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PREFACE

There is a great deal of misuse of and ignorance about the subject of genocide. Paradoxically, the misuse and popularization of the term "genocide" coincides with both a growing scholarship about genocide and an increase in genocide denial. Hence, it is crucial to find out how teachers define genocide and show how it is recognized, documented and explained. What methods and examples are studied to analyze how people become "defined outside the moral universe of obligation" (Fein, Accounting for Genocide, 1979) and how does one explain the subsequent course of destruction?

In the spring of 1990, the Institute for the Study of Genocide considered the need for a forum to talk about issues concerning the teaching of genocide. In gathering together teachers and scholars of the subject, we hoped to share concerns and experiences and gain further information on how to more effectively analyze and teach about this difficult, unsettling subject. We also wanted to help sensitize people to the need for early detection and prevention of potential genocidal atrocities.

On April 19, 1991, teachers and researchers from the United States and Canada came together at the Runkle School, Brookline, MA to discuss "Teaching about Genocide on the College Level" in a forum co-sponsored by the Institute for the Study of Genocide and Facing History and Ourselves. The conference was arranged by Helen Fein, Executive Director of the Institute for the Study of Genocide, and Mary Johnson, Program Associate of Facing History and Ourselves. Margot Stern Strom (Director of Facing History), Mark Skvirsky (Facing History), and Ervin Staub (University of Massachusetts) participated in different phases and planning. Jackie Lau (Facing History) assisted throughout all phases and at the conference.

The timing of the conference coincided with the mass exodus of Kurds fleeing Iraq in fear of genocidal massacre. Other events throughout the world, from Latin America to the Middle East to Eastern Europe, gave the forum a sense of particular urgency and importance.

This guidebook is a direct outgrowth of this conference and the enthusiastic responses of the participants and their desire to share with and learn from other teachers and scholars. We want to express our appreciation to scholars and teachers at the conference (see program following) as well as those who allowed us to include their remarks and syllabi in this book.

It is our hope that this guide will encourage more teachers to develop new courses and/or integrate aspects of the history of genocide into the curriculum. We also hope that interested individuals will find this a valuable introduction to the subject. Despite the long history and enormity of the subject, the number of courses on comparative genocide remains small. It is our belief that educating about genocide not only enhances causal explanation and understanding but will help to create individuals and societies committed to detect and prevent future genocidal atrocities.

Joyce Freedman-Apsel / Helen Fein
Conference On Teaching About Genocide In North American Colleges And Universities

April 19, 1991 Runkle School, Brookline, MA

9:30-12:30 Presuppositions and issues about teaching genocide in the college curriculum

Chair: Ervin Staub (University of Massachusetts, Amherst)

Rapporteur: Gershon Weisenberg (National Council of Christians and Jews, Providence, RI)

Panelists:
Michael Berenbaum (US Holocaust Memorial Council)
Frank Chalk (Concordia University, Montréal)
Helen Fein (Institute for the Study of Genocide)
Mary Johnson (Facing History and Ourselves Foundation)

Commentator: Clive Foss (University of Massachusetts Boston / Harvard University)

1:30-4:30 Disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches to teaching about genocide

Chair and Commentator: Joyce Freedman-Apsel (Sarah Lawrence College)

Rapporteur: Jack Nusan Porter (Bryant College)

Panelists:
Rouben Adalian (Armenian Assembly of America)
Donald Dietrich (Depart. of Religion, Boston College)
Roger Smith (Depart. of Political Science, College of William and Mary)
Ervin Staub (Depart. of Psychology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst)
Nehama Tec (Depart. of Sociology, University of Connecticut)
PART I

Assumptions and Issues
INTRODUCTION

Clive Foss

The papers delivered at the conference on the teaching of genocide by Michael Berenbaum, Frank Chalk, Helen Fein and Mary Johnson treat many aspects of the subject and reveal its complexity by presenting a variety of approaches to a large body of material. They also reflect, strikingly, the progress made in the past ten years, evidenced by the increase in publications, all part of a serious effort to understand genocide, and to disseminate this understanding. The following remarks are intended to bring together some of these disparate approaches, to see what they have in common, and to consider the general problems and methods of teaching this subject.

We are essentially dealing with two closely related questions: (1) What is our subject? and (2) How do we teach it? All our speakers have addressed some aspect of these; some have treated both questions in some detail.

My own perspective comes directly from my teaching. In 1985, I started a course on "Genocide in History" and have taught it almost every year as a seminar at the University of Massachusetts. I soon became curious to know what was going on in the field of genocide studies, to learn who else was teaching about genocide, and what approaches were being used. Thanks to the enthusiastic cooperation of Israel Charny, I conducted a survey, the results of which were summarized in Internet on the Holocaust and Genocide, No. 19 (February 1989). I asked the readers of this newsletter what specific subject they were teaching, in what department, and what approach they used; they were invited to send in syllabi and course materials.

The response was gratifying, but a little mysterious. I received 30 replies the first time and another 15 from a second questionnaire. I was surprised to find that the great majority were from the United States. Although Internet is an international newsletter, the only other country seriously represented was Israel (as would be expected), but even there, the replies were few. Hardly anything came from Europe where this subject must surely be of some interest. I have no explanation for this, and therefore cannot say how representative the sample might be.

In any case, the survey showed that the great majority of courses dealt specifically with the Holocaust, with relatively few treating genocide as a whole. Courses showed an impressive variety of approaches, as reflected in the departments which offered them: Government, History, Interdisciplinary Studies, Literature and Language, Philosophy, Psychiatry, Psychology, Religion, Social Work and Sociology.

In 1988, Fein carried out a similar survey through the newsletter of the Institute for the Study of Genocide, which circulates almost entirely in North America. She received 29 replies: 12 were comparative courses on genocide while 17 focused on the Holocaust (though about a
quarter of those related the Holocaust to genocide in their titles). The range of departments and theoretical perspectives was similar in both surveys.

These two surveys, as well as conversations at meetings in Europe, indicate that teaching about genocide is largely a North American phenomenon but that the field is definitely growing. They show that both the Holocaust and the general topic of genocide are being taught, often separately. The Brookline conference, though, revealed that many who were teaching the Holocaust were eager to learn more about the concept of genocide and to incorporate comparative questions, sources and theories into their work.

All this brings up a question which is central for everyone involved in the field: What is our subject? Is it the Holocaust in particular; the Holocaust in a broad context; or the context itself -- genocide as a whole, with the Holocaust as an example? Obviously, any of these can be a valid and viable subject. If we choose, for example, specifically to teach about the Holocaust, it is important, as Berenbaum shows us, to let the students know that the Holocaust exists in a context. Understanding the context can help us understand the Holocaust itself. On the other hand, if we teach genocide as a whole, it is important to allow the students to work on the subject, to develop it -- as Johnson eloquently tells us -- and so to derive a kind of understanding of their own. In this way, they can develop a definition based on the knowledge of what happened and why it happened.

Definition is central to much of our discussion -- that is the definition of genocide. Everyone knows what the Holocaust was; there is no doubt about that definition. But there is enormous discussion of what genocide is, and how much should be included in the term. In a practical sense, though, it hardly matters how genocide is defined, as long as the students are given information to study, from which they can work out a definition. This is an approach many use.

There seem to be three main ways of defining genocide, ranging from the all-inclusive to the relatively narrow. By all-inclusive, I have in mind that of Israel Charny, as expressed in his review of Fein's *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective*. He writes:

> Yet I am also uncomfortable that her definition is used to exclude a number of classes of mass murders such as of sundry political opponents or people perceived as dangerous to or antagonistic to a ruling government; murders of the unfit, aged or ill, not as a class object but as worthless people or who constitute a burden on government; extensive mass murders engaged in by rival warring ethnic groups such as, at this writing, Zulu and ANC in South Africa; and mass murders of civilians in wartime strikes against an enemy such as by saturation bombing, nuclear bombing, or chemical and biological weapons. [Internet 30/31 (Feb. 1991) p. 6]

This definition would include virtually all cases of mass murder and so make genocide into an all-embracing term. Fein, however, discussed this approach in the same issue of *Internet* (pp. 7-8) and amply demonstrated its weaknesses.
Fein made a point about definition which I think is extremely important: We must avoid banalization of this concept. Genocide is a real word, a modern word, which must mean *something*. But, as Fein pointed out, it seems to be applied to almost *anything* in the popular press and in informal discussions. I ask my students at the beginning of the seminar what they think genocide is. They think all sorts of things. Then I ask them to read the press *continuously* and to bring in all examples of the term they can find. The results are amazing: Genocide is used to mean almost anything (usually something the writer doesn't like) from the mistreatment of cats and dogs to any number of real and imagined criminal activities. Throughout the course I ask them to work out a definition on the basis of case studies, a method much like that used by Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn. At the end, I ask them to write a definition on the basis of what they have learned. The results are very different from the first answers they gave. So I agree with Fein: it is important that genocide should have a clear meaning, that it should not be trivialized and lose its force, so that some of the most monstrous examples of human behavior seem no different from events that happen all around us.

We have, therefore, the all-inclusive definition of Charny, and the broad approach within a careful definition, such as Fein has given us, such as Chalk and Jonassohn use in their book. As we have seen in Chalk's paper, he and Jonassohn consider a wide range of examples, but always within a context, within a definition. You may not agree with the definition, but that hardly matters in terms of teaching, because the definition itself can serve as a focus of discussion, and the students can be encouraged to develop definitions (and therefore understandings) of their own. Berenbaum takes a similar approach. He discusses the Holocaust primarily, but points out the importance of comparative work. In order to understand one case of genocide, it is essential to understand many others, and to realize that no one case is above or beyond comparison. The approach of Facing History and Ourselves falls in the same category. This focuses on the Holocaust because it is extremely well documented and can be discussed in substantial detail without requiring students to have much background knowledge or foreign languages. Yet it is best understood in the broad context of the historical circumstances and of the whole concept of genocide.

Finally, there is what might be called a narrow or very restrictive approach, such as Michael Berenbaum attributed to Elie Wiesel. In this, the Holocaust is on a different plane, outside history as it were, not subject to comparison. This is also the point of view of Steven Katz in his review of Chalk and Jonassohn's *History and Sociology of Genocide* in *Commentary* (91:1, January 1991, pp. 52-57). He analyzes the cases discussed in the book and concludes that most of them should not be included under the heading of genocide; that such examples as the Armenians, Ukrainians and Cambodians were rather victims of mass murder or national homicide, and that the Holocaust alone merits the name of genocide.

In terms of teaching, these questions of definition concern primarily the university level, where one can expect or hope that students will get involved deeply in the subject. Johnson, however, points out -- I think very helpfully -- that we are not all addressing the same audience. Teachers in schools find that debates about definition do not move the students very much.
Instead, they need to be brought into direct contact with the subject, so they can feel and understand what it is about, why and how genocide happened, and in what kind of social and historical context. Also, as Fein said (and it seems obviously correct once it is stated), we must teach the subject in different ways in different places. The audiences in Berlin, Burundi or Brookline would have different expectations, would bring different experiences; and so the teacher would adapt the subject, stressing the appropriate aspects.

Many departments can be the vehicle for teaching genocide in universities. The historical approach is obviously very useful for gaining perspective. Genocide can provide a way of approaching many periods and aspects of civilization, a way which is novel for most students. I use the historical perspective in my own courses, taking the common element of genocide as a means of exposing the class to a great variety of human experience. Fein expresses the importance of the subject for sociology: although generally neglected by sociologists, it is possible to integrate genocide into the discipline and use it as a base for learning a good deal about major sociological questions. The work of Chalk (an historian) and Jonassohn (a sociologist) provides an excellent synthesis of the methods of the two fields, to the benefit of both. More broadly interdisciplinary is the approach of Facing History, which combines the methods of history, psychology and sociology to help people get directly inside the events in question.

Teaching genocide -- however it is defined -- should lead to a certain understanding. Frank Chalk addresses the need to understand the people who actively committed genocide, and their motives. In my own courses I ask the students to answer half a dozen questions about each case: Who did it? Why did they do it? How did they do it? Who were the victims? How did they react? What was the result? These are certainly not all the possible major questions, but they serve as a guide in approaching the subject, and encourage the students to look at each case from as many points of view as possible.

Understanding necessarily leads to larger questions. As Chalk tells us -- in fact all the speakers have something to say on this -- these are basic questions about human nature, and human motivation, about freedom and democracy, and about the nature of evil. All these necessarily form part of the dialogue between student and teacher.

This leads finally to the role of the teacher and of the subject, in terms of the relation of the past to the present and the related question of activism. Johnson tells us how important it is to involve the students by putting them in touch with the society where these events took place, and to see how the group as a whole would have reacted at the time. Frank Chalk discusses the whole question of making moral judgments, of teaching values as part of a necessary agenda, not very hidden but always implied. However you approach the subject, there is always the implication that real values do exist, that judgments do need to be made. Facing History wants to put students directly into the circumstances of the time and to question assumptions that we and all students constantly make, assumptions which can be clarified and understood best by looking at the past and relating directly to it.
Yet it is possible for reasonable questioning of assumptions to go too far and to convey a hidden political agenda. Lucy Dawidowicz (in "How They Teach the Holocaust," Commentary 90:6 [December 1990] pp. 25-32) maintains that Facing History and other high school curricula are also inculcating moral relativism and a left-wing political agenda, and thus guiding students in directions not at all demanded by the study of genocide. These charges were discussed in the Letters from Readers in Commentary, 91:3 (March 1991) pp. 2-8: reactions ranged from indignant denial to forceful support. Whatever the truth of this matter, the subject needs serious discussion because, if it is to gain public support, the teaching of genocide should be free from any notion that it is serving as a vehicle for a hidden agenda.

According to some of the conferees, the policy which Facing History claims to follow, of teaching students to take individual moral responsibility (rather than automatically conforming to authority or group pressure), should serve as a counter to moral relativism and support responsible citizenship, though the stands the students take may be badly received by those who disagree with them. Part of the debate about the curricula involves content; another is the way the students interpret what they learn. Obviously, there can be disagreements about the conclusions students draw from such courses -- that in itself would be a worthwhile subject for research. There was certainly a considerable range of perspectives on this and all aspects of the subject among the teachers and scholars at the conference.

It seems to me that scholars should certainly make their values and assumptions explicit. But they should equally refrain from using the classroom -- and the conference hall -- as a pulpit for propagating views on contemporary issues which are, as likely as not, to have nothing to do with the subject, and only serve to weaken it in the eyes of others. It is essential that the study of genocide manifest a political neutrality -- not be identified with Left or Right -- in order to maintain support among all members of the community. After all, genocide and the Holocaust are not political questions; they transcend any differences between points of view and represent far greater universal issues.

In sum, if such a diverse session can really be summarized, we need to know what we are teaching, whether the Holocaust or genocide. We need to define it. We need to know what we are doing with it -- that is, how do we relate our experience and those of our students to these events without turning them into simple names on a piece of paper, like other dry facts that might appear in a curriculum. And finally, we need to see how the study can contribute -- for us and for our students -- to understanding a great range of fundamental questions about human nature and the human experience.
THE UNIQUENESS AND UNIVERSALITY OF THE HOLOCAUST

Michael Berenbaum

For more than a decade the debate over the uniqueness and universality of the Holocaust has divided scholars, survivors, and civic leaders on three continents. I have argued against those opposed to the representation of non-Jewish victims in the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum who feared that this inclusion diminishes the singularity of Jewish fate. Only by discussing all the Nazis' victims can the uniqueness of Jewish suffering be convincingly conveyed as a matter of fact rather than a statement of faith.

Yehuda Bauer locates the uniqueness of the Holocaust in the intentionality of the perpetrators. This view is essentially supported by Lucy Dawidowicz, Uriel Tal, George Mosse, and Steven Katz. These scholars emphasize intent and ideology.

By contrast, Raul Hilberg and other historians have focused on results rather than intentions. Hilberg concentrates not on the philosophy that underscored the destruction but on the processes of execution. Emil Fackenheim, Lawrence Langer, Hannah Arendt, Richard Rubenstein, and Joseph Borkin concur with this approach. How the terrible crime was committed, as much as its theoretical conception, distinguishes the Holocaust from previous manifestations of evil.

John Cuddihy says that the stress on the uniqueness of Jewish destiny in the Holocaust serves several ideological functions for Jews. Firstly, he maintains that the "residual category" of non-Jews that continues to divide the world serves three critical functions for Jews. It preserves a sense of sacred particularity, freezing the presence of anti-semitism in Jewish consciousness, and thus preventing Jews who consider that anti-semitism alone mandates that one assert that one is a Jew from rejecting or forgetting their Jewish identity. It continues to separate Jew from Gentile not as a free-choice by Jews but as a decision imposed by Hitler who radically divided Jews from non-Jews. Finally, according to Cuddihy, uniqueness functions not so much for preventing historical fraud or dejudiaization but as a device for conferring status.

However, there is no conflict between describing the uniqueness of the Jewish experience during the Holocaust and recognizing other victims of Nazism. In fact, the examination of all victims is not only politically desirable but pedagogically mandatory if we are to demonstrate the claim of uniqueness. History should guide the portrayal of all victims of Nazism -- Jews and non-Jews. There are three historical dimensions to the question of uniqueness.

Firstly, the goal of the Holocaust was unprecedented. Never before did a state sponsor a systematic, bureaucratic extermination of an entire people in a quasi-apocalyptic act promising national salvation. Nazi Germany ranked the murder of Jews over the war effort.

In terms of rationalization of processes, the Holocaust was without parallel. Raul Hilberg traces the process of extermination from definition to expropriation to concentration to
deportation and to extermination. Each step was part of a disciplined program borrowing on past policies but breaking new ground, shattering previous boundaries -- moral, political, psychological, and religious -- and overcoming the inertia of an entrenched bureaucracy, civilian as well as military. The end result was the creation of new instruments of destruction; the Nazis created l'universe concentrainaire, which Arendt called a "society of total domination," where Fackenheim's musselman (the walking dead) inhabit Wiesel's "kingdom of night." Langer speaks of the "death of choice," and Primo Levi writes about a "new language of atrocity."

Finally, the results of the Holocaust were six million dead, one million of them children -- an entire world destroyed, a culture uprooted, and mankind left with new thresholds of inhumanity.

In order to demonstrate each dimension of the uniqueness, the plight of all the Nazi victims must be understood. Contra Bauer, the inclusion of non-Jews is neither a convenience nor a bow to the realities of pluralistic American life but an intellectual, historical, and pedagogical prerequisite to conveying the truth of what occurred in the Holocaust. Historical accuracy should unite ethnic communities who wish their dead to be remembered with Jewish survivors who appropriately want the Judeo-centric nature of the experience to be told. Particularity need not be sacrificed to false universalism.

Bohdan Wytwytzky, a young philosopher of Ukrainian ancestry from Columbia University, has offered a compelling image for describing the Holocaust. He refers to the many circles of hell in Dante's Inferno. The Jews occupied the center of hell with the concentric rings extending outward to incorporate many other victims much as waves spread outward with diminishing intensity from a stone tossed into a lake. In order to comprehend the Jewish center, we must fully probe the ripple effects as well as the indisputable core.
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Both the concept of genocide (Lemkin 1944) and our need to understand the phenomenon emerged from World War II. Research on the Holocaust, which was scant before 1960, had first focused on the perpetrators and then on the victims, paralleling public preoccupations. The 1970s marked the take-off point in both examining the bystanders and turning to examine genocide as a phenomenon embracing the Holocaust but not restricted to it. Indeed, between 1945 and 1988, 14 state perpetrators had been noted, mainly in Asia and Africa: The best known case, often called an "auto-genocide," was Democratic Kampuchea (Fein 1990, 87). In the 1980s, books on genocide have more than doubled in number.

The definition of genocide became a problem dividing researchers largely because of widespread dissatisfaction with the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (UNGC) which defines genocide in international law. Its exclusion of political, sexual, and social groups troubled many; and there was some controversy about the necessity of establishing intent, the meaning of intent, and how one goes about establishing intent (Fein 1990, 8-24).

One of my interests in finding consensus on a social-scientific definition which parallels (to some extent) the recognized legal definition is to rescue the concept of genocide from the rhetorical stretch and depreciation resulting from its frequent use as a political labelling device. Today, the term genocide may refer to anything from abortion, bisexuality, cocaine addiction, and dieting, to suburbanization and tuition increases in the contemporary press.

My aim in definition is to retrieve genocide as a usable concept for research, teaching, and social prognosis in order (1) to understand genocides that have occurred, and (2) to anticipate and deter those that might happen. My definition, which embraces but is not limited to the examples given in the UNGC, is: "Genocide is sustained purposeful action by a perpetrator to physically destroy a collectivity directly or through interdiction of the biological and social reproduction of group members" (Fein 1990, 24). This parallels the intent of the UNGC and corresponds to how the UNGC has been interpreted by some legal scholars (Fein 1990, 19-20). In the great majority of instances, the cases of genocide that fit this definition also fit under the UNGC definition.

In terms of teaching, the first question is: How does genocide fit into the liberal arts curriculum? Courses in genocide are sometimes mistakenly viewed as the academic turf of victimized groups. I believe that this is an error. Such courses are critical to the traditional western liberal arts curriculum and should be taught firstly because of the questions they raise rather than because of their representation of the groups victimized. Such studies should be integrated into the curriculum rather than enclosed in departmental or intellectual ghettos.
Genocide can be related to the liberal arts curriculum as the worst example of how states destroy subjects and citizens rather than liberate and represent them. We need to understand how genocide occurred and what it reflects about where we are at. Since civilization -- its progress and regresses -- is a central focus of that curriculum, genocide appears to be a problematic issue to probe our assumptions about civilization, rationality and modernity. Other problem-centered courses in the curriculum which transcend the period, region, and state framework include studies of revolution, war, slavery, and modernization.

Another approach (countering the modish and extreme cultural relativism of post-modernism) is the (philosophical and psychological) study of evil (see Staub :990). While Western civilization is specific yet has universally relevant dimensions, evil is universal but has situationally specific manifestations.

Genocide can be taught through case studies and survey courses in the social sciences, literature and philosophy. In teaching about genocide, your choice of cases and focus may depend not only on whether you prefer intense study of one case or a survey of several cases but on your audience; you may choose different foci in Berlin, Birmingham, Brooklyn and Brookline. When teaching in Berlin, I focused on the so-called bystanders in order to get students to examine the responsibility of all of German society rather than just the machinery of destruction. In education about genocide, one must stress that to understand is not to forgive or to accept all. But it is essential to understand before we evaluate and judge.

Because of its embededness in western civilization and in Christianity, it seems likely that the Holocaust will continue to be the case most chosen. There are many choices in teaching, starting with naming the case. I shall present another perspective starting out with understanding the "Final Solution of the Jewish Question." My thesis is that genocide was the Nazi locomotive of history or vehicle of social change rather than simply an unanticipated outcome of search for a solution to the Jewish question -- nor was it restricted to Jews. In this perspective, the aim is to understand the development of the criminal state and the evolution of a chain of murders and genocides.

The question always recurs: How do we understand the Final Solution in relation to other Nazi crimes against humanity during the same period? The latter includes (1) the categorical murders of defective "Aryan" children and institutionalized adults in 1939; (2) the totalistic genocide of the Gypsies (with little publicity) throughout German-occupied Europe; (3) the mass starvation of captured Russian soldiers; (4) the selective killings of the Polish intelligentsia and significant groups of other Slavic peoples; and (5) the incarceration and often consequent deaths of political prisoners and German homosexuals in German concentration camps. Both the second, third and fourth can be classed as genocide under the UNGC and were so regarded by Lemkin (1944) prior to the Convention. Although the Final Solution was a singular genocide which cannot be comprehended without explaining the role of antisemitism in European history and politics, it was one of a train of murders which needs to be understood in the context of Nazi ideology (including its bio-sociology as well as its race myth) and war goals.
Often, this has been overlooked because we have detached the victims in trains of boxed victims by focusing on false issues, e.g., the "uniqueness question." The so-called "uniqueness" school ignores the fact that to understand unique events we must place them against an explanatory background and contextualize them.

Three contexts have been offered so far to make sense of the Final Solution: (1) the history of antisemitism; (2) the rise of the Nazi criminal state; and (3) comparative studies of genocide. The first explains how and why the Jews became victims; the second explains how and why the Nazi state became a killer-state; and the third explores the preconditions, motive and types of genocide in order to discern patterns and causes. These are alternative, not mutually exclusive frameworks, and the same findings may be studied from each perspective, revealing different truths.

Analytic comparisons among genocides is a valid and intellectually demanding enterprise which should not be confused with comparisons of some partisans or descendants of perpetrators of previous genocides -- principally Turks and (a minority of) Germans -- intended to justify their ancestors (Fein 1992). Political comparisons among genocides and the use of one mass murder as the model or prototype have been used by heirs of the perpetrators to deny, obscure and justify the deeds of their predecessors -- and probably will continue to be so misused.

Teaching about genocide thus presents a set of problems of explanation and interpretation related to but going beyond most academic controversies. For we are always aware that the implications are not only academic. Just as the Final Solution grew out of a set of institutions and organizations -- the concentration camp, the SS, the nullification of the rule of law -- that produced many other victims, present-day genocides occur against an institutionalized background of gross violations of life-integrity in many states: mass killings, calculated state murders, disappearance and torture. For this reason, my present work as a social scientist focuses on monitoring and scaling these phenomena which may be clues to or lead to a genocide. Personally, I am weary of just "accounting" for genocide; the mission of our time is to stop it.
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PRESUPPOSITIONS AND ISSUES ABOUT GENOCIDE

*Frank Chalk*

My comments are based on the research, writing, and teaching on genocide that I have done for the past 12 years with my collaborator, sociologist Kurt Jonassohn. Both of us embarked on the study of genocide because we were struck by the neglect of genocide as a distinct phenomenon requiring comparative analysis by scholars in our respective fields of study, history and sociology. Exactly why my colleagues in history have partaken of the collective denial of genocide that is characteristic of much of modern discourse we will probably never fully understand. It is apparent, however, that historians -- aware of the power of interpretations of the past to arouse bitter hatreds -- have shared a strong aversion to moral judgments in history. Many, like the philosopher of history Herbert Butterfield ("The Dangers of History," *History and Human Relations* ed. Herbet Butterfield (London: Collins, 1951)), have seen discussions of persecutions that assigned responsibility to specific perpetrators, and their ideas, as serious barriers to true historical understanding. In essays written in the late 1940s and early 1950s, Butterfield especially feared that biased scholars would seize upon religious persecution, great massacres or the modern concentration camp, to condemn whole religions, nationalities, or political philosophies. Historians faced with these terrible events, he argued, should describe them in detail so that the terrible nature of the crime would be vivid to every reader. But he disdained any effort by the historian to direct attention to the doers of the action and to present a historical analysis examining the perpetrators in detail.

Yet even Butterfield saw that the comparative study of events could help people "to face a new world, and to meet the surprises of unpredictable change with greater flexibility."

In an example that is strikingly similar to the comparative work on genocide that is now under way, he observed that:

If a man had a knowledge of many wars and of the whole history of the art of war, studying not merely the accounts of battles and campaigns, but relating the weapons of a given period to the conditions of the time, relating policies to circumstances, so that he came to have an insight into the deep causes of things, the hidden sources of the changes that take place -- if he allowed this knowledge not to lie heavily on his mind, not to be used in a narrow and literal spirit, but to sink into the walls of his brain so that it was turned into wisdom and experience -- then such a person would be able to acquire the right feeling for the texture of events, and would undoubtedly avoid becoming the mere slave of the past. [*History and Human Relations* (1951) pp. 181]

Thus Butterfield, despite his caveats against ethical and moral judgments by historians, acknowledged the potential efficacy and legitimacy of the comparative method when employed by historians interested in acquiring an understanding of the scourge of war.
There are many possible approaches to designing a university course on genocide. Genocide can be introduced as part of the study of world history or Western civilization. It can be studied through an intensive examination of a small number of genocides. It can be approached comparatively and throughout history in a survey course that includes many cases and themes. And, when we have learned enough to develop significant generalizations about past genocides and their roots, it will become feasible to offer courses based on major themes in the history of genocide. Our method at Concordia University from the very beginning has been to examine genocide comparatively, and from its earliest beginnings in human history down to the present. Using a definition of genocide that includes political and social groups, as well as the racial, religious, national and ethnic groups covered by the United Nations definition, and restricting our definition of acts that constitute genocide to the killing of members of the group or deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction, we developed a typology of genocide which classifies genocides according to the motive of the perpetrator. The details of this definition and typology are set out in *The History and Sociology of Genocide* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

Our students come from many different ethnic and religious backgrounds. Most of them are young people with no family legacy of genocide. They take the course in large numbers -- 70 students enrolled last year and another 70 are enrolled for the class beginning this fall -- because they care deeply about human rights and they are worried about the capacity of human beings to do evil as well as good. In our course, which requires two semesters, they critically examine the different definitions and typologies of genocide. The core of their work is the detailed examination of over 20 cases of genocide and genocidal massacres throughout history and a major research paper, using primary sources whenever possible, on a particular case which they must assess for its genocidal or non-genocidal characteristics. The complete set of case studies, and a supplementary bibliography intended to serve as a "starter kit" for students and members of the general public, can be found in our book.

What do students take away from our course? This year, I intend to introduce myself to the class, quoting Edward Segel's description of Sir Isaiah Berlin, as a "secularist who believes in original sin." ["The Crooked Temper of Humanity," Review of Isaiah Berlin, *History Book Club Review*, May 1991, pp. 18] By the end of the academic year, our students may very well conclude that democracy is the least evil and the most humane form of government; that the rule of law is the surest defense against the rise of leaders likely to commit genocide; and that political violence and theories that legitimize killing in the pursuit of political objectives are the seedbeds of most modern genocides.

In addition to these overall generalizations, we will have introduced the students to the utilitarian motives of the perpetrators of the earliest genocides, helped them to see the great importance of genocides in empire-building, and emphasized the important role of revolutionary ideologies in many of the great mass killings of the twentieth century. We will argue and debate, sift and winnow conflicting evidence, and work together to find unique and universal elements among the cases. At the final examination, each student will write a brief to a
government minister recommending a course of action regarding some apprehended genocide. Our experience at Concordia University shows clearly that today's students have the courage to study genocide if only more professors can find the will to teach about it.
MORAL EDUCATION AND TEACHING

Mary Johnson

For the past ten years as a staff member of Facing History and Ourselves I have been engaged with a singular program of moral and cognitive education. Since it began in 1977, our program has reached thousands of educators in the secondary and primary schools throughout the United States, including public, private and parochial schools, and on the college level. This program focuses on the Holocaust (which I will consider further in this essay) and the Armenian genocide. The experience of Facing History can provide insights for teachers preparing to teach courses on genocide and for those who wish to reach out to the community.

In order to establish a relationship between the past and present, Facing History has developed resource books and supplementary aides and manuals that focus on the era of the Holocaust within the larger framework of human behavior. Rather than embark on a sweeping comparison of genocides in the last century, our approach focuses on an in-depth investigation of the Nazi era and urges students to apply what is learned from the history of the Third Reich to the study of other instances of genocide and human rights abuses.

The program opens with a study of the interaction between society and the individual, considering the range of choices persons have. Critical questions in this introductory section include: Why do individuals obey authority? What are the legal constraints on individuals and at what point is it appropriate for an individual to question laws of their society? How does peer pressure operate? What makes the needs for conformity so overpowering that an individual ceases to think for him or herself? To what extent does education help one in making responsible moral choices? What happened to the educated elites in Nazi Germany? How do we raise children to become responsible, thinking and caring citizens of a democratic society?

After introducing students to the broad issues of human behavior, the program makes a careful study of the Nazi era, reviewing how the Nazis came to power, consolidated their authority and planned the Final Solution. As students look at the actual history, they are repeatedly asked to consider how they might have responded to events of the Third Reich and to consider why totalitarian solutions seemed so appealing to societies in the 1930s. Turning next to the years of World War II and the Holocaust, students are asked to analyze why victims of Nazism were left with few choices, and how perpetrators and bystanders took on their respective roles. Analyzing Nazism leads students to re-evaluate human behavior and raise questions about individual and collective responsibility. Who is responsible for the Final Solution? Are individuals compelled to follow leadership that imposes an immoral system of government? Is it just for victorious nations to try defeated nations? Can individuals be held accountable for "going along to get along"?
For much of the last two centuries the Rankian tradition of objective history has been the dominant paradigm in the discipline, influencing the training of professional historians and the presentation of history in classrooms and textbooks. Emotional responses to the material, empathizing with people of previous generations and drawing parallels between the past and present are anathema to the criteria for scientific history established by Leopold von Ranke and his colleagues. In contrast, Facing History is rooted in the alternative tradition of seeing history as a moral science, a tradition which dates back to historians of antiquity and attained prominence in the eighteenth century work of Gibbons and Hume. From this perspective, history is a branch of moral philosophy and its lessons serve as guidelines for reflective thinking and moral behavior. Interestingly enough, this earlier tradition speaks to contemporary historians who increasingly do not want to confine their work to some ivory tower. It allows historians an opportunity to communicate with a much broader audience by applying their skill to help other historians and members of the general public think critically about social and political issues and reflect on their moral values and behavior.

I have observed that the effects of teaching the Facing History and Ourselves approach have a profound impact on people in a variety of settings. In some instances, the influence has been dramatic enough to compel students to vow that they will take direct measures to combat prejudice and intolerance in their communities. In other cases, the changes have been more subtle with students observing that they began thinking differently about stereotypes and racial slurs and will, in the future, find it harder to be bystanders if they are witnesses to acts of brutality. These reactions suggest that the long-standing tradition of history as a moral science addresses broadly felt needs in contemporary society.

History need not remain the preserve of trained historians. People of diverse backgrounds and levels of education can derive important lessons in critical thinking and morality from being exposed to this approach. They will come to recognize that history is not an inevitable process that transcends human intervention. Individuals in past societies made deliberate choices to act or remain apathetic which in turn affected the course of events. If individuals in current societies are to prevent situations that may lead to group and class persecution and genocide, they must reflect on the consequences of their actions and oppose the rise of authoritarian regimes that threaten the preservation of human rights and civic liberties.
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PART II

Course Syllabi and Assignments
TEACHING ABOUT GENOCIDE

Joyce Freedman-Apsel

In the last decade there has been an increase in the still small, but growing, course offerings on comparative genocide on the college level. (Today, the preponderance of courses at the undergraduate level which analyze in detail the attempt to eliminate an entire people focus on the Holocaust. In part, this reflects a continuation of interest in the Second World War and extensive documentation and scholarship which fuel popular interest in Nazism and Nazi exterminatory policy.)

The syllabi collected in this Guide reflect the case history and inter-disciplinary approach taken by most scholars and teachers in the field. The scope of the subject compels teachers to utilize a variety of disciplines to convey the different, sometimes contrasting, questions and levels one needs to explore in studying genocide. Hence, scholars and teachers in anthropology, history, literature, sociology, political science and psychology included here often draw material from each other’s disciplines. Although many teachers draw material and methods from other disciplines and some ask transdisciplinary questions, others seek to expand their own fields. (Examples are the syllabi of Smith and Nowak which focus on destruction and evil.) Many attempt to identify both specific cases of genocide and the universal or generalizable characteristics and causes which have occurred in different historical contexts. The content and emphasis vary from anthropologist Hilda Kuper’s course on indigenous peoples to political scientist Roger Smith’s more broad-based exploration of human destructiveness and politics. However, all share a sense of the importance of trying to understand the currents of genocide in history.

There exists no unanimity among scholars and teachers concerning a definition of genocide and, hence, what should be included in the content of the course. However, the debate over how to define genocide allows students to examine their own assumptions and to grapple with the various gradations of evil. In the spring of 1991, students in my course on The History of Twentieth Century Genocide debated what constitutes genocide, issues of just and unjust wars, and the politics of historic atrocities against the backdrop of massacres of the Kurds and subsequent threats to Kurdish lives and of the larger conflict in the Persian Gulf. Class members found it both disturbing and imperative to try to come up with a definition of genocide. The legal and political implications of the United Nations’ definition of genocide, and its limited action based on that definition, made a particularly strong impression given the international crisis of the time.

Frank Chalk, has co-taught a course with Kurt Jonassohn at Concordia University on “The History and Sociology of Genocide” eight times since 1980. He points out: "Each year some current event in the news seizes the students’ imagination as related to genocide and the cases in our course. Frequently, especially early in the year, they see any massacre or atrocity as
genocidal, even if it only involved ethnocide or the isolated actions of a mentally deranged
individual." Trying to decide whether apartheid or slavery or abortion are correctly labeled
genocide raises important issues concerning definition, intentionality and the very nature of
violence. Students begin to distinguish between the criteria or attributes pertaining to different
concepts, such as, for example, war crimes, genocide, ethnocide, crimes against humanity --
and realize that the borders of these concepts are often unclear. Furthermore, students begin
to understand that mass death is not necessarily genocide; and some genocides do not produce
mass death. Categorization of different forms of evil, a process of demystification of evil, often
undermines assumptions and beliefs, exposing students to the complex factors which contribute
to different genocides. Clive Foss comments that he has "often had students who wanted to
study the British 'genocide' of the Irish, or the 'genocide' of the American Indians, being quite
sure that they would find the expected answers, only to be quite surprised and ending up by
demonstrating the opposite of what they had supposed to be true." Now and then students find
it so difficult or morally repulsive to analyze different forms of evil that they decide they cannot
remain in the class. For example, in the spring of 1991, a student dropped my course on The
History of Twentieth Century Genocide because she felt the assignment -- a typology of
-genocide -- v as what she called "immoral." She felt that it was improper to delineate between
different types of killing. Some years earlier, a student who was raised in the Bruderhof
community (the Societ, of Brothers, a Hutterian community with a settlement in Rifton, New
York) dropped a course on the Holocaust because her Elders objected to her studying evil.

However, most students come to understand and value the need to encounter and distinguish
among the different categories of historic atrocity.

Why, one may ask, are teachers drawn to teaching so innovative and demanding a subject
as genocide? Personal background plays a crucial role in what teachers decide to teach. Most
teachers whose syllabi are included in this Guide wrote that they had some type of personal
experience with prejudice or genocide, or professional work with human rights or refugee
organizations. Leo Kuper was a lawyer in South Africa active in the nonviolent anti-apartheid
movement before becoming a sociologist; Kurt Jonassohn and Ron Baker were child refugees
from Nazi Germany, while Ervin Staub survived the Nazi occupation of Hungary with the aid
of Christian friends. Both Ron Baker and Rhoda Howard state that their work with human
rights organizations led them to become interested in knowing more about genocide. Clive
Foss comments that in doing archeological research in historic Armenia he noted the lack of
Armenians and determined to try to find out what actually happened. This generated a more
general interest in the whole question of genocide. My own interest in understanding the Nazi
genocide against Jews and Gypsies led me to develop courses on the Holocaust which included
sections on the earlier genocide against the Armenians and to then develop a course on
comparative genocide. 'n my experience, the comparative approach provides an invaluable
broad context within which to examine particular genocides. Many educators as well as
students echo Margi Nowak's comment that she wanted to know how people could do this to
other human beings and how could they survive?
Indeedy, students are often shocked to discover that genocide has not only reoccurred throughout the 20th century and that nation-states are able to get away with mass murder, but that genocide can be a politically effective tool of states. Many courses on comparative genocide discuss the Turkish genocide against the Armenians and the subsequent history of denial. The profound and cataclysmic events of the First World War, including the first ideological genocide of the twentieth century, forever changed the nature of our world. Nationalism, implying homogeneity, became ideological justification for excluding and eliminating people from Turkey in 1915 to Cambodia in 1975. Nationalism, revolution and war provide a background for genocidal conditions up to the present time. For many students, this approach provides a painful re-examination of history: suddenly they are faced with the human cost of change and the need to evaluate whether they believe this was necessary for a particular national or political movement. Furthermore, popular notions which blame one individual or group of people for atrocities are undermined once the students note how many peoples are implicated in the continuum of destruction—both as bystanders and perpetrators—at different times and places.

Teaching about genocide can be intellectually, emotionally and pedagogically demanding. Students and teachers can sometimes feel depressed by investigating the scope of historic atrocities. Students and teachers report dreams about the subject, sometimes resulting in a preoccupation with death and a sense of futility. There are a variety of techniques for helping lessen the students' sense of powerlessness. For example, Ervin Staub emphasizes the need for community and connection and gives assignments which allow students to explore acts of human kindness as well as cruelty. By writing letters for human rights organizations such as Amnesty International or petitioning governments about the treatment of indigenous populations, students begin to get a sense of how they can go beyond being bystanders in history. Research projects provide students with a way to explore one event or reaction in detail; this often results in their recognizing the politics of genocide and helping demystify evil in history. Roger Smith, in response to a questionnaire given to teachers whose syllabi are included in this guide, astutely points out the need to "grapple with the complexities as well as horrors of mass destruction, and to find inner resources that prevent one from being overwhelmed, and thus made powerless, when confronted with the need to prevent genocide." He explains:

As a teaching technique, I think there has to be a kind of in-out approach: if one is dealing with rather abstract or, on the other hand, historical material of a rather bland sort, then one begins to forget what genocide is about. On the other hand, if one confronts genocide in its horror and immediacy, then it becomes too painful for us all. A rhythm of distance and immediacy seems necessary: one must confront the horror but not be overcome by it. The latter is the way of despair and impotence; the other gives distance but also only the surface. One needs to respond to genocide both cognitively and existentially—neither by itself is adequate in my opinion.
The challenges and difficulties of effectively teaching about genocide have undergone significant changes from 1970 to the present. As historians and others began to teach and write about the inequities in American history, students became exposed to such previously neglected areas as Afro-American, Women's and Labor History. Beginning in the early 1970s, there was more and more public exposure to the Holocaust through memoirs, movies and television. At the same time, the Vietnam War gave new generations of American students an awareness that their country's foreign policy could result in devastation and suffering to innocent civilians. Increasing domestic problems such as violence, crime and drugs changed students' attitudes about how they would react to violence.

During the 1980s there was a shift away from idealized notions of resistance to more understanding and empathy for victims of genocide. Students talked about passing by homeless people or being confronted with violence and how they tried to protect themselves. They were less likely to talk about the victims "going like sheep to the slaughter" and were more ready to understand the difficulty of avoiding or getting through the net of violence and destruction. However, stereotypes about the single villain in history, especially Hitler, remain. The lack of awareness of the political efficacy of genocide persists as does the notion that victimization ends when the killing stops. Students now have greater empathy for victims and are very interested in knowing about events related to terror and killing, such as the auto-genocide in Cambodia, murders in Uganda, disappearances in Argentina and massacres in Iraq. The popularity of courses on utopias and communes in the 1970s has given way in the 1990s to interest in the cultures of terror and twentieth century genocide. For the majority of students this interest in genocide in history is, I believe, a positive development. Students' interest in knowing about what went wrong in history may educate a new generation who want to take an active role in helping prevent future atrocities. As teachers we face the challenge of informing students about the magnitude of historic atrocity: of understanding particular genocidal events within the larger comparative framework. The increase in denial of the Holocaust and other genocides underlines the importance of documenting and analyzing genocide in history. At the same time, we must present possible alternatives for individual and societal action to help prevent, monitor or stop genocidal atrocities. Most syllabi and accounts cited here tell of the cost to the victims; however, there are also long lasting costs to the perpetrators. Both the human cost and the political success of past genocides compel students and teachers to continue teaching and learning about and from this disturbing subject.
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DESTRUCTION AND SURVIVAL OF INDIGENOUS SOCIETIES

Hilda Kuper

Spring 1989
Anthropology
University of California at Los Angeles

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The course is focused on problems of theoretical and practical concern to anthropologists, whose discipline is based essentially on empirical research among indigenous people in different parts of the world. Selected cases will be analyzed within a broad sociological framework and in historical perspective in order to obtain a realistic understanding of causes, processes, and consequences of destruction and survival of indigenous peoples.

Consequences range from restricted assimilation into dominant groups at one end, to genocidal annihilations and total extinction of cultures at the other, but destruction must not be reduced to meaningless relativity and the dehumanizing measure of statistics. Theories of social change, conflict, militarization, ethnocide and genocide will be explored for their relevance and validity.

In some cases, colonization has been accompanied by the deliberate extermination of indigenous peoples; in other cases destructive consequences have resulted indirectly by: importation of disease, undermining of the traditional subsistence base, or enforced deculturation and the imposition of conditions inimical to survival, resulting, as suggested by Pitt-Rivers, in the failure in the will to survive.

At the present time, a major threat to indigenous societies arises from policies of local government, and the indirect economic force exerted by politically and technologically more powerful interest groups. The forced relocation of indigenous peoples, as in the South African implementation of apartheid policies, or the relocations in the interests of economic development, as in so many major development projects, e.g., agricultural developments, ranching or dam projects, provide the opportunity for the comparative study of the reactions of affected people, and the conditions which promote different forms of more or less successful readaptation.

By contrast, the economic development of the Amazon Basin provides comparative material on the deliberate elimination of small indigenous groups and the disastrous consequences of ill-conceived or poorly administered reservations, quite apart from the ecological threat to the environment.

Among physical survivors of widespread violence are refugees, a group distinct from migrants who form part of recognized populations. Studies of resettlement camps emphasize
high death rates, disease, the breakup of the family life, deleterious psychological effects of long periods of incarceration, and the struggle to maintain traditional institutions and modes of living. What might be done to improve conditions in these refugee camps? And more generally, what measures can be taken for the protection of indigenous groups against annihilatory violence and gross violations of their human rights?

The issues are complex and raise a number of difficult questions: What is meant by destruction? What are the roots of conflict? Who are the victims? Why did it happen? How was the process? And, what is survival? What is the relationship between destruction of institutions and destruction of people? How relevant to our understanding of the issues are current theories of structure, adaptability, conflict, ethnicity?

While it is clear that cases could be classified by such criteria as: ecology, social systems, (political, economic, religious, linguistic), and conflicts may be analyzed in general terms of ethnic, religious, racial or economic differences, it is also clear that each case is unique in its own history and specific structural and cultural content. It is at the level of in-depth information that anthropologists can make a major contribution to more formal reports by international and national organizations and authorities.

It is anticipated that this research will illuminate general trends emerging from comparative material and also indicate the extent of specificity which makes each case unique. The material reflects broad historical changes. Thus, in the 19th and early 20th century, colonization was frequently accompanied by direct force of conquest or pacification. In the present era, the major threat to indigenous people is indirect economic force exerted by politically and technologically more powerful interest groups.

Reactions reflect the diversity of social relations and cultural traditions of communities no longer protected by isolation from the rest of the world. The range of cases provides material for the testing of different approaches in both periods. Destructive consequences have also occurred indirectly, for example through the importation of disease, destruction of living space or other conditions inimical to social survival.

The general purpose of the course is to rouse the interest and awareness of students to the dialectic between destruction and survival, while contributing to the essential tasks of compiling, interpreting and disseminating information in the hope that knowledge can be of practical effect in limiting destruction and indicating techniques of survival.

Members of the Anthropology faculty who have faced these issues in the field will present specific cases from their area of geographic specialization. Selection of cases and interpretation will depend on individual lecturers.

There is growing literature on the subject including a well established quarterly journal, Cultural Survival; publications by internationally recognized non-governmental organizations (NGOs), more particularly Survival International for the Rights of Threatened Tribal Peoples, and reports submitted to the UN on discrimination against indigenous populations. There are also numerous individual case studies and reliable documentation of destruction in widely
dispersed existing groups in societies throughout the world. Some are linked with the technology of development, others with ancient antagonisms. Relevant readings for each case will be provided by the individual speakers.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

The grading will be based on a cumulative final examination and a term paper. The final will be essay format and draw upon materials presented in the lectures and in the required readings. The term project is to write a case study of a particular indigenous population analyzed in terms of the concepts presented in the course, and should be approximately 20 pages in length.

SPRING QUARTER SCHEDULE

Week 1:
Tuesday April 4  Dr. Hilda Kuper -- Destruction & Survival of Indigenous People
Thursday April 6  Dr. Hilda Kuper -- South Africa: Race, Apartheid and Destruction

Week 2
Tuesday April 11 Dr. Peter Hammond -- Development: An Analytic Paradigm
Thursday April 13 Dr. Joseph Birdsell -- Destruction & Survival of Australian Aborigines

Week 3
Tuesday April 18 Dr. Christopher Donnan -- Punctuated Equilibrium & Stability in Peru
Thursday April 20 Dr. Robert Gordon -- Bushmen Policy in South West Africa

Week 4
Tuesday April 25 Film -- The Turtle People (Miskito Indians of Nicaragua)
Thursday April 27 Dr. Robert Bailey -- Development in the Ituri Forest of Zaire

Week 5
Tuesday May 2  Dr. Allen Johnson -- Destruction of the Amazon Forest
Thursday May 4  Dr. Timothy Earle -- Destruction of the Inca

Week 6
Tuesday May 9  Dr. John Kennedy -- Tahaumara of Mexico
Thursday May 11 Dr. Sondra Hale -- Reconstruction in the Sudan
Week 7

Tuesday May 16 Dr. David Maybury-Lewis -- Savages to Security Risks: Indians of Brazil

Thursday May 1 Dr. Jac - Sri Lanka: An Anthropological Perspective

Week 8

Tuesday May 23 Dr. Nazif Shahrani -- Afghan Massacre

Thursday May 25 Dr. Douglas Hollan -- Ambivalence of Missionizing in the Pacific

Week 9

Tuesday May 20 Film -- The Last Tasmanian

Thursday June 1 Dr. Robert Edgerton -- Resistance to Colonialism

Week 10

Tuesday June 6 Dr. Paul Krokrity -- De-acquisition of Language among the Tewa

Thursday June 8 Dr. Hilda Kuper -- Summary & Conclusions

REQUIRED READINGS

Books


Articles

Glumbert, Marc, "Paradigm Lost;" Oceania, 52: 103-123, 1981.

RECOMMENDED READINGS

GENOCIDE IN HISTORY

Clive Foss

Spring 1990
University of Massachusetts
Graduate Seminar/History

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND GOALS

This course will study an unpleasant but widespread phenomenon in human history, the slaughter of whole nations of innocent people. By considering a large number of examples, it will attempt to define genocide, to see how frequent it has been in history and to understand why and under what circumstances it happens.

The course will begin with introductory material about the ancient world and the Middle Ages and will then move on to a detailed consideration of the most notorious case, the German genocide against the Jews. The history of the Jews and their persecutions will be surveyed, along with the rise of Hitler, and the aims and methods of the genocide. From there, the subject will move to a parallel case, the Turkish massacre of the Armenians, which will receive similar attention.

The direction from there will be geographical, treating the following cases: Stalin's deportation of minority peoples; Genghis Khan and Tamerlane; Chinese actions in Tibet; the Cambodian self-genocide; the Christians in Japan; and the Communists in Indonesia. It will also deal with the slaughter of the Arabs in Zanzibar, the careers and actions of the Zulu chiefs in Southern Africa in the nineteenth century, and the cases of American Indians. Other possible or controversial examples will be discussed, according to the interests of the class.

In each case of genocide, the following questions will be asked: Who did it? Why did they do it? How did they do it? Who were the victims? How did they react? What was the result?

In each case, too, the central question -- was this a genocide? -- will be asked, so that a suitable definition can be worked out during the course of the discussion.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

The course is a seminar and each student will be expected to participate actively by preparing frequent oral reports on aspects of the subject currently discussed; and a long (30 minute) report toward the end of the semester, which will be a summary presentation of the student's term paper.

The paper, due at the end of the semester, will be the only written requirement of the course. It should be a serious research paper on a topic of the student's own choosing within the framework of the subject of genocide. The topic and the bibliography for it will be chosen in an individual conference with the instructor. It may deal with a specific case (e.g., were the
Irish victims of genocide?) or a theoretical aspect (e.g., the distinction between genocide and war), or attempt a broad synthesis (e.g., comparison between genocides in industrial and pre-industrial societies). The paper will be 20-25 pages in length, with footnotes and bibliography in standard scholarly form. It should give evidence of critical treatment of source material, and of ability to organize a complex body of material with focus on a particular point.

Grading: term paper 80%; oral reports and class participation 20%. Students will be assessed with the performance of graduate students in previous years or other courses in mind. Active class participation as well as the competence to do research and present it coherently, both orally and in writing, will be stressed.

COURSE SYLLABUS

REQUIRED READINGS
(Source book for numerous cases of genocide.)
Other readings will vary each year with the focus of the course and the interests of the students; they will be put on reserve.

CLASS DISCUSSIONS
1. Proposed definitions of genocide: discussion
   The ancient world: Israelites, Assyrians, Greeks, Romans
   Medieval Europe: the Albigensian Crusade; the Crusaders in Germany
Required Readings: Kuper: chapters 1-5; Porter, pages 2-33

2. The Holocaust I
   History of the Jews. Anti-semitism in Germany; The Nazi Party and Hitler’s Career.
Required Readings: Kuper, chapters 5,7; Porter, pages 34-97.
3. The Holocaust II
   Plans, Mechanism and Execution.
   Required Readings: As above.

4. The Armenians I
   History of Armenia and late Ottoman Turkey.
   Required Readings: Lang and Walker; Kuper, chapter 6; Porter, pages 98-149.

5. The Armenians II and Other Peoples of the Caucasus.
   Discussion of Morgenthau and of current efforts to deny the Armenian genocide.
   Peoples of the Caucasus, deportations under Stalin; comparison with liquidation of the kulak and the Great Terror.
   Required Reading: Morgenthau, *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*

   Discussion of massacre and genocide; war and genocide.
   Required Readings: Porter, pages 194-259; Kuper, chapter 8.

7. First oral reports: summaries of proposed papers; general discussion of type of genocides.

8. Asia II: The Communists in Indonesia; Hindus and Moslems in India; The Christians of Japan.
   Discussion of political genocide; religious genocide.
   Required Readings: See week 6 and L. Collins and D. Lapierre, *Freedom at Midnight*.

9. Asia III: Cambodia
   Discussion of "auto-genocide"
   Required Reading: Kuper, chapter 9.


10. Africa: Rwanda-Burundi; the Arabs of Zanzibar; the Zulu Kings; the Asians of Uganda.

   Discussion of "genocide" without killing.
   Required Reading: Kuper, The Pity of It All.

11. General Discussion: Review of other real or claimed cases; what is genocide?; discussion of readings in Kuper and Porter with review of UN definition; causes of genocide; aggressors and victims; early detection and prevention of genocide; general synthesis of material covered.

   Required Readings: Kuper, chapters 9 and 10; Porter, pages 260-305.

Last Three Weeks: Presentation of Final Reports.

Please note this syllabus predates the publication of Chalk and Jonassohn's The History and Sociology of Genocide and it will be revised to make use of that work.
TWENTIETH CENTURY GENOCIDE

J. Freedman-Apsel

Spring 1991
Sarah Lawrence College

This course will examine one of the central problems of the 20th century -- the continuation of mass murder in our own time. At this moment the world is at war and the possibility of mass destruction and death, as well as of genocide and mass killings, is very real. Central to the course's rationale is the belief that by learning about past destruction we can better recognize and act to deter killing. Clearly, present-day events reveal how difficult it is to bridge the gap between ideology and praxis; the dilemmas of moving from being bystanders to participants in history.

We shall analyze the nature of genocide and focus in on three examples of 20th century genocide: the Armenians, the Jews and the Cambodians. Our emphasis is on trying to understand the historical background and reality of victims and victimizers. We shall use literary, psychological, philosophical, sociological and political analyses. Much of the course will examine the destruction of two-thirds of European Jewry during World War II. The Holocaust will serve as a unique case of genocide and also provide an important historical model for other ideological genocides and mass killings. We shall look at what happens to both perpetrators and survivors, trying to understand the processes of dehumanization. How are people defined "outside the universe of moral obligation" (Fein, Accounting for Genocide)? How do people cope with life in extremis? What is the social structure of a concentration camp; of a displaced persons camp? What are the roles of bystanders, of those who take active roles as resisters or humanitarians? Finally, how do we create caring, non-aggressive people in the face of the continuation of violence, aggression and brutality? What preventive actions and networks may help deter genocide and mass killing?

The following books are available at the bookstore and on reserve in the library:

Arlen, Michael, Passage to Ararat.
Bauer, Yehuda, A History of the Holocaust.
Bauman, Zygmunt, Modernity and the Holocaust.*
Chalk and Jonassohn, The History and Sociology of Genocide.
Cohn, Norman, Warrant for Genocide.
Des Pres, Terence, The Survivor.
Fein, Helen, Accounting for Genocide.*
Hilberg, Raul, The Destruction of European Jewry.
Hitler, Adolph, Mein Kampf.
Koonz, Claudia, Mothers in the Fatherland.*
Levi, Primo, Survival at Auschwitz.*
Pawelczynska, Anna, *Values and Violence in Auschwitz.*
Schochet, Simon, *Feldafing.*
Staub, Ervin, *The Roots of Evil.*

*These works will be read in part or as one of a choice of reading selections.

Students are expected to attend all classes on time with readings completed and to hand in comment and class papers on assigned days. Class discussion based on readings is a central part of this seminar as we exchange ideas and reactions to information. Conference papers may be on subjects discussed in class or on related topics from the European witch hunt to the Kurds in Iraq; unfortunately, there is a very long list of hostage and oppressed peoples. Others might like to analyze memoirs of survivors or emphasize roles of rescue, altruism or networks for preventive actions. A conference paper of at least ten pages with bibliography and footnotes is due May 15.

The following may be helpful as you begin trying to read for conference work:

**Periodicals**
- Internet on the Holocaust and Genocide, Institute for Study of Genocide Newsletter.
- Cultural Survival Quarterly.
- Leo Baeck Yearbook, YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, Yad Vashem Studies.
- Jewish Social Studies, Dimensions.

**Reports, Monographs, Articles**
- Amnesty International reports
- Chalk and Jonassohn, *History and Sociology of Genocide.*
- Kuper, Leo, *Genocide, its Political Use in the 20th Century.*
- Robinson, Jacob, and Friedman, Philip, *Guide to Jewish History under Nazi Impact.*
- Wallimann, Isidor, and Dobkowski, Michael, eds., *Genocide and the Modern Age: Etiology and Case Studies of Mass Death.*

**COURSE OUTLINE**

"In order to deter both collective violence and genocide, the forces leading to destruction need to be better understood. Those leading in the other direction not only need to be understood but must be better nurtured and organized." Helen Fein, *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective.*

I. Introduction: Twentieth Century Genocide in Historical Perspective.

Why are we studying this subject? What popular myths and difficult questions concerning the nature of individuals, of peoples, of nation-states and of civilization must we consider? How do individuals become part of a process of mass destruction? Is genocide an historical aberration or an integral part of twentieth century culture and civilization?

Historical and sociological analyses and debates: war and genocide; particular and universal; revisionism and denial. Trying to define terms "Genocide," "Holocaust" and "Shoah." How do people become defined "outside the universe of moral obligation"? (Fein, Accounting for Genocide)

Due: January 23:

Chalk and Jonassohn, The History and Sociology of Genocide, Preface-page 53.
Handout: Text of the UN Genocide Convention.

Due: January 30:


Bring to class a typewritten definition-typology of genocide (no longer than one page).

II. Genocide and Denial: Who remembers the Armenians?

"The Turkish massacres and 'deportations' of the Armenians were the most notable early example of the employment of modern communications and technology in the acting out and realization of political violence." -- Michael Arlen, Passage to Ararat.

"The history of the denial of the Armenian genocide has passed through several phases, each somewhat different in emphasis but all characterized by efforts to avoid responsibility and the moral, material, and political consequences of admission." -- Richard G. Hovannisian.

Due: February 6:

Helen Fein, Accounting for Genocide, pages 3-30 (RR Library).
Richard Hovannisian, The Armenian Genocide in Perspective, Forward-84, 97-134.

Bring to class one-page comment on how the Armenian are defined as outsiders, as hostage people.

Due: February 13:

Michael Arlen, Passage to Ararat, Armenian Survivor Testimonies.
III. The Holocaust: Ideology, Bureaucracy and Mass Death.

"Exterminatory anti-semitism appears where Jews are imagined as a collective embodiment of evil, a conspiratorial body dedicated to the task of ruining and then dominating the rest of mankind." -- Norman Cohn, Warrant for Genocide.

"What we must fight for is to safeguard the existence and reproduction of our race and our people, the sustenance of our children and the purity of our blood, the freedom and independence of the fatherland, so that our people may mature for the fulfillment of the mission allotted it by the creator of the universe." -- Adolph Hitler, Mein Kampf.

"Nazi women epitomized the everyday 'banality of evil.' Carrying out traditional women's roles..., they cooperated with war, genocide and terror by ignoring it and helping to create an image that all was well." -- Claudia Koonz, Competition for Women's Lebensraum.

Themes to be explored include: the appeal of Nazism as a political alternative; frustration with Weimar and fear of communism; and antisemitism as an integral part of National Socialist ideology.

What obsessions, fears, belief about Jews does Hitler repeat? In particular, notice how the Protocols and world conspiracy themes are picked up and given a volkish rationale. What do you think your response would have been to Mein Kampf if you were in Germany or, say, England, in the 1930s? What is your reaction to this book now?

What separate gender roles emerge within Nazi ideology and practice? How are ideas of race and gender used to reinforce Nazi ideology and become part of a continuum of destruction?

Due: February 20:
Norman Cohn, Warrant for Genocide, Preface-chapter 2, 6, 7-11 and conclusion.

Due: February 27:
Yehuda Bauer, History of the Holocaust, pages 93-137.
Ervin Staub, Roots of Evil, pages 91-99.
Claudia Koonz, Mothers in the Fatherland  chapter 6; or Koonz, The Competition for Women's Lebensraum, 1928-34 in Bridenthal, ed., When Biology Became Destiny.

Due: February 28:
Claudia Koonz, "The Second Sex and the Third Reich," Required Lecture.

"Most of you know what it means when 100 corpses lie there, or 500 lie there, or 1000 lie there. To have gone through this and -- apart from exceptions caused by human weakness -- to have remained decent, that has hardened us. That is a page of glory in our history never written and never to be written." Heinrich Himmler to SS and police, 1943.

Issues examined include: The Third Reich: the nature of the totalitarian state and its use of terror and propaganda. The evolution of the machinery for destruction: processes of economic
discrimination, boycott, definition, ghettoization, deportation and elimination. The Einsatzgruppen and the mind-set of perpetrators.

Due: March 6:

Bauer, History of the Holocaust, pp. 139-200.
Ervin Staub, Roots of Evil, pp. 128-150.

Paper Due.

IV. Genocide and the Killing Centers: Auschwitz. Victims and Victimizers; Bystanders and Rescuers; Resistance and Witness.

"Never shall I forget that night, the first night in camp, which turned my life into one long night, seven times cursed and seven times sealed." -- Eli Wiesel, Night.

"They (the condemned) do not despair. The Proof: they persist in surviving -- not only to survive but to testify. The victims elect to become witnesses." -- Eli Wiesel, One Generation After.

"They (the SS doctors) did their work just as someone who goes to an office goes about his work. They were gentlemen who came and went, who supervised and were relaxed, sometimes smiling, sometimes joking, but never unhappy. They were witty if they felt like it. Personally I did not get the impression that they were much affected by what was going on -- nor shocked. It went on for years. It was not just one day." -- Auschwitz prisoner doctor in Robert J. Lifton, The Nazi Doctors.

"In concrete terms it amounts to little: An Italian civilian worker brought me a piece of bread and the remainder of his ration every day for six months; he gave me a vest of his, full of patches; he wrote a postcard on my behalf to Italy and brought me the reply. For all this he neither asked nor accepted any reward, because he was good and simple and did not think that one did good for a reward." -- Primo Levi.

Due: March 13:

Bauer, History of the Holocaust, pp. 200-226
Terrence des Pres, The Survivor.

Due: March 14:

Film: "Night and Fog"

Due: April 3:

Survivor Memoir: Primo Levi, Survival in Auschwitz; or, Anna Pawelczyk, Violence and Values in Auschwitz; or, Sara Nomberg-Przytyk, Auschwitz: True Tales from a Grotesque Land.
Staub, "The behavior and psychology of bystanders and victims," in Roots of Evil.
Due: April 10:

Jerry Gicowski, "Fate of Polish Gypsies" in Porter, *Genocide and Human Rights*.

Due: April 15:

Trip to YIVO, Lecture, Archivist Fruma Mohrer.
Class Paper Due.

Due: April 24:

Hilberg, pages 251-331.
Bauer, pages 279-349.
Simon Schochet, *Feldafing*.

V. The Modern State and Political Genocide. post-holocaust History and the Choice Between Self-Preservation and Morality. Reevaluation of Lessons Learned and Not.

"...Communist ideology provided the motivation for an unprecedented massacre of men, women and children, and..., sacrifices of millions of people were made and they were in vain."
-- Robert Conquest, *Harvest of Sorrow*.

"...the bloody massacre in Bangladesh quickly covered the memory of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia; the assassination of Allende drowned out the groans of Bangladesh; the war in the Sinai desert made people forget Allende; the Cambodian massacre made people forget Sinai; and so on and so forth, until ultimately everyone lets everything be forgotten."

Due: May 1:

Response paper: What can/should be done to prevent genocidal massacres of the Kurds?
Handout: Kurds in Iraq.

Choose two other case studies: Indonesia, Burundi, Bangladesh, Cambodia, East Timor, Indians of the Amazon, etc. in Chalk and Jonassohn.

Due: May 8:


"It does not matter how many people chose moral duty over rationality of self-preservation -- what does matter is that some did. Evil is not all powerful. It can be resisted." -- Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust*, page 207.

Due: May 15:

HISTORY OF TWENTIETH CENTURY GENOCIDE

PAPER ONE

Choose one of the following questions and write a 5-7 page typewritten essay which integrates class readings and discussions. All indirect and direct quotations must be footnoted. This is an opportunity for you to synthesize the material we have covered to date; try to back up your analyses with concrete data and logical argument. The paper is due at the beginning of class on Wednesday, March 6.

1. "Exterminatory anti-semitism appears where Jews are imagined as a collective embodiment of evil, a conspiratorial body dedicated to the task of ruining and then dominating the rest of mankind." (Norman Cohn, Warrant for Genocide, pp. 280.) Discuss the ideological continuum of destruction which includes the pre-19th century history of anti-semitism, the Protocols of Elders of Zion and Mein Kampf. Include a discussion of demonization of Jewry and of the important new elements German racist-volkish ideas add to the myth of the threat of world Jewry.

2. "Affected by the development of both their domestic and their foreign policies, the realization of Nazi anti-semitism evolved gradually and was marked by considerable vacillations." (Yehuda Bauer, A History of the Holocaust, pp. 98.) Discuss some of the vacillation in Nazi policy and how the condition of the Jews was linked to domestic issues and war preparation. What were the processes by which German Jewry were gradually defined "outside the universe of moral obligation"? Include specific legislation as well as ideological rationale for the processes of stripping German Jews of their rights as citizens up to 1939.

3. As a woman, housewife and mother, discuss how Nazism might appeal to your concerns over the increasing weakness of the family, rise in divorce and abortion rates, feminism, unemployment, new morality, and other ills associated with Weimar. Using the material from Warrant for Genocide, Mein Kampf, Bauer and the essay by Koonz, discuss the threat the Jews pose to your way of life and demonstrate what type of new/old World Order the Nazi movement offers you as a woman, mother and Aryan.

4. In many respects, Mein Kampf incorporates and rejects events, ideas and realities (German defeat, liberalism, etc.) of the twentieth century. Discuss how Hitler reflects the historical era out of which he emerges; his sense of marginality; the passion of his volkish ideology; the combination of a new/old world order. How does he utilize modern techniques and processes to gain followers and strengthen National Socialism? How does anti-semitism play an essential role in racist-volkish ideology and what popular notions about Jews does he incorporate in his anti-semitism; what new elements appear after 1914?
5. Eric Leed concludes No Man's Land, Combat and Identity in World War I by stating that "The First World War...was destined to be repeated again in the 20th century, again on a mass scale, again with no apparent purpose or meaning. Those who had internalized the war, its peculiar relationship between victims and victimizers, the liminality that it imposed upon combatants, were destined to play a significant part in this repetition. For many could not resolve the ambiguities that defined their identities in war and resume their place in civilian society without acknowledging their status as victims" (pp. 213). Discuss how the status of victims becomes a central tenet in Mein Kampf. What are the contradictions between the threat of the Jews and the superiority of the Aryan? How does the war and the Weimar Republic provide a heightened sense of marginality and betrayal to Hitler and to other National Socialist members? How does the transference from victims to dominators take place in Nazi ideology?

HISTORY OF TWENTIETH CENTURY GENOCIDE

PAPER TWO

Due: April 17, 1991

Choose one of the questions below and write a 5-7 pp. essay with documentation (include footnotes; quotes over three lines should be single spaced).

Together we are trying to understand the complexity of the process of genocide. We are beginning to see that personal background, including psychological and sociological factors, all contribute to different and sometimes conflicting analyses of an historical reality. It is important for us to critically analyze what we have read and discussed and to try to complete our own synthesis and understanding. That we may never fully be able to understand or explain the Nazi genocide or other genocides is also something we have come to realize. Yet to try to understand, to grapple for meaning is all the more necessary given the past and present nature of historical reality and continuing evil and tragedy within history.

1. "Yesterday people said, 'Auschwitz, never heard of it.' Now they say, 'Oh yes, we know all about it.'" -- Eli Wiesel.

Using Lifton, Pawelczynska, Des Pres, and Bauer, describe as best you can some of the central features of Auschwitz for victims and victimizers. Why do you think the image of Auschwitz has become the archetype for hell in our time?

2. In the death landscape of the concentration camps words and tasks have taken on new meanings. Discuss the changing meaning and role of (1)-roll call; (2)-selection; (3)-work; (4)-doctors; and, (5)-resistance. Choose two other terms as well. Connect the changes in language and function to the larger world of the camp and processes and ideology of destruction. (Hilberg, Des Pres, Pawelczynska, Lifton.)

3. Eli Wiesel and Anna Pawelczynska both survived the "death landscape" of Auschwitz. They document the struggle to stay alive, as does Des Pres' analysis in The Survivor, in the
face of Nazi brutality and systematic dehumanization. Discuss how these works are different in emphasis, perceptions and tone. Include a discussion of Polish-Jewish relations and the plight of Hungarian Jewry (see Bauer) in your analyses of these works.

4. Everyone entered this class with certain preconceived ideas about Nazism and about Nazi treatment of the Jews. Describe at least three concepts or facts that have been revised or overturned from your readings. Describe three other important pieces of information that you were previously unaware of, but that you have discovered from your readings. Finally, why do you think our culture has such a fascination with Hitler and Nazism? (Use at least three sources in your essay; this is not a personal reflection so much as a synthesis of works read.)
COMPARATIVE STUDY OF GENOCIDE

Richard Hovannisian

Division of Honors
Winter 1992
University of California, Los Angeles

TEXTS:
Leo Kuper: Genocide: its Political Use In The Twentieth Century.
Frank Chalk & Kurt Jonassohn: The History And Sociology Of Genocide.
Franz Werfel: The Forty Days Of Musa Dagh.
Selected Authors: Excerpts

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:
Weekly readings, student presentations, and class discussions. Required participation in a weekly discussion sessions led by the Teaching Assistant.

At the end of the fifth week, a written critique of The Forty Days of Musa Dagh, with suggested topics, themes, character development, and choices faced during genocides discussed during weekly section. Suggested length 6-10 typed or printed pages double spaced.

Each student will research and write a paper on some aspect of genocide such as: comparative approaches to the study of genocide; analyses of causes and types of genocide -- religious, colonization, decolonization, ideological; the aftermath and consequences of genocide in general or a particular genocide, including the problem of denial, attempts to prevent the crime of genocide, and proposals relating to early warning-sIGNALS and intervention. The papers should be approximately 25-30 pages, typed or printed double space, properly annotated and with a bibliography of the works actually used in the research and writing. The paper will be due during the final discussion session of the term, March 14, 1992.

WEEKLY TOPICS AND READINGS

Week 1

The Theory And Ideology Of Genocide
Kuper: Chapters 1-5
Chalk & Jonassohn: Part I (The Conceptual Framework)

Week 2

Studies From Antiquity And The Middle Ages
Chalk & Jonassohn: pp. 57-172
Week 3
Colonization And Native Populations
Chalk & Jonassohn: pp. 173-203
Suggested Reading: Gary Nash, Red, White, and Black
Guest Lecturers: Gary Nash and Melissa Meyer

Week 4a
The Case Of The Tasmanians, Hereros, And Shaka Of The Zulus
Chalk & Jonassohn: pp. 203-248

Week 4B-5A
The Armenian Genocide
Kuper: Chapter 6 and Appendix 3, pp. 219-220
Chalk & Jonassohn: pp. 249-289

Week 5B
Food As A Weapon: the Case Of The Sudan
Guest Lecturer: Robert Collins, UC, Santa Barbara

Week 6A
The Ukraine Famine And Stalin Terror
Kuper: pp. 138-150
Chalk & Jonassohn: pp. 299-322

Week 6B-7A
The Holocaust
Kuper: Chapter 7
Chalk & Jonassohn: pp. 323-377
Guest Lecturer: David Myers

Week 7B-8A
Decolonization And Succession: South Asia, Indonesia, And East Timor
Chalk & Jonassohn: pp. 378-383, 394-397, 408-411
Kuper: pp. 150-154
Guest Lecturer: Damodar Sardesai

Week 9A
Africa: Ethnic Violence And The Refugee Problem In Rwanda And Burundi
Chalk & Jonassohn: pp. 384-393
Guest Lecturer: Rene Lernarchand, University of Florida
Week 10

Prevention

Kuper: Chapter 10
Chalk & Jonassohn: pg. 415-425
Kuper, "International Action Against Genocide," Minority Rights Group Report

RESERVE READING

Beshir, Mohammed Omer, Revolution and Nationalism in the Sudan. New York, Barnes and Noble, 1974.
PAPER ASSIGNMENT, 6-10 PAGE PAPER

Suggested Topics - *The Forty Days of Musa Dagh* by Franz Werfel

1. Discuss the universal themes that run through the novel and how those themes related to the "human condition."

2. Discuss the protagonist of the novel, Gabriel -- his influence on or submission to "destiny", his struggle against "the alien within himself," and his response to the Armenian calamity.

3. Discuss Werfel’s portrayal of women. What is symbolized by the French woman, the response of the women to the crisis, and the relations between Julliette and Iskuhi and the other Armenian women?

4. Discuss Werfel’s portrayal of (a) bureaucrats and perpetrators, (b) the pious Muslims, and (c) the Muslim populations around Musa Dagh.

5. Discuss the various choices that the Armenians had to make in the face of the impending calamity, and how and why they decided what choices to make. What were the consequences of their decisions?
6. Discuss the role of the Armenian clergy, the different positions they took, and the reasons behind such decisions. Keep in mind that there were different Christian orders represented.

7. Discuss the attitude of the Armenian population of Musa Dagh before and after the resistance and the role that fatalism and destiny play in the novel.

8. Discuss the break in the normal social structure caused by the threat of extermination and the act of rebellion, e.g. marital, familial, parent-child relations.

9. What similarities or differences can you find between the themes of this novel and that of a novel on the Holocaust or other genocide?
THE HISTORY AND SOCIOLOGY OF GENOCIDE

*Frank Chalk: History*
*Kurt Jonassohn: Sociology*

*Concordia University, Montreal, Canada*
*1990-1991*

The attached course outline indicates the cases that we shall deal with and their approximate sequences; this will help you in doing the readings at the appropriate times. Many of the readings are included in *The History and Sociology of Genocide*.

THE EVALUATION OF YOUR WORK

The weighting of grades for this course will be distributed as follows:

- 40% for exams and assignments
- 50% for the revised version of your research paper
- 10% for class participation (attendance plus the value of your contribution to class discussions)

DEADLINES FOR RESEARCH PAPERS

- **October 10:** Hand in a brief paper proposal (two pages) on the particular topic that you have selected for your research paper. No bibliography is necessary at this time.
- **October 24:** Hand in a revised proposal for your research project -- revised on the basis of our comments. This revision must include a bibliography.
- **January 30:** If you want our comment on a draft of your paper, it must reach us by this date. This draft of your research paper should be in proper format (see Turabian or Northey and Tepperman, below, for the required formats). The paper must be footnoted and include an annotated bibliography.
- **April 10:** Hand in the final revised version of your research paper.

TEXTS


In addition, you will find it useful to consult:

Recommended


**COURSE OUTLINE 1990 - FIRST TERM**

September 5

Preview of the Course: The Research Paper; Take-Home Exam

(1) Kuper, chapters 1 and 2; Appendix 1. (To be read by class time, next week; please follow this pattern throughout the year in our course.)
(2) Northey and Tepperman, chapters 1, 2, 3 and 6.

September 12

Course Research and the Use of the Library

(1) Kuper, chapter 3.
(2) Text, Part I through "The Definition of Genocide"
(3) Text, Part II, Antiquity and Melos.

September 19

No class -- religious holy day

(1) Text, Part I through Appendices.
(2) Text, Part II, Antiquity.

September 26

Definitions and Typologies; Ancient Near East

(2) Text, Part II, Melos and Carthage.

October 3

Athens and Melos; Rome and Carthage

(1) Text, Part II, The Mongols.
(2) Northey and Tepperman, chapters 8 and 14. (This material will be covered in an in-class reading quiz on October 10.)

October 10

The Mongols

(1) Text, Part II, The Zulus; The Hereros.
October 17
The Zulus under Shaka; The Hereros
(1) Text, Part II, Indians to 1900; The Tasmanians.

October 24
Indians of the Americas to 1900; The Tasmanians
(1) Text, Review all of Part I.
(2) Text, Part II, The Albigensian Crusade.

October 31
The Transition to Ideological Genocide; The Albigensian Crusade; The Spanish Inquisition
(1) A new reading to be distributed in class (if we can get to it)

November 7
The Great Witch-Hunt; Christians in Tokugawa Japan
(1) Text, Part II, The Armenians.
(2) Kuper, chapter 6.

November 14
Nationalism, the Nation-State and Genocide
(2) Kuper, chapter 5.

November 21+28
The Armenians
(1) Text, Part II, U.S.S.R.
(2) Kuper, chapter 8, The Soviet Union.
(3) Northey and Tepperman, chapters 4,5,7,9-13, Glossary and Appendix.

Questions for take-home mid-term examination will be distributed in class. Your answers are due on January 9.

1991 - SECOND TERM

January 9
Hand in take-home mid-term examination.
January 9

The U.S.S.R.


January 16

The U.S.S.R.

(1) Text, Part II, the Holocaust.
(2) Recommended: Cohn, first half of book.

January 23

The Holocaust

(1) Kuper, chapter 7.
(2) Recommended: Cohn, rest of book.

January 30

Last day to hand in draft of research paper if you want our comments on it.

January 30

The Holocaust

(1) Review all of Part II through the Holocaust.

February 6

Genocide since World War II

(1) Text, Part II, Cambodia; China.
(2) Kuper, Chapter 8, Cambodia.

February 13

The Peoples Republic of China; Cambodia (Kampuchea)

(1) Text, Part II, Indonesia; East Timor.
(2) Kuper, chapter 8, Indonesia.

February 20

Mid-Term Break -- No class

February 27

The Indonesian Coup; East Timor

(1) Text, Part II, Rwanda-Burundi.
(2) Kuper, chapter 4.
March 6

Rwanda-Burundi; Equatorial Guinea; Nigeria

(1) Kuper, chapter 4, Bangladesh.

March 13

Bangladesh; Iran

(1) Read handouts on Ethiopia, Liberia and Sudan.
(2) Kuper, International Action Against Genocide

March 20

Ethiopia; Liberia; Sudan

(1) Kuper, chapter 9.
(2) Text, read rest of part II.

Questions for the take-home final examination will be handed out in class. Your answers are due on April 10.

March 27

Prediction of Genocide; Prevention; Labelling

(1) Kuper, chapter 10.
(2) Jonassohn, paper on reserve.

April 3

Prediction of Genocide; Prevention; Labelling

April 10

A Critical Review of Definitions and Typologies of Genocide

April 17

Hand in your answers to take-home final examination and your research paper.
RESEARCH PAPERS

Requirements

The research paper in this course will be based on your examination and analysis of original sources; that is, written evidence that originated at the time of the genocide you are studying. This assignment should contribute to your ability to find evidence, to evaluate sources, to assess contradictory evidence, and to write a coherent presentation of your findings accompanied by your reasoned conclusions, with emphasis on your argument in favour of those conclusions.

Each paper should include a title page, including the title of your paper and your name; a table of contents giving the name of each part of your paper and the page number; footnotes or endnotes containing your reference in scholarly style; and an annotated bibliography. Each paper should be typed double-spaced with proper margins. Your paper should be written in good English or French. On matters of spelling, consult any good dictionary. On matters of organization, style, format, and citation of sources in your notes and bibliography, see Northey and Tepperman or Turabian. The research paper will be marked for the quality and quantity of your research and analysis. We expect a paper (between 15 and 25 pages long) that you consider good enough to submit to a scholarly journal. Take a look at any good academic journal and its instructions to authors. And here is a small tip: The format for citation in a footnote is different from the format in a bibliography. Be sure to keep a copy of your paper when you submit our copy. And remember, we will return your paper only if you submit TWO copies. For deadlines, please see the course outline distributed in class.

Suggested Topics

All paper topics must be approved by us to minimize false starts and misunderstandings later. Here is a list of topics that can be investigated in the appropriate manner using the resources of the Concordia Library. If you have an idea for a paper on another topic that interests you, see us to have it approved.

1. The American Indians in the Nineteenth Century
   A. United States government policies on Indian hunting and food supplies and their bearing on Indian morbidity and mortality (you may want to focus on a specific tribe or group of tribes).
   B. United States government efforts to assimilate the Indians and the consequences of these efforts for the survival of the Indians (tribes that you may want to study include the Cherokee, Cheyenne, Sioux, Winnebagos and Yaki).
   C. Settlers as initiators of Indian devastation (choose settlers in particular states or regions; include the reactions of local, state and national authorities).
   D. The reaction of American newspapers to the decimation of the American Indians (this should be done comparatively where possible, contrasting and comparing at least two publications).
2. A paper looking at a case of genocide from one of the following perspectives:
   A. Press coverage (this should be done comparatively, contrasting and comparing at least two publications in one country or publications from two different countries, e.g., the Chicago Tribune and the New York Times coverage of the famine in the Ukraine or the purge trials. The Library has extensive holdings of newspapers from Canada, France, the United States and Great Britain. Note: Students who can read German, Russian and other foreign languages will have a wider selection to choose from.
   B. A specific government agency and its role in a genocide (e.g., a government ministry, such as foreign affairs, based on an examination of diplomatic correspondence and internal memoranda). Examples include: the German General Staff in South West Africa and its attack on the Hereros; the role of Soviet government and communist party agencies in the Ukrainian Famine and the assault on "kulaks" and "enemies of the people"; the Committee for Union and Progress and the army in the case of the Armenian genocide in Turkey; and, the role of the German Foreign Office, the economics and war production ministries, the Einsatzgruppen, or the armed forces in the Holocaust.
   C. Bystanders to the genocide (these can be other governments, diplomats, writers, or reporters who witnessed a genocide, institutions such as a church or a group of missionaries, the United Nations, etc.).
   D. Legislators, members of parliament, and other representatives sitting in legislative bodies and their attitude toward a specific genocide in their own country or elsewhere (as inciters to genocide, opponents of genocide, or bystanders).

3. The Ideological Underpinnings of Genocide
   A. The founding philosophers of a particular ideology and the contribution of their principles and attitudes toward a specific genocide.
   B. The use of an ideology by later disciples as a factor contributing to a case of genocide (e.g., the use of Marxist-Leninist theory in the U.S.S.R., China, Kampuchea, or Ethiopia; the relative weight of traditional anti-semitism and race theory in Nazi propaganda).

4. War Crime Trials
   A. Acts of genocide in a particular trial and how they were conceptualized or categorized by the prosecution and by the defense.
   B. How the trial participants (judges, prosecutors, defense lawyers and defendants) assessed the responsibility of powerful leaders, followers, and local auxiliaries in the commission of acts of genocide.
   C. Raise these same questions with regard to the trials in Turkey after World War I.
   D. A comparison of two different World War II war crimes trials, one of Japanese defendants and the other of German accused, comparing the legal bases of the trials, the types of accused, the nature of the crimes alleged, the defenses mounted, and the outcomes.
5. The Question of Intervention

A. Compare cases where concrete intervention took place to prevent apprehended genocidal massacre, by using the documents of the intervening agent (e.g. India in Bangladesh, India in Sri Lanka, the UN in Cyprus, the UN in Lebanon, Vietnam in Kampuchea, and Tanzania in Uganda).

B. The arguments, pro and con, in legislative bodies and/or the UN in cases where no intervention took place (e.g., East Timor, Sudan, Brazil [Amazon], Guatemala, and Surinam).

C. Assess the impact of attempted intervention in specific cases by private organizations working in famine relief, refugee assistance, or human rights (e.g. Kampuchea, Sri Lanka, Ethiopia, and Sudan).

TAKE-HOME MID-TERM EXAMINATION
November 29, 1989

Instructions
Please answer all questions. Your answers should be typed and double-spaced. The left-hand margin should be one-and-one-half inches. Allow top and bottom margins of one inch each. Limit yourself to 300 words for each answer.

Questions


2. What are the major characteristics of pre-twentieth century genocides? Give relevant examples to support your answer.

3. The Great Witch-Hunt is not considered a genocide by most experts. Why not? Do you believe that this case has any significance for the study of modern genocide? Defend your position in a reasoned essay.

4. Discuss the Shimabara rebellion and its significance for the study of genocide.
TAKE-HOME FINAL EXAMINATION
March 20, 1991

Instructions

Your answers to this take-home final examination must be brought to class on Wednesday, April 10th. Your answers must be typed with a dark ribbon and should be single spaced. You may not write more than 300 words on each question. It is essential that your answers demonstrate that you have done the course reading and paid attention to the course lectures. You must discuss the concepts in the reader, the assigned readings, and the lectures. You must identify the authors of the concepts found in the reading as you discuss them. Your instructors know the material. We are trying to determine if you do. If you do not mention relevant authors and their work, we must assume that you have not done the appropriate reading. Please help us to avoid that situation by preparing your answers carefully. See our handout entitled "The Well-Argued Essay."

The remaining weeks of the course are essential to your success on this examination. Instructors often find attendance declining near the end of the term, as members of their classes work to complete research papers. Please do not make this mistake in our class; it is the road to poor results.

Questions

1. The Ukraine in the Thirties, Nigeria in the sixties, and Ethiopia and the Sudan in the eighties have each experienced famine. Analyze each famine with respect to the allegation that a genocide was committed, giving the reasons for your conclusions.

2. Write an essay on the unique aspects of the Holocaust and on those aspects on which it can be compared with other genocides.

3. "Type Four genocide (Chalk/Jonassohn typology) is the most appropriate category for the cases of Burundi, Bangladesh, and Indonesia." Write a well-argued essay on this statement that supports your agreement or disagreement with it.

4. You are the senior officer in the Department of External Affairs responsible for relations with Burundi. You receive the following offer from the government in Bujumbura: If Canada and other friendly countries will grant significant foreign aid to Burundi, the government of Burundi will pay compensation to the victims of the 1972 killings. Write a reasoned memorandum to your Minister, Joe Clark, containing your advice and recommendations.
LITERATURE OF THE HOLOCAUST AND GENOCIDE

Thomas Klein

Spring 1991 / English
Bowling Green State University

TEXTS:
Course Pack of materials on Holocaust and Genocide
Elie Wiesel -- Night, Bantam-Avon
John Roth and Michael Berenbaum, Holocaust: Religious and Philosophical Implications, Paragon House
Primo Levi, Survival in Auschwitz, Collier
Jerzy Kosinski, The Painted Bird, Bantam
Toni Morrison, The Bluest Eye, Washington Square Press
Larry Kramer, The Normal Heart, NAL/Plume
Lawrence Thornton, Imagining Argentina, Bantam

REQUIREMENTS:
60% -- Three papers, 3-5 typed pages (see Paper Assts. Sheet) Two are revisable
20% -- Final Exam
10% -- Participation in two Panels; one paper for each Panel
10% -- General preparation and participation

PAPERS:
The topics and writing required for this course are emotionally and intellectually demanding. If you are a weak writer, have not completed ENG 112 and at least one literature or other writing course, I would advise you not to take this course.

PANELS:
These are meant to be symposia in which you, the class, raise important concerns, feelings and thoughts that come from the readings. You will have an opportunity to request the Panels you want to sit on. Here is a sketch of a format these might take:

1. Summarize salient parts of the reading; these might be divided up among panel members. 10 minutes.
2. Raise questions and lead class in a discussion of these questions. 15 minutes.
   Panel members might take turns asking questions, though follow-up questions are encouraged.
3. Give a personal response to the reading. Take this literally or figuratively -- it offers you a chance to respond in subjective, idiosyncratic and very personal ways. No rules here.
4. Turn in a 2-3 page typed paper identifying one issue in the reading, defining that issue, and analyzing it. This might be a very personal issue, or one having to do with the reading itself. This is required.
COURSE OUTLINE

January 15
Introduction; requirements

Sources of Hatred

January 17
Jones "You Will Do As Directed" reprinted in Holocaust and History, ADL, 1983
Thomas Monteleone "Mister Magiste" (in Rod Serling's Other Worlds, Bantam 1978)
Volunteers for 1st Panel; turn in Panel choices.

The Holocaust

January 22
Wiesel, Night; terminology / Panel

January 24
Wiesel from One Generation After, pages 8-17 (Pocket Books 1978)
Wiesel tape

January 29
Roth/Berenbaum Prologue xiii-xxix
What is a Jew?

January 31
Des Pres, "Excremental Assault" in The Survivor
"Susan" tape (Herb Hochhauser, Director, Kent State University, Jewish Studies Program);
"Bergen Belsen" tape (Frontline, Public Broadcasting Corporation, Washington, DC)

February 5
Levi, Survival in Auschwitz / Panel

February 7
Continue Levi
Dennis Prager, Why the Jews? Panel on Prager

February 12
Borowski (in Roth) / Panel

February 14
Hugh Nissenson, "The Law" / Panel

February 19
Kosinski, The Painted Bird, chapters 1-10
February 21
Continue Kosinski, chapters 11-20 / Panel:
Holocaust poetry

February 26 -- Paper 1 due
Lifton from Nazi Doctors in Roth
Bitburg documents by Reagan and Wiesel (in pack) / Panel

Christian Anti-Semitism

February 28
Merton "A Devout Meditation on Adolph Eichmann" / Panel
Levi, "Vanadium" in Periodic Table
Sichrovsky from Born Guilty / Panel

March 5
Cargas from Shadows of Auschwitz
Visit: Rev. Karen Thompson: Christian Anti-semitism

Hitler Today

March 7
Rosenfeld "Where Hitler Lives Again" from Dissent 1985, Spring
My Lai; see tape

Afro-American Genocide

March 12
Yehuda Bauer, Place of the Holocaust (in Roth)
Frederick Douglass, from The Life and Times of FD

March 14
Morrison, The Bluest Eye (Autumn and Winter)

March 19
Morrison, The Bluest Eye (Spring and Summer) / Panel / Paper topics

March 21
Shelby Steele, "The Recoloring of Campus Life: Student Racism" Harpers, February 1989
Cambodia

April 2 -- **Paper 2 due**
Becker, *When the War Was Over*
20/20 tape on Tom Jarrell in Cambodia, Simon & Schuster, 1986

April 4
Killing Fields

**Gays, Lesbians and AIDS**

April 9
Larry Kramer, *The Normal Heart*, Plume / Panel

April 11
Continue Kramer

April 16
Stilts, from *And the Band Played On*, Penguin 1987 / Panel

Argentina

April 18
Thornton, *Imagining Argentina*, Bantam 1987, chapters 1-12 / Paper topics

April 23
Finish Thornton / Panel

**Where Are We Now?**

April 25
Susan Griffin, "The Sacrificial Lamb" chapter from *Pomography and Silence*, Harper & Row, ages 156-168 / Panel
Hammill-Anderson, "The Necessity To Speak: Naming the Beast" from *Poetry East Poetics*, 1986

**Paper 3 due**

April 30
Reading on Amnesty International, *Time* article on AI, October 17, 1988
Des Pres *Goodness Incarnate*
Amnesty local chapter president visitor

May 2
Judith Miller, *One by One by One: Facing the Holocaust*, Simon & Schuster, 1990
PAPER ASSIGNMENTS

Other than the journal, papers should be 3-5 pages typed. You will see that there is considerable leeway in these topics; nevertheless, writing successfully on any topic in this course requires that you pay careful attention to the foundations, in fact and theory, of each genocide we study. That will inform your writing, whatever topic you choose.

1. Journal

Requires a minimum of five pages a week of reflection, analysis and argument over a five-week period. Shows both careful reading of class assignments for that five-week period and close attention to class discussion. Evidence of mind stretching, thinking on paper, connections being made between various readings, lectures, video tapes, and discussions. Primary audience is yourself as you "muse" over that material.

2. Literary Analysis

Examines one poem, memoir, dialogue, short story, novel or essay we've studied in class. Examines the way conventional literary devices like metaphor, structure, plot, character, image, irony and theme work. Primary audience is another who has only passing acquaintance with the text in question. Purpose is to illuminate and appreciate.

3. Book Review

Assesses a book we've not read in class (see ALA bibliography at end of course packet; I have several other bibliographies if you want more ideas; I'd also be pleased to talk with you about your interests and to suggest a book from my own library.) Begins with a thesis followed by a 1-2 paragraph summary of the book; moves to a critical assessment of the book's argument or contents. Refers to other literature in presenting either an appreciation or a more negative critique. Audience is one who has not read the book.

4. Personal Narrative

Narrates personal events and ideas which connect in emotional and intellectual ways to course material. Given the painful nature of the course, you may frequently recall experiences of victimization or victimizing -- related, perhaps, to your race, gender, nationality, ethnicity, appearance, or ideas -- as the course progresses. The opportunity in this paper is to bring these feelings and memories to the foreground, rather than suppressing them (which is what education too often asks us to do). Studying genocide will heighten our sensibilities; this paper allows you to get some of that personal material on paper.

5. Critique

A critical reading of a class reading that does some or all of the following: states the author's thesis/theme and reasons for taking that position; assesses the significance, fairness, logic, and accuracy of information presented by the author; reflects on the success or failure of the argument.
6. Argument

Presents your own point of view on a topic, drawing on others' thoughts where needed. Tackles a debatable, arguable thesis, i.e., one where there are at least two "reasonable" sides and where opposite conclusions can be drawn from the same evidence. Defines your own points of view clearly and presents at least one counter-argument fairly. Counter argument may be so strong that you will have to modify or accommodate your original thesis in light of that counter-argument.

7. Your choice; see me first. I encourage this option.

All words, phrases, sentences and ideas which come from other sources are to be documented. Plagiarism is theft. Please avail yourselves of the ample resources of the library, but include a bibliography or works cited page when you do. Footnotes can be bottom of page, end of paper, or within the text of the paper. The last is the easiest, requiring only author name and page number after quote or paraphrase. Please consult a research handbook if you've forgotten -- I'd be happy to lend you one.
GOVERNMENT REPRESSION AND DEMOCIDE

R. J. Rummel

Spring 1992
Political Science/Graduate Seminar
University of Hawaii at Manoa

In this century governments have killed in cold blood over 150,000,000 men, women, and children, more than four times the total battle-dead in all this century's international and domestic wars and revolutions.

While there has been a growing concern over social justice, world order, and the environment, the focus of political science and peace research has been and remains on war in all its various forms (international war, civil war, revolution, guerrilla war, and the like). The aim is quite clearly to understand enough about the causes and conditions of war to resolve it, and hopefully make it an obsolete social pattern. The reason for this focus has also been clear. With the 9,000,000 killed in battle in World War I, the 15,000,000 in World War II, and the potential for hundreds of millions to die in a nuclear war, peace researchers have seen war as the last great plague for science to conquer. Simply put, the horror of all that international killing and all the untold associated pain and suffering, and the belief that it was the foremost form of institutional killing, has emotionally driven research on war and peace.

Yet, this near universal assumption in peace research that war is mankind's foremost, purposely operated, killing machine, is wrong. While war in its various forms does kill in the millions, a much bloodier human meat grinder has been government itself, particularly absolutist governments. Although all international and civil wars have killed 36,000,000 combatants in this century, absolutist and authoritarian governments have probably massacred over 150,000,000 Russian, Chinese, Ukrainian, Cambodian, Armenian, Jewish, Gypsy, Polish, Greek, Japanese, Ugandan, Indonesian, Serb, Croatian, German, Bengali, Kurd, Burundian, Tibetan, Iranian, Baltic, and Vietnamese, among others, unarmed and helpless men, women and children. And I am still counting.
Following is the list of texts and articles to be read in whole or part for this class.

PAPER REQUIREMENTS

Two papers are required for this course:

1. Each paper is to be on a separate case or aspect of government democide (genocide, politicide, or mass killing) in this century. Your proposed topic for each paper is to be presented to the class and subsequently approved by the instructor.

2. Each paper is to be a research paper, with references and footnotes, as necessary. It is to cover who did what to whom, when, how, and why.

3. Each paper is to be typed, double-spaced. No handwritten papers will be accepted.

4. The first paper should be no longer than ten double-spaced pages, exclusive of tables, figures, reference or bibliography. You will be expected to present your paper to the class before you hand it in.

5. The second paper can be any length you deem necessary to adequately cover your topic (a topic different from that of your first paper). You will also be expected to present this paper to the class.

CLASS ORGANIZATION

This will be taught Socratically and as a seminar. This means that you will be expected to present your ideas and research, and discuss those of others. I will, of course, talk on some related topic for perhaps ten or twenty minutes, but the purpose will be to present background material, fill in some missing topics in your text, or comment on something said in class. You are expected to add comments of your own or to question what is unclear or doubtful, or that with which you disagree.

Class activities will involve:

1. Two or three seminar members summarizing the assigned reading for each meeting (those to do so will be selected the week before);
2. Student presentation of preliminary paper topics;
3. Student presentations of the research in their papers (to be presented at least one week before the paper is due).

Grades will be based on class preparation, presentations and involvement, and of course, your two written papers.

CASES OF DEMOCIDE

Week 1
Class syllabus/orientation/discussion

Week 2
Rummel, R.J. "1,000,000 murdered: the Armenian genocide." Chapter Draft in *Death by Government*, forthcoming.

Week 3

Week 4
Kuper, Leo, *Genocide*, Chapter 8 (pp. 138-150).

Week 5

Week 6
THEORIES OF DEMOCIDE

Week 7
Kuper, Leo, Genocide, Chapter 8 (pp. 150-160).

Week 8
Kuper, Leo, Genocide, Chapters 3-5.
Chalk and Jonassohn, The History and Sociology of Genocide, pp. 29-31 (review).

Week 9

Week 10
WHAT HAS/CAN/SHOULD BE DONE?

Week 11
Glaser/Possony, Victims of Politics, chapter 29.
Kuper, Leo, Genocide, chapters 2, 9, 10, Appendices.

Week 12

Week 13

Week 14

Week 15

Week 15

REFLECTIONS
HUMAN DESTRUCTIVENESS AND POLITICS

Roger W. Smith

Spring 1992
Government
College of William and Mary

Genocide pervades the contemporary imagination, yet both the origins and the meaning of this form of human destructiveness are problematic. What is genocide? What is its history? How, if at all, is it related to specific forms of government? To types of economic organization? Is there a basic structure to genocide? Or perhaps a logic, though irrational, that underlies various examples of genocide? Do present attempts to explain genocide actually succeed? What conditions must be met if genocide is to be averted? Who bears responsibility for genocide? Realistically, what would seem to be the future of genocide?


Course Requirements: class participation, a term paper (10 or more pages), and a final exam.

I. Introduction

II. What is Genocide?
Leo Kuper, Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century, Chapters 1-2 (R)

III. Genocide and the Moral Imagination
George Steiner, In Bluebeard’s Castle, Chapter 2
Elie Wiesel, Night (R)
"Shoah" (film excerpts) (R)

IV. Genocide and Contemporary History
Helen Fein, Accounting for Genocide, Chapter 1* (R)
42 (Spring 1989); Edward Alexander, A Crime of Vengeance; Leslie A. Davis, The Slaughterhouse Province; Michael J. Arlen, Passage to Ararat.


Donald Kenrick and Grattan Puxon, The Destiny of Europe's Gypsies; Jack Porter, ed., Genocide and Human Rights, pages 151-57, 178-87; Ian Hancock, The Pariah Syndrome; Gabrielle Tymauer, Gypsies and the Holocaust.

Raul Hilberg, The Destruction of the European Jews; Leon Poliakov, Harvest of Hate; Alexander Donat, The Holocaust Kingdom; Ervin Staub, The Roots of Evil, Part II (R); Robert Marrus, The Holocaust in History; (R) Leni Yahil, The Holocaust.

David Hawk, "Pol Pot's Cambodia,"* New Republic, November 15, 1982; Kimmo Kiljunen, ed., Kampuchea: Decade of the genocide, Chapters 1-3; Molyda Szymusiak, The Stones Cry Out; Elizabeth Becker, When the War Over; Kurt Jackson, ed., Cambodia; Staub, The Roots of Evil, Chapter 13 (R)


Robert Payne, Massacre (on Bangladesh); International Commission of Jurists, The Events in East Pakistan.


* = on desk reserve
R = required reading

V. Models of Human Destructiveness

A. The Painted Bird
   Jerzy Kosinski, The Painted Bird*
   Jean-Paul Sartre, Anti-Semite and Jew
   Andre Schwarz-Bart, The Last of the Just, Chapter 5*

B. Universal Paranoia
   Anthony Storr, Human Destructiveness

C. The Authoritarian Personality
T. Adorno and others, *The Authoritarian Personality*  

D. The Banality of Evil  
Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*  

E. Social Structure  
Kuper, *Genocide*, Chapter 4 (R)  

F. Taking Orders  
Stanley Milgram, *Obedience to Authority* (R)  

G. Ideology  
Albert Camus, *The Rebel*  
Kuper, *Genocide*, Chapter 5  
Clifford Geertz, "Ideology as a Cultural System," in *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Chapter 8*  

H. Psychological and Cultural Origins of Genocide  
Sanford and Comstock, ed., *Sanctions for Evil*, p. ix, Chapters 2, 5*  
Ervin Staub, *The Roots of Evil*, Part I (R)  

VI. A Contemporary Social Structure -- the Concentration Camp: Origins, Functions, Organization  
Primo Levi, *The Drowned and the Saved*  
Anna Pawelczynska, *Values and Violence in Auschwitz*  
"Night and Fog" (film) (R)  
Terrence Des Pres, *The Survivor*  
Richard Rubenstein, *The Cunning of History*, Chapters 3-4*  

VII. Genocide and the Professions  
Robert Jay Lifton, *The Nazi Doctors*  
Joseph Borkin, *The Crime and Punishment of I.G. Farben*  
Karl Dietrich Bracher, *The German Dictatorship*, pp. 259-272 (on education)  
Robert N. Proctor, *Racial Hygiene*  
Max Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors*
VIII. Altruism and Atrocity

Nechama Tec, *When Light Pierced the Darkness*, pp. 150-193 (R)*
"The Courage to Care" (film) (R)
Philip Hallie, *Lest Innocent Blood Be Shed*
Thomas Keneally, *Schindler's List*
Susan Zucotti, *The Italians and the Holocaust*
"Weapons of the Spirit" (film) (R)
Staub, chapters 17-18

IX. Genocide and Responsibility

Everett C. Hughes, "Good People and Dirty Work," *Social Problems, Vol. 10* (Summer 1962)*
Karl Jaspers, *The Question of German Guilt*
Gitta Sereny, *Into That Darkness*

X. Preventing Genocide

Kuper, *Genocide*, Chapter 9 (R)
Kuper, *The Prevention of Genocide*
Albert Camus, *Neither Victims nor Executioners*

XI. Summary


TERM PAPERS / 1991

The essay should be ten or more pages and will be due on April 18. Some topics you may wish to consider are:

The United Nations and Genocide
Preventing Genocide
The Concentration Camp
Human Destructiveness in Literature
Children and Genocide
A Case Study of Genocide
Resistance (or lack of it) to Genocide
Genocide and Ideology
A Critical Examination of a Theory of Human Destructiveness
Genocide in the Ancient World
Survivors
Bystanders
Rescuers
Human Destructiveness: Through the Eyes of the Perpetrator
Genocide and Technology
The Professions and Genocide
Genocide and Modernization
Genocide and the History of Ideas
Genocide and the Bystander Nation
The Corporation and Genocide
The Historical Revisionists: The Holocaust Never Happened
Genocide and Denial
Art and Genocide

Most of the topics as stated are too broad, but they represent a territory or problems that might be explored more concretely. Each topic listed contains many possibilities: you should not shy away from anything that interests you simply because someone else is planning to write on the same theme. I should be pleased to help you with the papers in any way that I can.

FINAL EXAMINATION / 1991

1. Please comment appropriately on four (4) of the following:
   a. Kuper sees a substantial relationship between the "plural society" and genocide.
      What is this relationship?
   b. What are the common characteristics of those who risk their lives to save the lives of others?
   c. Who, according to Kelman, is most likely to be obedient to orders and why?
   d. "good people and dirty work"
   e. The UN Convention on Genocide contains certain defects. What are these? Can they be corrected?
   f. In what ways, if any, does genocide in the 20th century differ from that of previous ages?
   g. Compare Storr and Milgram on the "fatal flaw" in human nature.
   h. Why have indigenous peoples been especially vulnerable to becoming victims of genocide?
   i. What separates "functionalists" and "intentionalists" in their interpretations of the Holocaust?
   j. Staub and "learning by doing"
   k. "The road to Auschwitz was built by hate, but paved with indifference."
   l. How would you explain the repeated denials by the Turkish government that the Armenian genocide of 1915-17 took place?
II. Please choose one (1) question:

a. Please write an essay about one of the following: perpetrators, victims, bystanders, or rescuers. You should make reference to particular theories as to why the group you select behaves as it does and illustrate from at least one case study of an actual genocide.

b. To what extent does Milgram's Obedience to Authority explain genocide? What criticisms, if any, would you make of this study?

c. Please delineate Ervin Staub’s theory of why genocide takes place and briefly indicate how well it succeeds in explaining the genocide in either Armenia or Cambodia.

III. Please choose one (1) question and discuss:

a. Who, if anyone, is responsible for genocide? What are the implications of your analysis for the prevention of genocide? Can you offer suggestions for making the world less lethal?

b. What is genocide? Is it common in history? What are its preconditions? How, if at all, can it be prevented?

c. "The study of genocide is concerned, not so much with the past, as with the present and, above all, the future."

d. Please comment on the following is an extract from an interview with Franz Stangl, who was commandant of Treblinka:

"Would it be true to say that you get used to the liquidations?"
"To tell the truth, one did become used to it."
"In days? Weeks? Months?"
"Months. It was months before I could look one of them in the eye. I repressed it all by trying to create a special place: gardens, new barracks, new kitchens... There were hundreds of ways to take one's mind off it; I used them all."
"You didn't feel they were human beings?"
"Cargo. They were cargo." He raised and dropped his hand in despair.
"There were so many children, did they ever make you think of your children, of how you would feel in the position of those parents?"
"No, I can't say I ever thought that way. You see, I rarely saw them as individuals. It was always a huge mass. I sometimes stood on the wall and saw them in the tube. But -- how can I explain -- they were naked, packed together, running, being driven with whips like ..." the sentence trailed off.
"Could you not have changed that? In your position, could you not have stopped the nakedness, the whips, the horror of the cattle pens?"
"No, no, no. That was the system. It worked. And because it worked, it was irreversible."

Gitta Sereny, Into That Darkness
THE POLITICS OF GENOCIDE

Colin Tatz

First Semester 1992
School of History, Philosophy and Politics
Four Credit Course
Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

NATURE OF THE COURSE:

This is a study of the systematic extermination of national, racial, religious, political, ethnic (or tribal) groups. Objectives include:

- analysing the motives for, and the ideological bases of such killings;
- examining the socio-political conditions under which such mass killings can and do occur;
- observing the techniques and technologies used in genocides;
- attempting to pinpoint legal and moral/personal responsibility for their occurrence;
- attempting to understand the indifference of bystanders while these events occur; assessing gradations of genocide--from destroying cultural institutions, to forcibly transferring children from one group to another, to the planned, total annihilation of an entire race/group;
- reviewing what guards or safeguards there are against repetitions of genocide.

At the end of the course we should be in a position to produce a more embracing definition of genocide than the one below, and to arrive at a model for classifying what is and what isn’t strictly genocide.

The United Nations, in the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, defines the term genocide to mean any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, 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.

The UN, however, does not mention the central role of the state, or the state at all. We have to look at centrally planned and organized state murder, at the destruction wrought by state bureaucracies. We also have to look at colonisation processes, at what has befallen indigenous groups in terms of what the originator of the term, Raphael Lemkin, called ‘genocide’: inter alia, synchronized attacks on the political, social, cultural, economic, religious, biological and moral lives of the ‘captive people.’ The UN definition does not cover many groups: city
dwellers (as in Pol Pot's Cambodia), the retarded, homosexuals, or those 'non-existent' (yet very dead) groups defined by their destroyers as demonic witches (in western Europe) or 'enemies of the people' (in Stalin's Russia). A major aim of this course is to come to terms with the differences between massacre, mass murder, gross colonial oppression, forced assimilation or religious conversion, and total (or attempted total) extermination of a whole genus, as in the case of the Armenians and the Jews this century. They represent the most extreme forms of genocide, and most of the course will be concerned with these two groups.

Prerequisites: This course is open to students who have completed two history or political science courses such as race politics, aboriginal politics, or Modern German or European History.

Course Requirements: We meet for one two-hour lecture/seminar per week and one tutorial per week. Attendance is compulsory.

Assessment: Two pieces of written work are required. I suggest you begin choosing, reading and making notes as soon as possible.

One essay is worth 35%, the other 65%. The longer assignment will be on the Jewish Holocaust, or Judeocide, and the Armenian Genocide; the shorter one will be on a case study outside of these two events. Normally, the shorter one would be done first. But it is in the major paper that you have to come to terms with the two most extreme forms of genocide--and having done that, you will have the yardsticks with which to assess the other cases.

PRESCRIBED BOOKS:

Preliminary Reading:

Before the first lecture, try to purchase from the bookshop and read the introduction to your textbook for the course, Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, History and Sociology of Genocide and in the journal Social Education, volume 55, no. 2, February 1991 the essay "Genocide: An Historical Overview" by Chalk and Jonassohn. Read the Holocaust Chapter from the Encyclopedia Judaica (Reserve).

Essential Reading:

You must read the two Armenian sources: and, for preference, the He... F... Israel Charny and Michael Marrus books. These books are on Special Reserve in the library.

Helen Fein, Accounting for Genocide, Basic Books, 1979 and University of Chicago, 1983. This is a detailed sociological study of the nature of genocide, country by country, during the Holocaust, as well as an analysis of how differences in national culture and history affected the Final Solution.
Michael Gilbert, The Holocaust: The Jewish Tragedy, Collins, 1986


Ernest Klee, Willi Dressen, Volker Riess, 'Those Were the Days': The Holocaust as seen by the Perpetrators and Bystanders.

Leo Kuper, *The Prevention of Genocide*, Yale University Press, 1985. This is a follow up to his Genocide book--it is important.


Yad Vashem, *Documents on the Holocaust*.

The following is a list of reading assignments and topics and questions which you need to be prepared to analyse during the weekly tutorial. [Additional unpublished lecture notes and essay collections Professor Tatz assigns are not listed.]

**Week 1**

Discuss the meanings of politicide, genocide, ethnocide and Judeocide (or Holocaust) and examine the usages of words like Shoah, Holocaust, Judeocide. Pay attention to the new term ethnocide, one used by historians who find the colonial experience of indigenous peoples difficult to classify. What are the ingredients of modern genocide?

Chalk and Jonassohn, 23-32.


Dekmejian, "Determinants of Genocide: Armenians and Jews as Case Studies," in *Armenian Genocide in Perspective*. 
Week 2

Yeshuda Bauer says the Holocaust was unique because of two elements: the total, planned, systematic annihilation of a people and the particular ideology that underlay the murder. He also says the Holocaust was universal. Discuss this seeming contradiction of unique/universal.

Chalk and Jonassohn, pp. 326-329.
Bauer, "Whose Holocaust?" in Midstream (Reserve).

Week 3

Discuss the arguments about "intentionalism" and "functionalism", or what I call "inevitabilism" in relation to the Judeocide or the Armenian genocide or to both.

Reserve readit.gs collection.

Week 4

Professor Saul Friedlander, in discussing the Holocaust, wonders whether we miss a vital point: the dimension of the "utterly irrational impulse, of some kind of insanity." Analyze the strong objection to talk of mental illness in these contexts.

Saul Friedlander, "Some Aspects of the Historical Significance of the Holocaust."
Christopher Browning, "One day in Jozefow: Initiation to Mass Murder" in Lessons and Legacies.

Week 5

Discuss the role and function of the medical profession in the major genocides of this century. You should also discuss the role of American doctors and psychologists in developing sterilisation programs in the early 20th century.

Introduction and conclusion to the books by Benno Muller-Hill, Robert Proctor or Robert Jay Lifton.

Week 6

Discuss the bystander--both the nations and the individuals--during the two major genocides. Also look at bystanderism in the Australian Aboriginal context.

Arthur Morse, While Six Million Died.
See The Times accounts of the Armenian genocide in 1915-16 (Reserve).

Week 7

Discuss the whole complex question of resistance and think about the following issues: What does resistance mean in these genocidal contexts? Is it only partisans, the underground, hand grenades? Are there other forms of resistance and if so, what form do they take? Is resistance effective against a state determined on extermination?
Yitzchak Arad, Belzec, Treblinka and Sobibor.

Week 8

We may come to see how genocide is politically and even technically possible. But how is it humanly possible?

Read Ze’ev Mankowitz in Yad Vashem lecture (Reserve).

Week 9

Who was responsible? The whole German nation? The 40 SS elite? The 50,000 specially trained elite? The French, English and German academics, as I always argue?


Week 10

Stalin was guilty of several genocides. The German historians, Ernst Nolte and Andreas Hillgruber, argue that Hitler was, after all only following the models set by Stalin’s ‘Asiatic’ political genocides. Look at the whole question of denial and revisionism.

Chalk and Jonassohn, pp. 290-322.

Week 11

Why are the gypsies the case of a forgotten genocide? Why is this case so little discussed, even in as comprehensive a textbook as ours?

Ian Hancock, The Pariah Syndrome.

Week 12

What has been the nature of the genocide against Aborigines?

Tony Barta, "Relations of Genocide: Land and Lives in the Colonization of Australia,” in Wallimann and Dobkowski.

Article by Colin Tatz in Social Education.

ESSAY TWO: 35%, 7,000 WORDS

Choose one case study to illustrate the seven major themes set out on page 1 under "Nature of the Course." These points must be considered in addressing the topic of your choice. But not all themes may be applicable: where they are inapplicable, you should say so.

CHOICES

1. The treatment of gypsies (The Roma or Romany people) in World War II.
2. The atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki: was this genocide?
5. The case of East Timor.
6. Selective genocide in Rwanda and Burundi.
8. The position of the Kurds in the Middle East this past decade.
9. The 'Disappeared' People in Argentina.
11. The 'wreckers' and 'the enemies of the Soviet Union' during Stalin's purges.
12. The secession of Biafra from Nigeria.
14. The treatment of the Bahai's in Iran.
15. The Ache Indians in Paraguay.
16. South Africa: is apartheid genocide?
17. Genocide in Equatorial Guinea--the trial of dictator Macias.
18. The Chmielnicki pogroms against Jews in 1648: was this genocide?
19. The case of Brazil's Indians.
20. The black Jews of Ethiopia.
21. Australia's Aborigines: What aspects of our treatment amount to genocide?
22. The annihilation of Aborigines in Tasmania (is this a clear case? Compare the Aborigines' mainland experience).
23. The massacre of the Acholi soldiers in Amin's Ugandan army.
24. 'The genocide that is rife in Algeria'--Frantz Fanon, writing in 1959.
25. Russian treatment of Chechens, Ingush and Crimean Tatars in the 1940s.
26. The Nazi genocide against Russian prisoners of war.
27. Violence and massacres in Northern Ireland: a case of what?
28. Tibet under China: a case of what?
GENOCIDE AND "CONSTRUCTIVE" SURVIVAL

Ron Baker

1987

Richmond Fellowship College, London

CHALLENGES AND ISSUES FACING SURVIVORS, FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES AFTER HOLOCAUST AND GENOCIDAL EXPERIENCES

A 20-week course that aims to develop understanding of how genocidal situations occur, the effect of such experience on the individual, the children of survivors and on victimized communities, and what might constitute 'constructive survival.' We will also look at what Holocaust and survivor research can teach us in the prevention of further genocides.

Objectives

- to explore psychological, political, economic, cultural and religious factors that may lead to genocidal situations.
- to introduce some concepts and research information drawing from survivor research and identify common themes which are relevant to contemporary events.
- to identify "positive" and "negative" survival strategies which may be used by survivors, the children of survivors and victimized communities and how these may affect individual behavior and interpersonal relationships.
- to develop insight into individuals and communities that actively reject participation in the dehumanization, torture and murder of scapegoated minority groups.
- to discuss a painful and challenging subject in as constructive and non-threatening way as possible.

Methods

To achieve the above aims, use will be made of selected films, literature, personal testimonies, small and large group discussion (SGD/LGD), and lecturettes.

PROGRAM - TERM 1

Each evening will start promptly at 7:30 and end at 10:15 p.m.

October 19

Introduction to ourselves

Aims and objectives of the course
Defining "Genocide," "Holocaust" and "Constructive Survival"
"The Hangman"
Issues, questions arising
Kaddish (Part 1) / Discussion
Kaddish (Part 2)
What is a "survivor family"?
Analysis, issues arising
SGD
Plenary
The Children of Hiroshima
SGD
Comparisons and contrasts
Analysis - questions and issues arising
L/SGD
Rumkowski and the Jews of Lodz:
    Exploring individual and community reactions
Survival techniques: the individual, the family, the community
    -- what can survivors teach us?

Lessons from the past for constructive survival for today and tomorrow
Reviewing this term's work and planning next term's course
Program - Term 2

INTRODUCTION TO TERM 2 - OBJECTIVES

Week 1
What makes people say "NO"?

Week 2
The courage to care

Week 3
Questions from the Ashes!
    The Moral Questions posed for those who come after the Holocaust and Genocides --
    what are they and what are the common responses?

Week 4
Can potential genocidal situations be predicted -- how?

Week 5
Genocides in Turkey, Nazi Germany and Cambodia -- are there common identifiable
    factors? (psychological, cultural, political, economic, practical)
    What supports the dehumanization, torture and murder of individuals and "minority
groups"?

Week 6
Breaking the Silence of Trauma -- What adult children of survivors make of their
    parent/s experiences and their responses.
Week 7
The Children of Survivors and Perpetrators -- have they anything in common?

Week 8
Issues on the Reception and Resettlement of Refugee Survivors in an asylum country --
Vietnamese and Chilean experiences in the U.K.

Week ?
Why don’t we learn from the past?
Linking the past to the present -- universal applications.
What can we do -- What should we do?

Week 10
Review of the course -- What next?
"Up is Down" -- a message for us all?
KINDNESS AND CRUELTY: PSYCHOLOGICAL UNDERSTANDING AND PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

Ervin Staub

Fall 1990/Psychology
University of Massachusetts

Reading materials:
1. Class handout: A book of readings listed in the course outline.

1. Introduction: The nature and purpose of the course. The phenomena of cruelty and kindness. The origins of concern for other human beings (human nature; sociobiology; human relations and the nature of society; religion; government and law). Assumptions about human nature. Human beings as "good" (kind, altruistic); "bad" or "evil" (selfish, aggressive); or having varied potentials. How should we act? (September 6, 11, 13)

Readings:

THE ORIGINS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL BASES OF KINDNESS

2. The psychological basis of the "good": helpfulness, self-sacrifice, rule following. Self-other bonds: empathy, sympathy, sense of similarity to others, expanding one's identity. Promotive tension. Value orientations -- moral orientations. Kohlberg; Hoffman; Durkheim; Gilligan; Staub. Judgments of good and evil. (September 18, 20)

Readings:
Hornstein, Chapter 2.

3. Helping people in emergencies, in physical distress, in danger. Definition of the meaning of events; assumption of responsibility (types of responsibilities); decision to take action; execution. Role of circumstances; of societal orientation toward victims; of the personal characteristics of actors. Competencies inherent in situations and persons. Costs of helping -- conflicting goals, sacrifices. Spontaneous helping. Heroism. Carnegie heroes. A small Huguenot village: Rescuers. (September 25, 27)
Readings:

4. The determinants of moral conduct. Personal goals, value orientations, environmental influences, the self-other bond, competencies. (October 2)

Readings:

THE ORIGINS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL BASES OF CRUELTY

5. The psychological bases of inflicting harm on others, of aggression, of cruelty: basic concepts. Us-Them differentiation; devaluation, stereotypes, negative images, prejudice; the just world hypothesis; scapegoating. Negative value orientations leading to cruelty. Instigators of aggression: frustration, attack or threat to physical self, to self-image, to goals. Motives that result and their modes of fulfillment. The role of the self: self-esteem, unsatisfied needs and threatened goals. Unconscious motives and their projection onto others. (October 4, 9, 11)

Readings:

6. Inflicting harm on other people: obedience to authority. The role of authority -- in defining events, in affecting compliance, in assuming responsibility. Group influence. The Asch experiments. The Milgram experiments. Obedience, conformity, deindividuation, the submergence of the self in the group. The authoritarian personality. The effects of roles. (October 16, 18)

Readings:
Hornstein, H. Chapter 10.
Byrne, D., & Kelley, K. An Introduction to Personality. Chapter 5, "Authoritarianism: The Fascist Within.

EVIL IN SOCIETY: GENOCIDE, WITH A FOCUS ON THE HOLOCAUST

7. Difficult life conditions. Cultural characteristics-predisposition. Psychological needs and their attempted modes of fulfillment. The continuum of destruction. The psychology of perpetrators and bystanders. Ideologies and the reversal of morality. (October 23, 25, 30)

Readings:
Staub. The Roots of Evil. Chapters 2, 7-11.

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN GOOD AND EVIL

8. Cruelty and abuse in the family: Child abuse, wife abuse, sexual abuse. Influences that lead to them; consequences for victims. (November 1)

Readings:

9. Everyday kindness (and cruelty) in close relationships. Reciprocity and complementarity in relationships. Systemic views -- personality and the selection of and creation of partners in close relationships. Friendship. (November 6)

10. Prejudice. Discrimination against ethnic and other subgroups in the past and in contemporary U.S. Racism, sexism, anti-semitism. Justice, injustice and rage. Psychological consequences for victims; their relations to themselves, to other victims, and to society. (November 8, 15, 20)

Readings:

11. The psychological and cultural-societal origins of war. Conflict of interest, desire for conquest. Ideology of antagonism. Glory of war, just war. Perceptions of other countries as sources of conflict and war. (November 27)

Readings:
SOCIAL CHANGE

1. The evolution of caring and non-aggressive cultures and societies.


   Readings:


2. The evolution of caring and non-aggressive cultures and societies.

   How changes in institutions and cultural values came about. Processes of change. Conflicts of values, conflicts of interest, superordinate values and goals. The good society. (December 4, 6)

   Readings:

   Staub. The Roots of Evil. Chapters 17, 18.

SUMMARY

   Judgment and action: noticing evil and taking action. What can we do to promote individual and communal welfare? The responsibility of "bystanders" -- individuals and groups. (December 11, 13)

Requirements:

1. Reading assigned material and participation in class discussions.
2. Writing the papers and take-home exam described below.

   Paper A.1 - A first version of a paper on personal experience of kindness or cruelty. The first alternative is to describe an extreme, dramatic experience of either kindness or cruelty (when you have enough information about the circumstances or actors to analyze the origins or sources of it), for example, a heroic action in saving another person or other dramatic action which demanded self-sacrifice and produced great benefits, or an act of similar magnitude of harmdoing. In this act, ideally, you are either the person who performed the act or the person at whom the act was directed.

   The second alternative is to describe a persistent or lasting experience of kindness or cruelty either by others toward you or in your own behavior toward others (for example, special kindness or abuse in a relationship). These experiences of kindness or cruelty may have been
either directed at you or enacted by you as an individual, or as a member of a group (ethnic, religious, or other).

Following the description of the experience, you are to analyze it in light of your current understanding: you are to briefly discuss the sources of these actions as a function of the past experience and characteristics of actors, the relationship between persons, as a function of circumstances, etc.

If you have no relevant experience of your own, you can attempt to analyze from available descriptions, real-life examples of kindness and cruelty. About 6-8 pages. Due September 25.

**Paper B.1 -** Write a paper about a topic related to kindness or cruelty. In this research paper, you are to: (a) describe the problem or issue that you are concerned with and the questions you want to answer, (b) describe - review relevant research and theory, and (c) analyze and draw conclusions. That is, answer the questions you asked using research and theory. 8-12 pages. Due October 18.

**Paper C -** Keep a diary, for 5 days, of helpful or kind and harmful or unkind acts that you witness. Then write a 3-4 page summary report of what you have learned from your observations. (Briefly summarize your observations and then describe what you have learned from them.) (Do diary October 24-28; summary report due November 1.)

**B.2 -** Having received feedback and evaluation on your paper (B.1), revise it as needed. 8-12 pages. Due November 20.

**Take-home exam: receive it on November 29; return it on December 4.**

**A.2 -** Rewrite Paper A. This version is to be a scholarly paper using information from the course and additional sources. Following (a) a careful presentation of events, (b) describe research findings, psychological concepts, and theory that you will use to analyze the events you described, to explain how they came about. Proceed with the actual analysis and with drawing conclusions. 8-12 pages. Due December 13.
GENOCIDE AND ETHNOCIDE

Rhoda E. Howard

Fall 1991
Social Science and Sociology
McMaster University

COURSE SUMMARY

Genocide is deliberate mass murder of a social group, usually by a state. Since WWII, it is estimated that twice as many people have been killed by genocide as by war. In the entire twentieth century, it is estimated that 36 million people died as a result of war as compared to 119 million as a result of genocide. Genocide is thus a regular social phenomenon and a massive social problem that is, nevertheless, very rarely the object of social scientists' attention.

This course will investigate three types of genocide and some of the attendant issues they touch upon. It will begin with a consideration of the best-known twentieth century genocide and the classic prototype in the literature, the Nazi exterminations of Jews, the Romany people ("Gypsies") and others, as well as the Nazi genocide's predecessor, the Turkish genocide of the Armenians. It will continue with a discussion of ideologically-based politicides (mass murder for political reasons), especially the genocide by man-made famine in the Ukraine in the early 1930s and the genocide in Cambodia in the 1970s. Thirdly, we will discuss developmental genocide and ethnocide—the destruction of the cultures of indigenous people, usually by developed capitalist/colonial societies. Here, the focus will be on indigenous peoples of Canada.

Attendant sociological issues are the use of euthanasia as a means of "improving" the quality of a people, the debate over obedience to authority, the role of bystanders in genocide, the impulse toward altruism. Attendant political issues are the appropriateness of humanitarian intervention in the case of genocide, and the relationship (if any) between genocide and warfare.

TEXTS

Assigned readings will come from the following texts, all paperbacks ordered by the bookstore; and from readings on reserve, as listed in the weekly outline.

Geoffrey York, The Dispossessed: Life and Death in Native Canada, Toronto: Lester and Orpen Dennys, 1990
REQUIREMENTS

These requirements depend partly on class size and are subject to change after discussion with the class.

Class Participation: (if class is small enough to permit): 10%
Term Paper: 15-20 pages: 40%
Due Dates: Essay proposal (5% of grade) October 8th
Complete draft (optional) November 12
Final version: November 26

N.B. No extensions without medical certification or letter from the student's faculty indicating extraordinary circumstances.

Assignments must be handed in during class time. The office staff of the Departments of Sociology and Peace Studies are not responsible for accepting assignments and will not date-stamp them.

Final Examination: short essay format: 50%.
The final examination will be held on December 10, 1991, one week after the end of class. Students will be given a set of questions on the last day of class, December 3, to study at home. A subset of these, chosen by the professor, will constitute the examination.

SCHEDULE OF LECTURES AND READINGS

The following lists topics for each week, films, and required readings for each week. This outline is provided for students' guidance, but there may be the occasional change. In order to partake in class discussions, students should read each week's assignments ahead of time and review their notes immediately prior to class.

C and J is Chalk and Jonassohn, History and Sociology of Genocide
Fein is Genocide, a Sociological Perspective.

Week 1 / September 10
Introduction to the course: Definition of genocide
C and J: Part 1, Fein chapters 1 and 2

UNIT I: ETHNIC GENOCIDES

Week 2 / September 17
Nazism and Nazi Genocides: Destruction of the Jews
C and J: pages 323-366
Fein, chapter 4
Week 3 / September 24

Nazism and Nazi genocides: Other victims
C and J: pages 366-377 (Gypsies)
Plant chapter 4, "Persecutions" (gays)

---

Week 4 / October 1

The Armenian genocide
(Film: FORGOTTEN GENOCIDE)
C and J: pages 249-289
Kuper, chapter 6

UNIT II: POLITICIDES

Week 5 / October 8

The Ukrainian genocide
(Film: HARVEST OF DESPAIR)
C and J: pages 290-322
Kuper, chapter 5

Week 6 / October 15

Cambodia and Indonesia: Auto-Genocides
C and J: pages 378-383, 398-411
Staub, chapter 13

UNIT III: DEVELOPMENTAL GENOCIDES AND ETHNOCIDE

Week 7 / October 22

Developmental Genocides
C and J: pages 173-203, 412-414
Fein, chapter 5

Week 8 / October 29

Ethnocide of Canada's aboriginal peoples
York, The Dispossessed, chapter 1-5

Week 9 / November 5

Case study: Grassy Narrows Reserve
(Film, GRASSY NARROWS)
York, The Dispossessed, chapters 6-9 and Epilogue
UNIT IV: ATTENDANT SOCIOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL QUESTIONS

Week 10 / November 12

Obedience to authority, the euthanasia question

Fein, chapter 3
McLaren, chapters 3 and 4
Bauman, chapter 6

Week 11 / November 19

Bystanders and Altruism

C and J: pages 415-21
Abella and Troper, chapter 1
Staub, chapter 18

Week 12 / November 26

Humanitarian intervention: Genocide and Warfare

C and J: pages 422-425
Kuper, chapter 9, "The Sovereign Territorial State"
Staub, chapter 16
Lifton, Future of Immortality, chapter 9

UNIT V: REPRISE AND REVIEW

Week 13 / December 3

Reprise, Review, Discussion of Examination Questions

Fein, chapter 6
Bauman, chapter 7

FINAL EXAMINATION: DECEMBER 10, 6:15-9:15 P.M.

LIST OF READINGS ON RESERVE

N.B. * means readings from this book are assigned in course outline.

*Abella, Irving and Harold Troper, None is Too Many, (Lester and Orpen Dennys, 1986)

*Bauman, Zygmunt, Modernity and the Holocaust, (Cornell, 1989)

Bodley, John H. Victims of Progress, 3rd ed. (Mayfield, 1990)


Dawidowicz, Lucy S., The War Against the Jews, (Bantam: 1975)

Fein, Helen, Accounting for Genocide, (Free Press, 1979)
Koonz, Claudia, Mothers in the Fatherland, (St. Martin's, 1987)
*Kuper, Leo, Genocide, (Penguin, 1981)
*Lifton, Robert Jay, Nazi Doctors, (Basic Books, 1986)
*McLaren, Angus, Our Own Master Race, (McClelland and Stewart, 1990)
Shkilnyk, Anastasia M., A Poison Stronger than Love, (Yale, 1985)

EXAM QUESTIONS

Below are five questions. Three, chosen by the professor, will be on the final examination. Students are expected to prepare answers in note form to these questions, showing understanding of the assigned readings as well as of the lectures. Students may bring two pages (two sides) of notes per question to the exam room. Footnotes in the exam should follow the bracket style, e.g. (York, p. 125): no bibliography of assigned readings is necessary.

1. Relying on Geoffrey York's Dispossessed, discuss whether native Canadians can be considered to be victims of ethnocide. Make sure that you provide a clear definition of ethnocide and discuss how its constituent components are evident in the Canadian case.

2. Discuss Kuper's "sovereign right to genocide" with reference to Canada's attitude to the Nazi genocides and the world's attitudes to the Cambodian genocide. Are there any political, psychological or other means that can reduce bystanders' propensity to ignore genocide?

3. From the introduction to Chalk and Jonassohn, pick the definition of genocide that you consider the best. Justify your decision by applying the definition to both the Armenian and the Ukrainian genocides.

4. The Nazi genocide of the Jews has been attributed to various causes, including the state of crisis in inter-war Germany, the role of nationalism and ideology, and the modern technological capacity for social distancing. Taking into account these different factors, construct your own theory of why the Nazis exterminated the Jews.

5. One of the most difficult questions in the genocide literature is that of obedience to authority. Referring in your answer to two or more of the several case studies we have considered, discuss how individuals can be persuaded to commit horrendous crimes against other individuals.
THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF GENOCIDE

Leo Kuper

Spring 1987
University of California at Los Angeles

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The comparative study of genocide will be based on a number of case studies of genocide, presented in theoretical perspective. Major topics will include theories of genocide, structural analysis of the societies involved, processes of polarization of group relations, and the role of ethnic, racial and religious differences, and of ideological commitment in the genocidal conflict. The course will be interdisciplinary and conclude with a discussion of preventive action against genocide.

COURSE STAFFING

The following faculty members will staff the course: Professors Shlomo Aronson, Amin Banani, Richard Hovannisian, Edward Kannyo, Gary Nash, Stanley Wolpert, and Leo Kuper.

COURSE SYLLABUS

Part One: Course Requirements and Overview

Week 1

General outline of course. Historical introduction to genocide and its varied manifestations. Leo Kuper.

(Students will be encouraged to develop a detailed knowledge of a selected case of genocide, which need not be one covered in the lectures.)

Reading: Leo Kuper, Genocide, Chapters 1 and 2.

Part Two: The Religious Element in Varied Contexts

Week 2


Reading: Stanley Wolpert, Roots of Confrontation in South Asia, Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 7.
Week 3

Case study of a contemporary threatened genocide -- the Baha'is in Iran. A relatively pure case of persecution based on religion. Amin Banani (with possible participation of a member from the Baha'i community).

Preferred Reading: Douglas Martin, "Baha'is of Iran" (Pamphlet)  
(Alternatives: Geoffrey Nash, "Iran's Secret War" (pamphlet); or Minority Rights Group, "The Baha'is of Iran").

Week 4

The Holocaust, introducing a complexity of factors. Shlomo Aronson.

Reading: Yehuda Bauer, History of the Holocaust.

Week 5

The Turkish genocide of Armenians, Historical context, plural structure of the Ottoman Empire, and role of ideological, ethnic, and religious factors. Some comment on comparison with the Holocaust. Richard Hovannisian.

Reading: Richard Hovannisian, The Armenian Genocide in Perspective, Preface, Introduction, Chapters 1 to 6, and 12.

Week 6

(a) Panel on the comparative aspects of the case studies in the first half of the course. Professors Banani, Hovannisian, Wolpert, and Aronson.

(b) Review of the case studies and discussion of theories of genocide, including plural society theory. Leo Kuper.

Reading: Leo Kuper, Genocide, Chapters 3 and 5.

Part Three: Introduction to the Colonial Experience As It Bears on Genocidal Conflict.

Week 7


Reading: Gary Nash, Red, White and Black, Chapters 2 to 16; 12.

Week 8

Problems of integration in the successor post-colonial societies.

(a) Case study of Uganda -- the Amin and Obote regimes. Edward Kannyo.

(b) General reflections on genocidal conflict in colonial and post-colonial societies, with brief reference to contemporary colonization. Leo Kuper.

Reading: Leo Kuper, Genocide, Chapter 4
Jean-Paul Sartre, Genocide (short essay)
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Part Four: Prevention of Genocide

Week 9:

(a) Open period, drawing on community resources, invited speakers.


Reading: Leo Kuper, International Action Against Genocide

Week 10:

(a) Panel on the prevention of genocide. International lawyers, social scientists to be invited.

(b) Review of course.

BOOKS ON RESERVE IN THE COLLEGE LIBRARY

Martin, Douglas (1985) Baha'is of Iran. Ottawa: Association for Baha'i Studies
According to the sociologist and philosopher Jurgen Habermas, "moral consciousness" involves the ability of an individual to make decisions consciously (that is, self-reflectively) in the face of morally relevant conflicts.

In exploring the implications of this idea, this course will refer to historical events that now generally evoke the judgment of "moral outrage" (e.g. the Holocaust; the Gulag). At the same time, the goal of this investigation will aim beyond mere exposure to the horrors of Fascist and Stalinist death camps. In addition, the readings and discussions are intended to foster a self-reflective "moral consciousness": i.e. one which would be able to transcend both naive ignorance ("How could people do such things?!") as well as cynical apathy ("Inhuman cruelty is to be expected in such situations.").

The course will be a difficult one for several reasons. First, it entails a great deal of reading, and a significant portion of this is complex and challenging in style. Secondly, if this is to be a "good" class, it is absolutely essential for every student to do the reading, come to class, and participate in the discussions regularly. For that reason, attendance and participation will constitute a measurable part of your final grade.

Finally, this course may be particularly difficult because of its almost unrelieved concentration on human suffering and extreme, deliberately inflicted cruelty. Students should be forewarned that honest attempts to be self-reflective about "moral consciousness" rarely, if ever, result in satisfactory, certain answers or easy optimism.

Required Readings

Tadeusz Borowski, This Way for the Gas, Ladies and Gentlemen, NY: Penguin, 1976
Anna Pawelczynska, Values and Violence in Auschwitz, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979

Final grade will be based on a total score of 700 possible points:
I) Class work: 200 points total
   (170 points from three in-class short essay exams)
   (30 points for full participation)
II) Final exam: 500 points total
   (400 points for content)
   (100 points for form)

The final exam, which will be given out after Spring Break, consists of several long, in-depth essay questions to be answered on the basis of class readings, lectures, and audio-visual presentations.

Tuesday, January 22 - Introduction

Video: Genocide (80 min)

Reading for Thursday:
Arendt, Preface to Part One, xi-xvi
Arendt, Chapters 1 and 2, 3-53
Wiesel, Chapters 1-4, 12-76
Malamud, Chapter 1, 1-24

Thursday, January 24 - Discussion: Anti-semitism (I)
1) anti-semitism as an outrage to common sense
2) the Jews, the nation-state, and the birth of anti-semitism

Reading for Tuesday:
Arendt, Chapters 3 and 4, 54-120
Wiesel, Chapters 5-9, 77-127
Malamud, Chapter 2, 25-61

Tuesday, January 29 - Discussion: Anti-semitism (II)
3) the Jews and society
4) the Dreyfuss affair

Review for test Thursday
Thursday, January 31 - Test Re "anti-semitism"

Reading for Tuesday:
- Arendt, Preface to Part Two, xvii-xxii
- Arendt, Chapter 5, 123-157
- Kosinski, Chapters 1-5, 1-55
- Malamud, Chapter 3, 63-96

Tuesday, February 5 - Discussion: Imperialism (I)
1) the political emancipation of the bourgeoisie

Reading for Thursday:
- Arendt, Chapter 6, 158-184
- Kosinski, Chapters 6-9, 57-111
- Malamud, Chapter 4, 97-122

Thursday, February 7 - Discussion: Imperialism (II)
2) race-thinking before racism
Film: The White Laager (58 min)

Reading for Tuesday:
- Arendt, Chapter 7, 185-221
- Kosinski, Chapters 10-12, 113-162
- Malamud, Chapter 5, 123-160

Tuesday, February 12 - Discussion: Imperialism (III)
3) race and bureaucracy
Film: Last Grave at Dimbaza (55 min)

Reading for Thursday:
- Arendt, Chapter 8, 222-266
- Kosinski, Chapters 13-17, 163-219
- Malamud, Chapter 6, 161-205

Thursday, February 14 - Discussion: Imperialism (IV)
4) continental imperialism: the pan-movements

Reading for Tuesday:
- Arendt, Chapter 9, 267-302
- Kosinski, Chapters 18-20, 221-251
- Afterword, and "On Kosinski," 253-275
- Malamud, Chapter 7, 207-235

Tuesday, February 19 - Discussion: Imperialism (V)
5) the decline of the nation-state and the end of the rights of man

Review for test Thursday
Thursday, February 21 - Test Re "imperialism"

Reading for Tuesday:
Arendt, Preface to Part Three, xxiii-xl
Arendt, Chapter 10, 305-340
Malamud, Chapter 8, 237-265

Tuesday, February 26 - Discussion: Totalitarianism (I)
1) a classless society

Reading for Thursday:
Arendt, Chapter 11, 341-388
Malamud, Chapter 9, 267-306

Thursday, February 28 - Discussion: Totalitarianism (II)
2) the totalitarian movement
Film: The Warsaw Ghetto (54 min)

Reading for Tuesday:
Arendt, Chapter 12, 389-459

Tuesday, March 5 - Discussion: Totalitarianism (III)
3) totalitarianism in power

Reading for Thursday:
Arendt, Chapter 13, 460-479

Thursday, March 7 - Discussion: Totalitarianism (IV)
4) ideology and terror: a novel form of government
Review for test Tuesday

Tuesday, March 12 - Test Re "totalitarianism"

Reading for Thursday:
Leach, "Translator’s Introduction" in Pawelczynska, xi-xxxi

Thursday, March 14
Discussion: Nazi extermination camps: the social context

Video: 1984

Reading for next Tuesday:
Borowski, 11-26, 29-81
Pawelczynska, Chapters 1-3, 6-43

Tuesday, March 26
Discussion: The World Outside the Camps; Frames of Reference; Institutions of State Crimes; Living Space

Reading for Thursday:
Pawelczynska, Chapters 4-6, 44-82
Borowski, 82-130
Thursday, March 28 - Slides: Oswiecim (Auschwitz), Poland
Discussion: Breaking the Prisoners' Solidarity, Social Differentiation and the Odds for Survival; A Place in the Structure of Terror
Reading for Tuesday:
Borowski, 130-135

Tuesday, April 2
Discussion of the novels of Malamud, Wiesel, Kosinski, and Borowski
Reading for Thursday:
Pawelczynska, Chapters 7-12, 83-144

Thursday, April 4
Discussion: The Psychological Relativity of Numbers;
Love and Erotica
Socio-Economic Defense Mechanisms
The Organized Resistance Movement
The Mechanisms of Adaptations and Self-Defense
People and Values
Reading for Tuesday: Des Pres, Chapter 1, 5-24
Ginzburg, 3-51
Solzhenitsyn, Preface, ix-xii, 616-620; 60-68 re "Article 58"; 68-76 re sentences (Reprints)

Tuesday, April 9 - Discussion: The Survivor in Fiction;
Solzhenitsyn; Ginsburg
Reading for Thursday:
Des Pres, Chapter 2, 29-50
Ginzburg, 52-100

Thursday, April 11 - Discussion: The Will to Bear Witness
Video: The Road to Total War (60 min)
Reading for Tuesday:
Des Pres, Chapter 3, 53-71
Ginzburg, 100-157

Tuesday, April 16 - Discussion: Excremental Assault
Reading for Thursday:
Des Pres, Chapter 4, 75-94
Ginzburg, 157-208

Thursday, April 18 - Discussion: Nightmare and Waking
Reading for Tuesday:
Des Pres, Chapter 5, 151-177
Ginzburg, 209-270
Tuesday, April 23 - Discussion: Life in Death  
*Video: The Killing Fields (Part I)*  
Reading for Thursday:  
Des Pres, Chapter 6, 151-177  
Ginzburg, 273-351

Thursday, April 25 - Discussion: Us and Them  
*Video: The Killing Fields (Part II)*  
Reading for Tuesday:  
Des Pres, Chapter 7, 181-209  
Ginzburg, 351-418  
Solzhenitsyn, 597-617; 632-655; 193-218; 523-527 (Reprints)

Tuesday, April 30 - Discussion: Radical Nakedness; The Ascent; Our Muzzled Freedom; Escapes -- Morale and Mechanics; Afterword  
Reading for Thursday:  
Mihajlov, 103-131 (Reprint)  
Solzhenitsyn/Sakharov, 1-23 (Reprint)

Thursday, May 2  
Discussion: Mystical Experiences of the Labor Camps:  
The Solzhenitsyn/Sakharov Debate  
Tuesday, May 7 - *Video: Mother Teresa (60 min)*

**TAKE HOME FINAL**  
*Due by Wednesday, May 15, 11:00 a.m. (may be handed in earlier)*

**ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS**  
(Complete exam should be approximately 20 typed, double-spaced pages, about 4 pages per question)

1. In her study of totalitarianism in power, Arendt speaks of "the peculiar unreality and lack of credibility that characterizes all reports from concentration camps" (438; see also 439). She further states that the horror of life in the concentration camps "can never be fully embraced by the imagination for the very reason that it stands outside of life and death. It can never be fully reported..." (444)

   In the light of this insoluble problem, what, then, were each of the following writers trying to do? (Discuss both their specific intent, as you understand it, and the literary techniques each writer employed in attempting to accomplish his or her purpose.)

   a) Elie Wiesel  
   b) Jerzy Kosinski
2. In examining the literature written by and about survivors of extreme situations, one is struck by two contrasting attitudes toward the use and affirmation of "transcendent" themes and vocabulary.

a) Clarify the use and affirmation of transcendent themes and/or vocabulary in the writings of Solzhenitsyn (who writes of "the soul and barbed wire" and "the ascent"); Mihajlov (who writes of "mystical experiences of the labor camps"); and Des Pres (who refers to "the apprenticeship of one's own soul").

b) Clarify the deliberate downplaying of transcendent themes and vocabulary in the writings of Pawelczynska and Borowski.

c) Do you think these two viewpoints are totally irreconcilable, or do there appear to be any possible points of convergence? (In developing your answer, it may be helpful to recall Sakharov's interpretation of Solzhenitsyn's thinking in general; see especially pages 11-13.)

3. Following her discussion of the "three killings" necessary for securing totalitarian domination (killing the juridicial person; killing the moral person; killing unique identity, individuality, and spontaneity, pages 447-455), Arendt then concludes that "radical evil," a concept never before quite conceivable in our entire philosophical tradition, has nonetheless emerged "in connection with a system in which all men have become equally superfluous" (459). She then warns that "today, with populations and homelessness everywhere on the increase, masses of people are continuously rendered superfluous if we continue to think of our world in utilitarian terms" (ibid.).

a) Discuss these insights in relation to social, economic, and political events and situations that have occurred and are occurring since the time of Nazism and Stalinism, paying particular attention to:

1) Contemporary parallels to "the three killings"
2) Arendt's ideas regarding superfluity in modern society (Hint: check the Index of her book for such entries as "isolation," "rootlessness," and "superfluity")

b) Consider the notion of "radical evil" in connection with:

1) Arendt's ideas on the "all or nothing" implications of modern politics (see 443; see also her definition of "absolute evil" in the Preface, ix)
2) Des Pres's contention that "we live in an age of genocide..." (48)

4 a) Pawelczynska identifies two types of adaptation necessary for biological and moral survival: reduction of material needs, and revision in the hierarchy of values. With respect to the latter, describe the pattern by which a new, potentially more viable system of diminished values could be created by prisoners in this situation. What fac-
tors affected the degree to which "original" moral norms would have to be revised? Explain.

b) Relate your answer to the question above to Pawelczynska's and Des Pres's descriptions of the organization of resistance movements in the camps. (Begin by defining "resistance" and "dignity" in this context.) What fundamental moral values underlie this kind of organized resistance? In this connection, explain Pawelczynska's contention that the concentration camps created a new moral value: "that bond with the wronged..." (144). Consider as well Des Pres's analysis of Malamud's "small hero" in *The Fixer*: "as a man unjustly condemned, he is connected to others" (13).

c) What moral plea is Arendt making when she links "the idea of humanity" with "the very serious consequence that in one form or another men must assume responsibility for all crimes committed by men, and that eventually all nations will be forced to answer for the evil committed by all others"? (236) How, specifically, do you interpret the words "responsibility" and "answer for" in the above quote?

5. Arendt acknowledges the inevitability of moral relativism and its attendant problems "once the absolute and transcendent measurements of religion or the law of nature have lost their authority" (299). She furthermore states that "nothing perhaps distinguishes modern masses as radically from those of previous centuries as the loss of faith in a Last Judgment... the idea of an absolute standard of justice combined with the infinite possibility of grace" (446-447).

In a parallel vein, Des Pres writes of the nihilism that results "when mythic structures collapse and symbolism fails" and the choice becomes one of "ourselves or nothing" (207). In the final chapter of his book, however, he nevertheless does employ the vocabulary of myths and symbols. He terms the death camps "the realized archetypes of eternal victimhood, of evil forever triumphant" (177), and he also states that "once we see the central fact about the survival experience -- that these people passed *through* Hell -- the archetypes of doom are, if not cancelled, at least less powerful in their authority over our perceptions" (ibid.).

At the end, however, he explicitly recognizes a non-transcendent basis for existence: "Life has no purpose beyond itself; or rather, having arisen by chance in an alien universe, life is its own ground and purpose, and the entire aim of its vast activity is to establish stable systems and endure" (193-194).

In relation to the ideas expressed above:

a) Contrast and compare Arendt's and Des Pres's thoughts concerning moral consciousness and social action.

b) Clarify which parts of either or both interpretations you personally find most viable and most problematic for:

1) modern society in general;
2) yourself in particular.

(Hint for Question 5: Begin by re-reading Des Pres' Preface)
Selected List of Comparative Studies on Genocide

Helen Fein

The following is a minimal list of works useful as texts, evaluations and bibliographic reviews; many reoccur in the course syllabi presented herein. These works contain ample references and bibliographies (especially 1, 2, and 3). There are also separate bibliographies on the Holocaust and the Armenian genocide (see 6) which should be consulted.

1. Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn. The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990. Includes brief bibliographies by genocide and region for cases in text and other putative cases—a good "starter kit" for students. This is the only text and bibliography to cover historical cases prior to the twentieth century.


Journals, Newsletters and other periodicals:

Internet on the Holocaust and Genocide is published several times a year by the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide POB 10311, 91102 Jerusalem, Israel.

Institute for the Study of Genocide Newsletter is published twice a year by the ISG, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, Room 622, 899 Tenth Avenue, New York, NY 10019.


Montreal Institute for Genocide Studies (Concordia University, 1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3G 1 MB) has an "occasional papers" series; write for a list.
Human Rights Internet

Human Rights Internet (HRI) is an international communications network and clearinghouse on human rights. Over 2,000 organizations and individuals contribute to the network.

Internet was founded in 1976 on the premise that accurate, timely and comprehensive information is a precondition for effective action in defense of human rights. Internet furthers the promotion and protection of human rights by collecting, analyzing and disseminating information on the status of human rights in all regions. Internet's resources are put at the disposal of human rights organizations, policy-makers, scholars and students, asylum lawyers, journalists, and the general public. Internet actively promotes teaching and research on international human rights, provides technical assistance to non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the area of documentation and information, and offers training internships to NGO staff and students from Canada and elsewhere.

Internet has Consultative Status with the United Nations (ECOSOC and UNICEF) and Observer Status with the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights. Based at the University of Ottawa, in Canada, Internet's documentation centre, computerized databases, and publications are joint projects of Human Rights Internet (HRI), the Human Rights Research and Education Centre (HRREC) of the University of Ottawa, and the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development (ICHRDD) in Montreal.

Internet's publications:

Human Rights Tribune/Tribune des Droits Humains (a quarterly magazine of news and analysis)

HRI Reporter (a semi-annual bibliographic reference that abstracts and indexes thousands of publications for research and advocacy)

Human Rights Education: The Fourth R (a semi-annual newsletter for human rights educators, co-published with Amnesty International USA)


In 1993, Internet will publish a special volume of syllabi for teaching international human rights at the university-level.

For further information on how to obtain Internet's publications, write: Human Rights Internet c/o Human Rights Centre, University of Ottawa, 57 Louis Pasteur, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5, Canada. Tel. (1-613) 564-3492. Fax. (1-613) 564-4054.
This volume brings together international essays on issues related to the teaching of genocide by academics in North America, as well as teaching strategies from various academic disciplines. Teaching about Genocide demonstrates the depth and diversity of approaches to the teaching of this critical subject.