GENOCIDE MATTERS

Ongoing issues and emerging perspectives

Edited by Joyce Apsel and Ernesto Verdeja

LONDON AND NEW YORK

CONTENTS

List of contributors vi
Foreword by Helen Fein viii

1 **Introduction: Genocide Matters: ongoing issues and emerging perspectives** **1**
Joyce Apsel and Ernesto Verdeja

2 **Questioning Boundaries: what's old and what's new in comparative genocide theory** **16**
Maureen S. Hiebert

3 **Critical Genocide Studies** **42**
Alexander L. Hinton

4 **Holocaust Studies and Genocide Studies: past, present, and future** **59**
Donald Bloxham

5 **Genocide and the Politics of Rape: historical and psychological perspectives** **82**
Roger W. Smith

6 **Genocide by Attrition: silent and efficient** **106**
Sheri P. Rosenberg and Everita Silina

7 **Research and Teaching about Genocide: history, challenges and new directions** **127**
Joyce Apsel

8 **Humanitarian Military Intervention After the "Responsibility to Protect": obstacles and prospects** **150**
Paul D. Williams

9 **Transitional Justice and Genocide** **172**
Ernesto Verdeja

References 195
Index 211

CONTRIBUTORS

Joyce Apsel is a faculty member in the Liberal Studies Program at New York University and was a recipient of the 2009 NYU Distinguished Teaching Award. She was President of the International Association of Genocide Scholars (2001–03) and is currently President of the Institute for the Study of Genocide. She is Director of RightsWorks International, a human rights and genocide educational initiative. Research interests include comparative genocide, pedagogy, and peace studies. Her works include: "The Complexity of Genocide in Darfur: Historical Perspective and Ongoing Processes of Destruction" (2009); and *Museums for Peace: Past, Present and Future* (2009) co-edited with Ikuro Anzai and Syed Sikander Mehdi.

Donald Bloxham is Professor of History at Edinburgh University. He is author, inter alia, of *The Final Solution: A Genocide* (Oxford University Press, 2009); *The Great Game of Genocide: Imperialism, Nationalism, and the Destruction of the Ottoman Armenians* (Oxford University Press, 2005); *Genocide on Trial: War Crimes Trials and the Formation of Holocaust History and Memory* (Oxford University Press, 2001); and co-editor of the *Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies* (Oxford University Press, 2010) and *Political Violence in Twentieth Century Europe* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Helen Fein is Board Chairperson of the Institute for the Study of Genocide (ISG), former Executive Director of the ISG and Founding President of the International Association of Genocide Scholars. She is the author and editor of eleven books and monographs on genocide, collective violence, antisemitism and collective altruism, including two prize-winning works, *Accounting for Genocide: National Responses and Jewish Victimization During the Holocaust* (1979) and *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective* (1993). She is an Associate of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University and a member of the International Genocide Prevention Advisory Network.

Maureen S. Hiebert is Assistant Professor of Political Science and Law and Society and Fellow at the Centre for Military and Strategic Studies, University of Calgary. She has published works on the role of identity construction and genocidal elite decision-making, comparative genocide theory, and genocide prevention. Hiebert is also a faculty member of the Genocide and Human Rights University Program summer school teaching units on comparative genocide theory and the Cambodian genocide.

Alexander L. Hinton is the Founder and Director of the Center for the Study of Genocide, Conflict Resolution, and Human Rights, and Professor of Anthropology and Global Affairs at Rutgers University, Newark. He is the author of the award-winning *Why Did They Kill? Cambodia in the Shadow of Genocide* (University of California Press, 2005) and six edited or co-edited collections. He is currently working on several other book projects, including a book on the Khmer Rouge Tribunal. He is President of the International Association of Genocide Scholars (2011–13) and a Member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton (2011–12). In recognition of his work on genocide, the American Anthropological Association selected Hinton as the recipient of the 2009 Robert B. Textor and Family Prize for Excellence in Anticipatory Anthropology.

Sheri P. Rosenberg is Assistant Clinical Professor of Law, Director of the Program in Holocaust and Human Rights Studies, and Director of the Human Rights and Genocide Clinic, at the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law at Yeshiva University, New York City. She was selected as one of two US lawyers to work for the Human Rights Chamber, a quasi-international court established under the Dayton Peace Agreement, in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and was a recipient of a Human Rights Fellowship at Columbia University where she worked for the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Policy Branch. She is Executive Director of the Institute for the Study of Genocide.

Everita Silina is Assistant Professor at the New School Graduate Program in International Affairs, with interests in genocide, theories of justice, representation and democracy in post-national contexts, political economy and theories of integration, the European Union and the politics of Europeanization, human rights and international law.

Roger W. Smith is Professor Emeritus of Government at the College of William and Mary in Virginia. He has written and lectured widely on the nature, history, and prevention of genocide, and on the issue of denial. He is a co-founder and past president of the International Association of Genocide Scholars. From 2002 to 2011 he directed the Zoryan Institute's Genocide and Human Rights University Program, a two-week intensive seminar held annually at the University of Toronto. In 2008 Armenia presented him with its highest civilian award, the Movses Khorenatsi Medal, for his contributions to the international recognition of the 1915 Genocide.

Ernesto Verdeja is an Assistant Professor of Political Science and Peace Studies in the Department of Political Science and the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame. He is the author of *Unchopping A Tree: Reconciliation in the Aftermath of Political Violence* (2009) and articles on comparative genocide, transitional justice, theories of political reconciliation and critical theory. Verdeja is on the boards of the Institute for the Study of Genocide and the International Association of Genocide Scholars.

Paul D. Williams is Associate Professor in the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University. He writes on the politics of contemporary peace operations, Africa's international relations, and the responsibility to protect. He serves on the editorial boards of the journals *African Affairs* and *Global Responsibility to Protect*.

Introduction: Genocide Matters

Ongoing issues and emerging perspectives

Joyce Apsel and Ernesto Verdeja

War and atrocity have been subjects of public and scholarly interest from ancient times to the present. However, the use of genocide as a conceptual lens to focus on the targeting of civilian populations for destruction is a modern phenomenon. The term genocide, from the Greek *genos* (race, tribe), and the Latin *caedere* (to kill), was coined by Raphael Lemkin in 1944 in his book *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, which described the laws and policies of occupation that resulted in the domination and annihilation of peoples. Some four decades later, Leo Kuper wrote in one of the first works to use the term in its title: "the term is new but the crime is ancient."[1]

The crime is indeed ancient, even as our understanding of the complexity and dynamics of human destructiveness continues to evolve and as further mass violence takes place before our eyes. This volume aims to deepen how we approach and analyze such destruction. The chapters include re-evaluations of earlier studies, debates and trends, analyses of under-researched subjects such as education, sexual violence, and genocide by attrition, and explorations of the challenges and future directions for studying and thinking about genocide.

THE EVOLUTION OF GENOCIDE AS A FIELD OF STUDY

Scholars began focusing on the mass atrocities inflicted on *civilian populations* as a separate subject of research after the traumas of World War I and World War II. The mass killings, rapes and other atrocities, as well as the presence of millions of refugees and survivors across Europe following World War II, drove scholars to conduct new studies on the origins, causes and methods of wide-scale violence and human suffering. In their broadest terms, these studies sought to explain the overwhelming violence of the recent past, while also uncovering disappeared peoples and neglected histories of violence and investigating the complexity of patterns of extermination across numerous cases.

Genocide emerged as a field of scholarly inquiry as historians, political scientists and other social scientists began analyzing the causes and methods of Nazi violence in the years after World War II, an interest that was reinforced by public fascination with Nazism and fascism. Nevertheless, this was a slow and uneven process: most early research on genocide was devoted solely (or primarily) to the Nazi extermination of Europe's Jews, and few studies sought to place the Holocaust in comparison with other cases of mass violence elsewhere in the world. Indeed, in the years after Germany's defeat scholars and others grappled with how to conceptualize the enormity and specificity of Nazism's crimes, and it was not until the 1970s that the term "Holocaust" came into wide use to describe what political scientist Raul Hilberg had earlier termed "The Destruction of the European Jews." Debates about the use and meaning of the term "Holocaust" have continued, with disagreements over whether to include Roma and Sinti, homosexuals and other targeted groups under its umbrella; the term's applicability to slavery, colonialism and other cases of human destructiveness; and whether the Holocaust was "unique" and what implications this may have for studying other genocides and historic atrocities.[2]

This early scholarship on the Holocaust examined the ways in which antisemitism and expansionist policies targeted disfavored and despised minorities, from persecution to physical destruction. These works included investigating the origins, sequencing, and dynamics of mass violence, as well as the roles of dehumanizing cultural views and ideologies that facilitated extermination.[3] On the one hand, scholarship on the nature and significance of the Holocaust provided areas of research and cross-fertilization that were taken up in subsequent studies of different and comparative cases of genocidal events. In some instances, Holocaust studies served as the model or yardstick for comparisons between one or more cases. For example, studies that showed the similarities between the Armenian genocide and the Holocaust provided an interpretive framework that gave attention to a genocide that had largely been ignored. On the other hand, there was considerable tension between scholars from the 1970s and later who debated the analytical and normative consequences of adopting comparative approaches that often times did not privilege any one case as the defining example of genocide. As this volume makes clear, these debates about studying the Holocaust, or what a number of scholars now refer to as Nazi genocides, have given rise to a complex politics of genocide scholarship that continues today, with debates between some Holocaust scholars and comparativists over the value of comparative scholarship.

From the 1990s on, scholarly perspectives on genocide were transformed as the number of studies of both particular cases and comparative analyses multiplied. Public and academic interest in genocide increased in the face of media coverage during and after the mass atrocities in Rwanda and the Balkans. Scholars and policy analysts, influenced by the growing numbers of non-governmental organizations and expanding scholarship on human rights, began to focus on other cases of atrocity, both historical and contemporary. Path-breaking studies on particular cases such as the Armenian genocide, the Cambodian genocide or other singular events of destruction, which tended to provide historically detailed descriptions of the causes and patterns of mass violence in a particular time and place, were synthesized into broader frameworks in the 1990s, generating a sophisticated literature on comparative theorizing and modeling over the past 20 years. For example, Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn's important survey course and text, *The History and Sociology of Genocide* (1990), helped introduce the new comparative approach to the study of genocide. Within two decades, a number of volumes were published that provide world surveys of genocide. Indeed, scholarship has broadened to investigate targeted destruction and violence and their ongoing impact in a range of contexts and times, from colonial policies of elimination to the "national security" doctrines of Latin America.[4] Today, genocide is receiving greater focus from scholars across the social sciences, and the multidisciplinary field of genocide studies itself is growing rapidly. The institutionalization of genocide studies is reflected in the founding of two comparative studies journals[5] and the establishment of two international scholarly associations and other institutes focused on studying genocide.[6] Additionally, the publication of a series of works and analyses on conceptual clarification, necessary conditions, and the various patterns of genocidal violence points to ongoing intellectual and public interest in the subject.

RECENT DIRECTIONS IN THE STUDY OF GENOCIDE

This focus on genocide over the past 20 years has resulted in important research advances. There are now empirically detailed accounts of the best-known cases, including Armenia, the Holocaust, Cambodia, Rwanda, and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as on mass killings in China and the Soviet Union.[7] Comparative work also continues to mature, with scholars devoting more attention to the role of contingency in the escalation of violence to genocide and developing sophisticated models of the tipping points that explain how sporadic and targeted killings become a widespread and coordinated plan of destruction.[8] Large databases and quantitative studies on political violence, a mainstay of the civil wars literature, have also deepened our understandings of the general conditions that enable genocide and related forms of violence.[9] Historians provide empirically rich and nuanced analyses of macro-historical processes and detail the complex interactions between agency and structure in genocide,[10] while psychologists adapt classic and contemporary social psychology research on obedience and scapegoating to explain acculturation to violence and popular support for genocidal elites.[11] Political scientists and sociologists employ rational choice and prospect theories of elite strategic action,[12]

structuralist analyses of social crises,[13] and theories of state repression, social stratification, instability and radical ideology to analyze the onset and development of genocide.[14] Anthropologists in turn provide sophisticated readings of cultural norms and practices to explain popular receptivity and resistance to genocidal propaganda and outgrouping.[15] They also largely lead the way in looking at post-genocidal societies and cultures, a subject of study that is expanding across disciplines.[16] Legal scholars and practitioners draw on the social sciences to inform the prosecution of mass crimes, while simultaneously participating in definitional and methodological debates about the meaning and study of genocide.[17] Genocide studies today is an expanding and rich area of research.

CONTINUING CHALLENGES AND UNSETTLED QUESTIONS

Genocide studies as a subfield or field of study (and where and how to place it in relation to other research fields remains an ongoing debate) has in a number of respects come into its own. However, as the chapters in this volume highlight, there remains both a series of continuing unsettled issues as well as new critiques and analytical directions to pursue. These include disputes over the definition and parameters of the term "genocide," a consequence of ongoing scholarly dissatisfaction with what are viewed as the limitations and biases of the United Nations definition.[18] A number of chapters in this volume (Alexander Hinton on "critical genocide studies" and Roger Smith on rape) point to the importance of understanding how and why certain cases, patterns, and methods were ignored, and explore ways to rethink genocide and its dynamics. In response, scholars continue to develop various alternative definitions with the aim of giving the concept more coherence and analytical leverage.[19] Some analysts adopt a rather restricted view of what qualifies as genocide, focusing only on instances where extermination was driven by an explicit ideology of national purification and cleansing.[20] Others are less concerned with ideology as a bounding concept, and attempt to explain large-scale atrocity more generally, such as by focusing on the systematic physical destruction of groups, regardless of group identity or perpetrator motivation,[21] while others have generated a complex taxonomy of violence that includes urbicide, politicide, ethnic cleansing, murderous cleansing, and even auto-genocide to explain a variety of phenomena that share family resemblances with one another and with the definition laid out in the UN's 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.[22] Further complicating this historiography is the fact that numerous and significant works, such as Michael Mann's *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing*, keep their distance from associating with genocide as a frame of analysis, but analyze the same case studies and processes. These developments reflect new sensitivity to the multiple ways in which mass violence originates and develops, but it also means few scholars use the same operational definitions. Thus they may select different cases for analysis that cohere to their definitions. Variation in case selection in turn makes it difficult to compare alternative causal theories, since these theories focus on a range of different processes and violent outcomes.

The multiplicity of analytical frames and terms means that there is continued disagreement on the relative strengths and weaknesses of different theoretical frameworks.[23] This raises a series of theoretical and empirical research questions: what are the most fruitful advances and findings in comparative research? What lessons can be drawn from various disciplines and methods? What are the limitations and strengths of pursuing single case and multiple case studies? These questions are important not only for developing sound theory, but also for informing effective strategies for the detection and prevention of genocide – that is, for practical efforts at stopping future genocides.

There is also still very little work that attempts to draw connections between genocide research and research on other forms of political violence.[24] Contemporary comparative literature tends to examine genocidal outcomes across cases, but not how genocide is related to other kinds of violence more generally. This is a fruitful area for further work, and includes investigating connections with the literatures on civil wars,[25] ethnic violence,[26] political repression,[27] "asymmetric" guerrilla warfare,[28] and structural violence.[29] How do these various phenomena connect to one another? For example, under what conditions does civil war become genocidal? How are counterinsurgency warfare and genocide related? Does severe structural violence constitute a form of genocide, and if so how? Are there insights that genocide studies can contribute to the study of other forms of violence, and vice versa?

There is no simple response to the problem of definitional proliferation and its consequences, and it is unlikely that scholars and activists will settle on a single definition. The legal definition of genocide in the UN Genocide Convention undoubtedly will continue to be the standard against which alternative definitions and terminologies are put forth. However, conceptual and theoretical variation may in fact shed light on important similarities and differences across cases that would otherwise be missed by demanding a uniform definition. The key is to be clear about our assumptions in defining and explaining genocide, and encourage reflection on what is "left out" in how we conceptualize genocide for research. Scholars are critically interrogating what Alexander Hinton, in his chapter for this volume, describes as the core "canon" of cases in genocide studies: Armenia, the Holocaust, Cambodia, Rwanda, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. They are asking which groups or cases have been largely ignored in earlier research (such as those of indigenous peoples or Biafra, Burundi, East Pakistan, and Indonesia, to name a few), what explains these omissions, and what the analytical and methodological consequences are of decentering this canon. As the field has become internally more pluralistic and heterogeneous, scholars are including historically ignored victim groups in current studies of already well-known genocides (Assyrians and Greeks in the Ottoman Empire, Hutu in Rwanda, and so forth). This shift in analytical perspectives has occurred in tandem with an expansion of scholarly networks beyond North America and Europe, traditionally the center of research of genocide. The field is rapidly globalizing.

As genocide studies progresses, some researchers are looking from new perspectives at the larger field of Holocaust studies for points of overlap and possible reciprocal enrichment. What are the parameters of Holocaust studies, and which

victims of Nazi destruction are included or excluded and why? What different historiographical schools and interpretations predominate? There continue to be areas of contention between the two fields. Donald Bloxham's chapter in this volume discusses some tensions and differences in interpretations between Holocaust studies and genocide studies, pointing to ongoing resistance by some scholars to comparative analyses, particularly in terms of holding on to the status of the Holocaust as unique and paradigmatic. Another example is recent work arguing that there are similarities between the Nazi war of conquest and earlier colonial genocides in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, leading to debates over the analytical status of differences between the two phenomena. These examples of debates and differences in emphases will likely continue and expand as different pieces of the mosaics of each field are reconfigured, and new research emerges.

Teaching about genocide has also expanded. Some of this takes as its model the pedagogy used in teaching about the Holocaust and hence is often seen as an important way to sensitize youth to the dangers of hatred, discrimination, and dehumanization, particularly at the pre-university levels. Given the "never again" and memorializing nature characteristic of much pre-university Holocaust education, the curricular focus in the United States was on reading memoirs about the destruction of European Jewry,[30] and the Holocaust often was introduced as the model example of dehumanization.[31] The politicization of debates over Holocaust and Holocaust/genocide educational mandates in the United States in the 1980s resulted in pressure to broaden content to include Native Americans as well as genocides carried out against Armenians, Ukrainians, Cambodians and other groups. Following the genocides in Rwanda, the Balkans, and recently in Darfur, with films, journalistic accounts, and celebrity engagement about the human toll of such gross human rights violations, student interest in contemporary cases provided an impetus for reading memoirs and journalists' accounts as well as viewing films that examine a range of genocidal events. While training instructors about teaching the Holocaust is the predominant pattern and has the greatest amount of resources and institutional backing by far (from organizations like the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and Israel's Yad Vashem museum, which focuses on Holocaust education and research), new memoirs and histories on Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Darfur, Cambodia, and Rwanda as well as teacher training courses that educate young people more broadly on issues of civic education (such as those sponsored by Facing History and Ourselves) have expanded the scope of cases and themes taught in the classroom. Most education remains focused on the Holocaust with other cases added on, but scholars are developing new comparative and multi-case textbooks on genocide to educate young people.[32] Nevertheless, there has been little research in genocide studies on examining the challenges in developing and organizing courses and new strategies for classroom teaching,[33] and integrating new research in genocide studies into secondary education and university modules. It is time for researchers to explore the current state of pedagogy on genocide critically. To what extent can studying the causes and methods of dehumanization and genocidal atrocities link with the prospects for promoting tolerance, inclusion, peace, and pro-social behavior? Or is it possible that the moral

education rationale of first Holocaust and now genocide studies education, particularly strong at the pre-university level, needs to be re-examined?

As teachers have moved to bring greater awareness about genocide in the classroom, policy makers and activists have devoted increased attention to preventing and intervening to stop genocide and related mass atrocities. There has been an enormous growth in work on prevention and intervention efforts, which constitute a broad spectrum of policies. The 2001 ICISS report, *The Responsibility to Protect* (R2P), identified a host of nonmilitary and military strategies available to third parties, including development assistance in poor and politically destabilized countries, support for good governance and the rule of law, national and local mediation efforts, and other programs to encourage dialogue between oppositional groups. More intrusively, strategies may include economic sanctions (including withholding military aid), political sanctions, and at the most extreme, armed intervention to stop ongoing mass atrocities. The R2P norm gained further support at the 2005 United Nations World Summit, where world leaders affirmed that states have a responsibility to protect the rights of their citizens, and in 2009 when UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon outlined "three pillars" of international action to promote state responsibility. The R2P norm aims to reframe the traditional tension between sovereignty rights against intervention on the one hand and the obligation to protect universal human rights on the other, so that sovereignty is reinterpreted as requiring the protection of civilian rights. Nevertheless, R2P raises a number of important questions that require further attention: under what conditions are nonmilitary and military interventions justified? What is the role of the United Nations in determining the need for intervention? Under what conditions may regional alliances like NATO or great powers intervene without formal UN support? How can R2P be applied so that "humanitarian intervention" does not become a cover for powerful states pursuing their own interests?

Finally, genocide studies scholars have begun to investigate the various ways to promote justice and reconciliation after large-scale violence, such as through the use of truth commissions, trials, collective memory initiatives, and reparations programs. Nevertheless, genocide studies scholarship has remained curiously detached from advances in the "transitional justice" field, as this area is known. Often, scholars focus on post-genocidal countries, but limit their analysis to a relatively small subset of post-conflict cases and risk missing – or misrepresenting – the complex challenges posed by the use of truth commissions, trials, reparations and similar justice efforts. Greater attention to the full range of these efforts across cases of mass violence can provide more nuanced understandings of the possibilities and limitations of justice and reconciliation.

THIS VOLUME

In sum, there are a number of issues that remain unexplored or unsettled in genocide studies. Indeed, although there is greater awareness of the need to reflect on the field, there are few works that do so. To date the most comprehensive critical re-assessment of the entire field is the *Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies* edited

by Donald Bloxham and Dirk Moses.[34] That important volume includes case studies and thematic essays and is quite broad in scope. Along with essays appearing in genocide and human rights journals, recent works such as René Lemarchand's *Forgotten Genocides*, Donald W. Beachler's *The Genocide Debate: Politicians, Academics, and Victims* and Adam Jones' edited collection *New Directions in Genocide Research* point to re-evaluations of how and what cases are examined, denial and other thematic issues in the field.[35]

This volume complements these works, but also takes a step back and seeks to provide an interdisciplinary, critical examination of where the field is, including its fundamental assumptions and presuppositions. By exploring the epistemological and methodological claims that underpin genocide studies, the book seeks to promote a discussion among scholars of genocide about the current state of research, and advance thinking about the theoretical and practical contributions the field can make to understanding violence and to genocide education and prevention. With this volume, we hope to contribute to identifying research advances, areas for further work, and the challenges the field faces going forward.

The volume focuses on four related, cross-disciplinary themes in genocide studies. These are: the current state of comparative research on genocide; new thinking about the categories and methods of genocidal violence; developments in teaching about genocide; and, critical analyses of military humanitarian interventions and post-violence justice and reconciliation. There are several reasons for focusing on these four themes. For instance, scholars have shown growing interest in questioning the methodological and theoretical assumptions employed in genocide research, but these discussions remain unsettled, and in this volume our contributors explore some of the consequences that follow from the field's most basic presuppositions. There has also been new work exploring forms of violence other than "direct killings" in genocide, but this research is still mostly eclipsed by studies that focus on genocidal killings and massacres. Thus, the deployment of other techniques of violence (such as enslavement, denial of food, and rape) remain relatively underexplored and in need of further analytical elaboration. Pedagogical issues remain mostly ignored in genocide studies, while intervention and post-violence justice and reconstruction are receiving increased attention among genocide scholars, but often in relatively limited, case-specific ways.

None of this is to say that genocide studies is still a small research field. Indeed, the explosion of research on genocide over the past decade means that any assessment of the field must remain partial; there are so many new research questions and publications that no overview can do justice to genocide studies as a whole. Thus, our volume has limited its scope to these four core themes. For instance, the book does not provide new case studies or definitions of genocide, though these issues are discussed in several chapters. Another important area of recent work, on colonialism and genocide, is not engaged in detail but is discussed by Maureen Hiebert in her evaluation of recent advances in causal theorizing, Joyce Apsel in her analysis of historical repositioning and teaching about mass killing, and by Donald Bloxham in his assessment of the methodological and epistemological challenges involved in rethinking the relation between the Holocaust and colonialist extermination. Lastly, we do not systematically investigate the emerging literature on the relation between

genocide and environmental degradation and resource scarcity, which is likely to be an important area for future research. Nevertheless, the four themes explored in this volume are central to current genocide studies research, and provide an important lens by which we can assess advances and challenges in the field.

CORE THEMES AND CHAPTERS IN THE VOLUME

The volume begins by examining the state of contemporary genocide research and providing a series of evaluations of the field. Political scientist Maureen Hiebert gives a critical overview of explanatory theories of genocide across disciplines. In an earlier work, Hiebert categorized theories according to whether they focused on agency, structural or ideational factors, or processes of identity construction. Here she deepens this analytical perspective by investigating the ways in which the current literature privileges different levels of analysis – individual, group, systemic – and what consequences this has for our understandings of the onset and diffusion of genocidal violence. Hiebert provides an extensive investigation of the "boundaries" of the genocide studies literature, and critically assesses how epistemological, definitional, geographical, temporal, and supranational boundaries shape what does and does not qualify as genocide. For Hiebert, while there are some current theoretical contributions that are truly novel, much of the recent scholarship is more of a refinement of older insights rather than completely new ideas. She also contends that much of this recent scholarship is in many ways a return to (or at least engagement with) Raphael Lemkin's foundational conceptualization of genocide. In evaluating the current research, Hiebert notes continued conceptual confusion and methodological underdevelopment that affect both the parameters and types of research genocide scholars undertake. Her chapter calls for greater clarity of research design and underlying theoretical assumptions in future work.

Alexander Hinton's chapter elaborates the elements of a "critical genocide studies." He uses his anthropological lens to interrogate the presuppositions, biases, and continued blind spots of the field. Beginning with uncovering what he describes as the "origin myth" of genocide studies, Hinton explores a series of assumptions and tensions in genocide research, and provides a reinterpretation of Raphael Lemkin as the foundational figure in the field and the continuation of the scholar–activist model rooted in early scholarship. Hinton provides a conceptual reconstruction of the field's origins and cautions that scholars should be wary of the ways in which their research may be co-opted by the interests of powerful political actors. Such concerns are particularly timely, given the continued public debates over the justifications of humanitarian intervention and its relation to state power.

The roots of genocide studies go back to the Holocaust, the first genocide to be studied extensively. As subsequent generations of scholars began investigating and comparing other cases of mass violence, a division grew between Holocaust research and comparative genocide research, one that is still with us today. Historian Donald Bloxham's chapter explores the continued tensions between Holocaust studies and genocide studies as well as the possibilities for greater synergies between the

two fields. Bloxham has been at the center of these debates and highlights several ways in which comparativist scholars (typically found in genocide studies) can learn from historiographical advances in Holocaust research. His chapter begins by problematizing the question of the Holocaust's "uniqueness" (and thus incomparability) and "universality" (as the benchmark of evil). The chapter also looks at cross-cutting relationships and similarities between the Holocaust and other genocides, for instance through the ways in which European colonial genocides abroad were reflected in Nazism's colonial project in Europe. Bloxham uses criticisms of his own work to explore a series of tensions he finds between some Holocaust and genocide scholarship. He investigates the differences between the two fields through a theoretical framework that looks at the degree to which each field balances analytical versus commemorative demands, and how scholarship is positioned between calls for historical contemplation versus proscriptive activism. With such a framing, Bloxham provides valuable critical insights into the divisions and similarities between Holocaust and genocide studies.

The following two chapters focus on new theorizing about the categories and methods of destruction. Here, contributors explore how to expand our analyses of mass violence by moving beyond the conceptual frames that have usually been employed in genocide research. Political scientist Roger Smith's contribution investigates the terrible politics of rape and its relationship to genocide. Smith looks at a series of historical cases and traces the fundamental elements of extreme sexual violence, including rituals of degradation employed by perpetrators, and highlights how rape in genocide is part of a policy process rather than merely "excesses" in the normal course of warfare. This interdisciplinary chapter, including psychological and political science theories, examines the functions of rape and range of victimization for the individual and community that continues after the initial acts of physical violence end. Although rape has been explored in studies of single cases of genocide, Smith's work places rape at the center of comparative research on genocides and helps brings sexual violence to the forefront of analysis.

Legal scholar Sheri Rosenberg and political scientist Everita Silina explore another aspect of genocide, namely the destruction of groups through attrition. The range of methods of human destructiveness has been an area of increasing interest in genocide research, and this chapter examines a number of cases by analyzing how groups are destroyed in whole or part through the calculated removal of food and healthcare and other means needed for human survival. Rosenberg and Silina note that genocide's legal definition and the crime's popular representation in Auschwitz as its paradigmatic example often prevent scholars as well as the public from seeing less direct methods of killing, such as starvation and enslavement, as forms of extermination. Through the examination of a number of cases, Rosenberg and Silina reconstruct the legal definition to include slower but no less intentional processes of annihilation. Given that extreme forms of structural and long-term violence have historically been ignored in genocide research, this chapter marks an important contribution to rethinking the contours of the field.

The next chapter turns to an area that has received surprisingly little attention from genocide scholars: the teaching of genocide and links between pedagogy and research. Even though most researchers are housed in academic institutions and

thus are also teachers, genocide studies has been slow to reflect on the basic goals and challenges of teaching such a morally complex issue in analytically sophisticated and rigorous ways. Historian Joyce Apsel's chapter investigates the ways in which the literature and research trajectories have changed over the past two decades, and the consequences of these changes for teaching. She considers how to frame genocide studies in relation to other thematic areas of teaching, including human rights, humanitarianism, development studies and postcolonialism, and the ways in which the field rests on the categorization of certain cases of violence as genocide. The fact that genocide studies is interdisciplinary and often solely dependent on the interest of a particular faculty member rather than firmly institutionally anchored has implications for undergraduate and graduate teaching. The chapter also explores how different historians of genocide use various comparative models to analyze genocidal events and related themes. From comparative to transnational analysis, the chapter looks as well at the implication of such frameworks both for teaching and new directions in research.

The final two chapters of the volume are dedicated to issues of intervention to stop genocidal violence and post-conflict efforts at securing justice and reconciliation. Political scientist Paul D. Williams investigates the rise of so-called "humanitarian interventions," where external military force is deployed to stop or minimize severe human rights violations such as genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing. Starting with the Responsibility to Protect doctrine endorsed by the United Nations in 2005, Williams identifies five types of obstacles to the theory and practice of intervention, raising serious challenges to the pro-interventionist positions that are at the center of genocide studies prevention activism. His chapter connects the intervention literature to genocide studies by highlighting the complex relations between intervention and the politics of preventing genocide.

Political theorist Ernesto Verdeja follows with a chapter devoted to investigating how insights from the post-conflict literature known as transitional justice can inform genocide studies. Transitional justice is broadly concerned with the strategies, practices, and theories of social repair and transformation for societies dealing with a recent history of authoritarianism, civil war or massive human rights violations, including genocide, and has drawn increased interest from genocide scholars. His chapter critically reconstructs some of the developments and current research advances in the transitional justice field. The chapter is motivated by the concern that much of the best research in transitional justice and genocide studies remains largely unconnected and discrete, with scholarship advances in one area going unnoticed in the other. As genocide scholars continue to focus on post-conflict settings and engage in advocacy for the prevention and punishment of genocide, Verdeja contends that it has become necessary to have a deeper understanding of the transitional justice literature. He maps the transitional justice literature as a way of furthering useful interactions between the two fields.

This volume provides a series of chapters engaged in questions about what the study of genocide entails. It raises important issues for scholars across disciplines and challenges us to rethink how we "see," investigate and explore the complicated issues related to past and present human destructiveness. As scholarly research

continues to expand, these essays will be of particular importance for scholars across disciplines working on genocide and political violence. Given the new developments and work being produced in genocide studies, the field is in need of general analyses of its advances, weaknesses, and areas for further research, and it is our hope that this volume will contribute to this critical work.

ORIGINS OF THE PROJECT

The idea for this volume originated from a series of discussions among board members of the Institute for the Study of Genocide (ISG), a nonprofit non-governmental organization that over the last three decades has been dedicated to educating the public about the crime of genocide and promoting scholarly research on genocide. Founded in 1982, the ISG is one of the earliest organizations in North America to use the lens of genocide to critically analyze past and ongoing cases of systematic mass violence, and has produced a series of conferences, roundtables, publications, and newsletters (see www.instituteforthestudyofgenocide.org). The Institute's board members felt that the field required a systematic evaluation of its current state. A number of scholars were invited to contribute to the project, and the main themes were refined through subsequent conversations and exchanges at an authors' workshop held at the University of Notre Dame in 2011. In addition to the contributors to the volume, we would like to thank Scott Appleby, Christian Davenport, Adam Jones, Helen Fein, and Luc Reydams for their valuable contributions to the project. Joyce Apsel expresses her appreciation for the ongoing support from the New York University Liberal Studies Program and Dean Frederic Schwarzbach. We are grateful to the following entities and offices at the University of Notre Dame for providing the resources that allowed us to host the initial workshop and to bring these chapters together in an edited collection: the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, the Kellogg Institute for International Studies, the Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts, the Office of Research, and the Nanovic Institute for European Studies. We would also like to thank Kathy Smarrella, Cathy Laake, Maria Surat and the staff at the Kroc Institute for making the workshop so rewarding.

NOTES

1 R. Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress*, Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944; L. Kuper, *Genocide: Its Political Uses in the Twentieth Century*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983, p. 1.

2 A. Rosenbaum, *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Comparative Genocide*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1988; Y. Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002; A. D. Moses, "The Holocaust and Genocide," in Dan Stone, ed., *The Historiography of the Holocaust*, New York: Sage, 2004.

3 R. Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, London: W. H. Allen, 1961, 3 vols; L. Dawidowicz, *The War Against The Jews, 1933–1945*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975; L. Poliakov, *Harvest of Hate: The Nazi Program for the Destruction of Jews*

in Europe, New York: History Library, 1956; Y. Bauer, *Holocaust in Historical Perspective*, Seattle: Washington University Press, 1978.

4 D. Feierstein, *El genocidio como práctica social: Entre el nazismo y la experiencia argentina: Hacia un análisis del aniquilamiento como reorganizador de las relaciones sociales*, Buenos Aires, Argentina: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2008; M. Esparza, H. Huttenbach and D. Feierstein, *State Violence and Genocide in Latin America: The Cold War Years*, New York: Routledge, 2011.

5 The *Journal of Genocide Research* and *Genocide Studies and Prevention*. *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* is devoted mostly to the Holocaust, though it does publish on other cases as well.

6 For example, see the *International Association of Genocide Scholars*, the *Institute for the Study of Genocide*, and the *International Network of Genocide Scholars*.

7 T. Akçam, *The Young Turks' Crime Against Humanity: The Armenian Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing in the Ottoman Empire*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012; D. Bloxham, *The Great Game of Genocide: Imperialism, Nationalism and the Destruction of the Ottoman Armenians*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005; H. Travis, *Genocide in the Middle East: The Ottoman Empire, Iraq and Sudan*, Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press, 2010; P. Longerich, *Holocaust: The Nazi Persecution and Murder of the Jews*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010; S. Straus, *The Order of Genocide: Race, Power and War in Rwanda*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006; B. Kiernan, *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007; S. Rosefelde, *Red Holocausts*, New York: Routledge, 2009; F. Dikötter, *Mao's Great Famine: The History of China's Most Devastating Catastrophe, 1958–1962*, London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2010.

8 B. Goldsmith, C. Butcher, D. Semenovich, and A. Sowmya, "Forecasting the Onset of Genocide and Politicide: Annual Out-of-Sample Forecasts on a Global Dataset, 1988–2003." Online. Available HTTP: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2027396 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2027396 (accessed March 20, 2012).

9 UCDP/PRIO (2011) *Uppsala Data Conflict Armed Conflict Dataset v.4–2011: 1946–2010*. Online. Available HTTP: www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/datasets/ ucdp_prio_armed_conflict_dataset/; PITF: Political Instability Task Force (2011) *Internal Wars and Failures of Governance: 1955–2008*. Online. Available HTTP: http://globalpolicy.gmu.edu/pitf/pitfdata.htm; ACLED (2012) *Armed Conflict Location and Event Dataset*. Online. Available HTTP: www.acleddata.com/; MAR: *Minorities at Risk Project* (2010). Online. Available HTTP: www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar/. All accessed March 20, 2012. Also see K. Eck, "In Data We Trust? A Comparison of UCDP GED and ACLED Conflict Events Datasets," *Cooperation and Conflict*, forthcoming.

10 C. Gerlach, *Extremely Violent Societies: Mass Violence in the Twentieth Century World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010; B. Kiernan, *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007; M. Levene, *Genocide in the Age of the Nation State*, London: I. B. Tauris, 2005, 2 vols; M. Marrus, *The Holocaust in History*, New York: Plume Books, 1989.

11 H. Kelman and V. Hamilton, *Crimes of Obedience*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990; R. Lifton, *Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide*, New York: Basic Books, 2000; C. McCauley and D. Chirot, *Why Not Kill Them All? The Logic and Prevention of Mass Political Murder*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.

12 M. Krain, "State Sponsored Mass Murder: The Onset and Severity of Genocides and Politicides," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41/3, 1997, 331–60; B. Valentino, *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the Twentieth Century*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell

University Press, 2004; M. Midlarsky, *The Killing Trap: Genocide in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

13 B. Harff, "No Lessons Learned From the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder Since 1955," *American Political Science Review* 97, 2003, 57–73.

14 M. Mann, *The Darkside of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007; H. Fein, *Accounting for Genocide: National Responses and Jewish Victimization During the Holocaust*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

15 A. Hinton, ed., *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*, Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2002; A. Hinton, *Why Did They Kill? Cambodia in the Shadow of Genocide*, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2005.

16 A. Hinton and K. O'Neill, eds., *Genocide: Truth, Memory and Representation*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

17 J. Hagan, *Justice in the Balkans: Prosecuting War Crimes at the Hague Tribunal*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003; S. Ratner and J. Abrams, *Accountability for Human Rights Atrocities in International Law: Beyond the Nuremberg Legacy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001; W. Schabas, *An Introduction to the International Criminal Court*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

18 F. Chalk and K. Jonassohn, *The History and Sociology of Genocide*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990, pp. 8–12.

19 D. Scheffer, "Genocide and Atrocity Crimes," *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 1/3, 2006, 229–50.

20 J. Sémelin, *Purify and Destroy: The Political Uses of Massacre and Genocide*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2007; E. Weitz, *A Century of Genocide: Utopias of Race and Nation*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.

21 V. Dadrian, *Warrant for Genocide: Key Elements of the Turko–Armenian Conflict*, New Brunswick, NJ and London: Transaction Publishers, 1999; H. Fein, *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective*, London: Sage, 1993; Valentino, *Final Solutions*.

22 M. Shaw, *What Is Genocide?* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

23 A. D. Moses, (2008) "Toward a Theory of Critical Genocide Studies," *Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence*. Online. Available HTTP: www.massviolence.org/Toward-a-Theory-of-Critical-Genocide-Studies (accessed March 20, 2012); S. Straus, "Second Generation Research on Comparative Genocide," *World Politics* 59/3, 2007, 476–501; E. Verdeja, "Genocide: Clarifying Concepts and Causes of Cruelty," *Review of Politics* 72, 2010, 513–26.

24 E. Verdeja, "The Political Science of Genocide: Outlines of an Emerging Research Agenda," *Perspectives on Politics* 10/2, 2012, 307–21.

25 S. Kalyvas, *The Logic of Violence in Civil War*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

26 A. Varshney, *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

27 C. Davenport, "State Repression and Political Order," *Annual Review of Political Science* 10, 2007, 1–23.

28 L. Cederman, A. Wimmer and B. Min, "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel? New Data and Analysis," *World Politics* 62/1, 2010, 87–119.

29 K. Weigert, "Structural Violence," in Lester Kurtz, ed., *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*, Oxford: Elsevier Press, 2008.

30 A. Frank, *Diary of a Young Girl*, New York: Doubleday Books, 1967; E. Wiesel, *Night*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1960; V. Frankl, *Man's Search for Meaning*, New York:

Pocket Books, 1997; P. Levi, *Survival in Auschwitz*, New York: Classic House Books, 2009.

31 S. Totten, P. Bartrop and S. Jacobs, eds., *Teaching About the Holocaust: Essays by College and University Teachers*, New York: Praeger Books, 2004.

32 M. Derdarian, *Vergeen: A Survivor of the Armenian Genocide*, Los Angeles, CA: Atmus Press, 1996; R. Hukanovic, *The Tenth Circle of Hell: A Memoir of Life in the Death Camps of Bosnia*, London: Little, Brown, 1997; J. Apsel, ed., *Darfur: Genocide Before Our Eyes*, 3rd edition, New York: Institute for Study of Genocide, 2007; C. Him, *When Broken Glass Floats: Growing Up Under the Khmer Rouge*, New York: W. W. Norton, 2001; L. Ung, *First They Killed My Father: A Daughter of Cambodia Remembers*, New York: Harper Perennial, 2001; P. Gourevitch, *We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families*, New York: Picador Books, 1999; A. Jones, *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*, 2nd edition, New York: Routledge, 2010.

33 For exceptions, J. Apsel, ed., *Teaching About Human Rights*, Washington, DC: American Sociological Association, 2005; J. Apsel and H. Fein, *Teaching about Genocide: A Guidebook for College and University Teachers: Critical Essays, Syllabi and Assignments*, 3rd edition, Washington, DC: American Sociological Association, 2002.

34 D. Bloxham and A. D. Moses, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

35 R. Lemarchand, ed., *Forgotten Genocides: Oblivion Denial and Memory*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010; A. Jones, *New Directions in Genocide Research*, London: Routledge, 2012. Also see D. Stone, *The Historiography of Genocide*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010; and the special issues of *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 6/3, 2011, and 7/1, 2012, which were devoted to examining the field.