas_ocv.pdf.
- Kellerman, Natan P. F. 2001. "Psychopathology in Children of Holocaust Survivors: A Review of the Research Literature." *Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences* 38 (1): 36–46.
- Kidron, Carol A. 2009. "Toward an Ethnography of Silence: The Lived Presence of the Past in the Everyday Life of Holocaust Trauma Survivors and Their Descendants in Israel." *Current Anthropology* 50: 5–27.
- Kidron, Carol A. 2010. "Silent Legacies of Trauma: A Comparative Study of Cambodian Canadian and Israeli Holocaust Trauma Descendant Memory Work." In *Remembering Violence: Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission*, ed. N. Argenti and K. Schramm, 193–228. New York: Berghahn Books. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt9qcs96.13>.
- Kublitz, Anja. 2011. "The Sound of Silence: The Reproduction and Transformation of Global Conflicts within Palestinian families in Denmark." In *Mobile Bodies, Mobile Souls: Family, Religion, Migration in a Global World*, ed. Karen Fog Olwig and Mikkel Rytter, 161–180. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Kublitz, Anja. 2016. "From Revolutionaries to Muslims: Liminal Becomings Across Palestinian Generations in Denmark." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 48: 67–86.
- Kuppens, Line, and Arnim Langer. 2016. "To Address or Not to Address the Violent Past in the Classroom? That Is the Question in Côte d'Ivoire." *Journal of Peace Education* 13 (2): 153–171.
- Lancy, David F., John Bock, and Suzanne Gaskins, eds. 2010. *The Anthropology of Learning in Childhood*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.

- Leegwater, Margot. 2015. *Sharing Scarcity: Land Access and Social Relations in Southeast Rwanda*. Leiden: African Studies Centre.
- Lehrner, Amy, and Rachel Yehuda. 2018. "Cultural Trauma and Epigenetic Inheritance." *Development and Psychopathology* 30 (5): 1763–1777.
- Lemarchand, René. 2005. "The Geopolitics of the Great Lakes Crisis." *L'Afrique des Grand Lacs–Dix ans de Transitions Conflictuelles: Annuaire* 2006: 25–64.
- LeVine, Robert A. 1974. "Parental Goals: A Cross-Cultural View." *Teachers College Record* 76: 226–239.
- LeVine, Robert A., and Rebecca S. New, eds. 2014. *Anthropology and Child Development a Cross Cultural Reader*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- LeVine, Robert A., Sarah Dixon, Suzanne Levine, Amy Richman, P. Herbert Leiderman, Constance H. Keefer, and T. Berry Brazelton. 1994. *Child Care and Culture: Lessons from Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Losoncz, Ibolya. 2017. "Finding Better Ways to Support Resettled Refugee Families: Dealing with Intergenerational Conflict." In *Children and Forced Migration: Durable Solutions During Transient Years*, ed. Marissa O. Ensor and Elzbieta M. Gozdzia, 273–293. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mac Ginty, Robert. 2014. "Everyday Peace: Bottom-up and Local Agency in Conflict-Affected Societies." *Security Dialogue* 45 (6): 548–564.
- Malkki, Liisa H. 1995. *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology Among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 2010. *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism and the Genocide in Rwanda*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- Masten, Ann S., and Angela J. Narayan. 2012. "Child Development in the Context of Disaster, War, and Terrorism: Pathways of Risk and Resilience." *Annual Review of Psychology* 63: 227–257.
- McCleary, Jennifer S., Patricia J. Shannon, Elizabeth Weling, and Emily Becher. 2019. "Exploring Intergenerational Communication and Stress in Refugee Families." *Child & Family Social Work* 25: 364–372.
- McDoom, Omar S. 2021. *The Path to Genocide in Rwanda: Security, Opportunity, and Authority in an Ethnocratic State* (vol. 152). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDoom, Omar S. 2022. "Securocratic State-Building: The Rationales, Rebuttals, and Risks Behind the Extraordinary Rise of Rwanda After the Genocide." *African Affairs* 121 (485): 535–567.
- Mead, Margareth 1928. *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for West*. New York: Blue Ribbon Books.
- Murray, Yxta. 2011. "The Pedagogy of Violence." *Southern California Interdisciplinary Law Journal* 20 (3): 537–584.
- Musanabaganwa, Clarisse. 2023. "Intergenerational and Epigenetic Effects of Trauma and PTSD Following Exposure to the 1994 Genocide Against the Tutsi in Rwanda." PhD diss., Radboud University.
- Mwambari, David. 2021. "Agaciro, Vernacular Memory, and the Politics of Memory in Post-Genocide Rwanda." *African Affairs* 120 (481): 611–628.
- Nordstrom, Carolyn. 2004. *Shadows of War*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ntanyoma, Rukumbuzi D., and Helen Hintjens. 2022. "Expressive Violence and the Slow Genocide of the Banyamulenge of South Kivu." *Ethnicities* 22 (3): 374–403.
- Otake, Yuko. 2019. "Suffering of Silenced People in Northern Rwanda." *Social Science & Medicine* 222: 171–179.
- Peristianis, Christakis. 2024. "'A Return, a Mirror, a Photograph': Return Journeys, Material Culture and Intergenerational Transmission in a Greek Cypriot Refugee Family." *Genealogy* 8: 57.
- Rakoff, Vivian A. 1966 "A Long Term Effect of the Concentration Camp Experience." *Viewpoints* 1: 17–22.
- Reis, Ria, Mathilde R. Crone, and Lidewyde H. Berckmoes. 2020. "Unpacking Context and Culture in Mental Health Pathways of Child and Adolescent Refugees." In *Child, Adolescent and Family Refugee Mental Health: A Global Perspective*, ed. Suzan Song and Peter Ventevogel, 37–51. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Rotberg, Robert I., ed. 2004. *State Failure and State Weakness in a Time of Terror*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Rowland-Klein, Dani, and Rosemary Dunlop. 1997. "The Transmission of Trauma Across Generations: Identification with Parental Trauma in Children of Holocaust Survivors." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 32 (3): 358–369.
- Rudahindwa, Susan, Leon Mutesa, Eugene Rutembesa, Jean Mutabaruka, Annie Qu, Derek E. Wildman, Stefan Jansen and Monica Uddin. 2020. "Transgenerational Effects of the Genocide Against the Tutsi in Rwanda: A Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Symptom Domain Analysis." *Open Research Africa* 1 (10): 10.
- Rwanda Ministry for Local Government. 2002. *The Counting of the Genocide Victims: Final Report*. Kigali: Ministry for Local Government, Department for Information and Social Affairs.
- Rydstrom, Helle. 2006. "Masculinity and Punishment: Men's Upbringing of Boys in Rural Vietnam." *Childhood* 13 (3): 329–348.
- Sameroff, Arnold J. 1975. "Early Influences on Development: Fact or Fancy?." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development* 21 (4): 267–294.
- Schönpflug, Ute. 2009. "Introduction to Cultural Transmission: Psychological, Developmental, Social, and Methodological Aspects." In *Cultural Transmission: Psychological, Developmental, Social and Methodological Aspects*, ed. U. Schönpflug, 1–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Straus, Scott. 2004. "How Many Perpetrators Were There in the Rwandan Genocide? An Estimate." *Journal of Genocide Research* 6 (1): 85–98.
- Titeca, Kristof. 2025. "Leiden de gevechten in Oost-Congo tot een regionaal conflict?" [Do the battles in Eastern Congo lead to regional conflict?]. *De Standaard*, 11 February.
- Tize, Carola. 2025. "Silenced: Palestinian Families in Berlin Navigating Increased Censorship and Surveillance." *Genealogy* 9 (2): 49.
- UNHCR. 2023. The UN Refugee Agency. *UNHCR Global Website*. Where We Work: Democratic Republic of the Congo. <https://www.unhcr.org/where-we-work/countries/democratic-republic-congo>.
- Van Ommering, Erik. 2015. "Formal History Education in Lebanon: Crossroads of Past Conflicts and Prospects for Peace." *International Journal of Educational Development* 41: 200–207.
- Van Wieringen, Layla, Daan Weggemans, Katharina Krüsselmann, and Marieke Liem. 2021. *Van ouder op kind: een systematische literatuurstudie naar de overdracht van extremistische denkbeelden van ouder op kind in de gezinscontext* [From parents to child: a systematic literature review of the transmission of extremist worldviews from parents to children in the family environment]. Leiden: Universiteit Leiden.
- Verweijen, Judith, and Koen Vlassenroot. 2015. "Armed Mobilisation and the Nexus of Territory, Identity, and Authority: The Contested Territorial Aspirations of the Banyamulenge in Eastern DR Congo." *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 33: 191–212.
- Vlassenroot, Koen. 2002. "Citizenship, Identity Formation and Conflict in South Kivu: The Case of the Banyamulenge." *Review of African Political Economy* 29: 499–516. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03056240208704635>.
- Weingarten, Kaethe. 2004. "Witnessing the Effects of Political Violence in Families: Mechanisms of Intergenerational Transmission and Clinical Interventions." *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 30 (1): 45–59.
- Weinstein-Shr, Gail, and Nancy Henkin. 1999. "Continuity and Change: Intergenerational Relations in Southeast Asian Refugee Families." *Marriage & Family Review* 16: 351–368.
- Whiting, Beatrice, and John W. M. Whiting. 1975. *Children of Six Cultures: A Psycho-cultural Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Yehuda, Rachel. 2022. "How Parents' Trauma Leaves Biological Traces in Children." *Scientific American* 327: 50–55. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-parents-trauma-leaves-biological-traces-in-children/>.