

Teaching Genocide in the Twenty-First Century:

A Comparative-Historical Approach

*Paper prepared for Presentation at the American Political Science Association's
Teaching & Learning Conference,
February 7-9, 2025,*

by

Leah M. Merrill
(lmerrill@exeter.edu)

and

Liza B. Williams
(liza.williams@tufts.edu)

Introduction

How should one approach teaching the concept of genocide when the public sphere is fraught with questions about whether the crime is unfolding in the status quo? To what extent should the content of current events be the basis of instruction around understanding the crime of genocide? Political scientists, historians, and those teaching in the humanities often reflect upon the question of how the present ought to impact the delivery and design of curricular materials to students, especially when content is being encountered for the first time, when ideas are unfamiliar, contested, or open to interpretive disagreement or partisan dissensus. This paper develops the argument that pedagogical instruction should emphasize historical-comparative methods to introduce the concept of genocide to secondary-level students, as well as undergraduates exploring the subject in introductory courses. The value-added of this instructional approach accomplishes the necessity of concept clarification prior to the discussion of current events, situates students to the present in a way that encourages the use of a historical-comparative framework for analysis, and it reinforces the possibility that students consider the causes and consequences of genocide by turning to evidentiary records that have benefitted from ongoing scholarly review and verification.

While global public consciousness has been especially heightened by unfolding events in the international armed conflict between Israel and Palestine, and in the parallel and contemporaneous conflict between Israel and Hamas, this tragedy is not unique in the kinds of questions it poses about whether the violence in question is constitutive of genocide; rather, the twenty-first century is ripe with international conflicts and human security crises which call forth the question of whether or not instances of mass atrocities count as genocide. In 2025, for instance, Human Rights Watch and Genocide Watch have already identified alerts for genocide in: 1) Russia's ongoing execution of its war with Ukraine; 2) in the Jihadist targeting of Christians in Nigeria; 3) in the case of the Chinese Communist Party's persecution of Uyghur Muslims; 4) in Myanmar's, India's and Bangladesh's persecution of the Rohingya; and, 5) in the recent renewal of violence in the Darfur region of Sudan.¹ These alerts for 2025 count as representative instances where official warnings of violence have questioned whether the definitional threshold has been met for crimes instantiating ethnic cleansing, mass killing, systemic human rights violations, or the crime of genocide itself.

Even with the current suspension² in fighting in the ongoing Israel-Hamas war, ignited by the aftermath of the Hamas-led attacks against Israel on October 7th, 2023 and Israel's subsequent retaliation against the Palestinian territories beginning in late October 2023, scholars, human rights activists, and international lawyers continue to raise questions about whether the human rights atrocities and attacks on civilian life in Gaza satisfy the legal and conceptual criteria associated with the crime of genocide. Ongoing prosecution in both the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice have raised global consciousness regarding

¹ Human Rights Watch, "World Report 2025," accessed February 3, 2025, <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2025>; Genocide Watch, "Genocide Alerts," accessed February 5, 2025, <https://www.genocidewatch.com/countries-at-risk>.

² Steven Erlanger, "Fighting Has Halted in Gaza: but, the War is Not Over," *New York Times*, January 20, 2025, <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/01/20/world/europe/gaza-war-fighting-ceasefire-hamas-israel.html>.

whether genocide has occurred in Gaza. For instance, on 17 November 2023, a coalition of states - including South Africa, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Comoros, and Djibouti - referred the situation in the state of Palestine to the International Criminal Court (ICC) for investigation, specifically in reference to the escalation of violence and human rights violations taking place in the Palestinian territories after 7 October 2023.³ By January 2024, additional states had joined the referral of the situation to the ICC Prosecutor, and by the end of November 2024, the ICC Pre-Trial Chamber announced a warrant of arrest for Mohammed Diab Ibrahim Al-Masri [known as Deif] (Commander-in-Chief of the military wing of Hamas) for war crimes on and after October 7th, 2023, including but not limited to: extermination as a crime against humanity, murder, taking hostages, mass rape, sexualized violence, and torture. Additionally, the ICC Pre-Trial Chamber issued warrants for arrest for Prime Minister of Israel Benjamin Netanyahu and Israeli Defense Minister Yoav Gallant for war crimes and crimes against humanity in the Palestinian territories beginning on October 8th, 2023, including forced starvation and attacking civilians, intentionally causing suffering and killing, extermination, and mass murder.⁴ In issuing the warrants against Netanyahu and Gallant, the Chamber rejected claims from Israel under Articles 18 and 19 of the Rome Statute regarding admissibility and jurisdictional authority, and the ICC further clarified that crimes against humanity were committed in both the context of international armed conflict between Israel and Palestine as well as an armed conflict between Israel and Hamas.⁵

³ International Criminal Court, "Situation in the State of Palestine: ICC Pre-Trial Chamber I rejects the State of Israel's challenges to jurisdiction and issues warrants of arrest for Benjamin Netanyahu and Yoav Gallant," accessed February 3, 2025, <https://www.icc-cpi.int/news/situation-state-palestine-icc-pre-trial-chamber-i-rejects-state-israels-challenges>; International Criminal Court, "State of Palestine," accessed February 5, 2025, <https://www.icc-cpi.int/palestine>.

⁴ International Criminal Court, "State of Palestine," accessed February 5, 2025, <https://www.icc-cpi.int/palestine>.

⁵ Situation in the State of Palestine, "Decision on Israel's challenge to the jurisdiction of the Court pursuant to article 19(2) of the Rome Statute," ICC-01/18 (21 November 2024), accessed January 20, 2025, <https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/CourtRecords/0902ebd180a0ebd8.pdf>.

In conjunction with the ongoing prosecution of crimes against humanity in the ICC against the aforementioned individuals, in December 2023, South Africa filed an Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (*South Africa v. Israel*) with the International Court of Justice (ICJ), alleging that Israel had violated the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Genocide Convention, in effect in 1951) in its failure to prevent genocide and its intent to cause destruction to the Palestinian people.⁶ Both the ICC's prosecution as well as the ICJ's decision in *South Africa v. Israel* on January 26, 2024 ordering Israel to take steps to prevent genocide attest to the ways that the contemporary public sphere is fraught with questions about what constitutes mass atrocities and crimes against humanity amounting to genocide. However, the perspective here is that instructors ought to avoid the temptation to design course curricula on the topic of genocide by deferring to the present to provide conceptual models of genocide. More stands to be gained from turning to the design of a course syllabus on modern genocide by looking to the past in order to compare historical cases, which have wide consensus in extant literature about whether or not the definitional and empirical burdens of the crime are sufficiently met.

Teaching Modern Genocide at Phillips Exeter Academy: Past and Present

Modern Genocide (History 558) was first designed and taught at Phillips Exeter Academy, a private secondary boarding school in Exeter, New Hampshire, in Spring, 2013. Initial proposals by the instructor to offer a senior elective on comparative genocide were denied by the then Chair of the History Department due to a cited lack of student interest; in a desirable turn of events, however, the first iteration of the course ran in response to student interest. A subset of seniors who completed and excelled in a fall term elective titled *Europe, 1900-1945*

⁶The United Nations, "Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (*South Africa v. Israel*)," accessed February 1, 2025, <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192>.

proposed a Field Course (History 999) to deepen their understanding of genocide after having studied the Holocaust. *Modern Genocide* ran as a Special Topics course offering the following spring and entered the Courses of Instruction, Phillips Exeter's curriculum, as a standing annual elective for seniors starting in spring, 2015. Growing from the initial group of six senior students in 2013, now the course runs annually up to two, capped sections of 13 students per class, the co-authors being the only previous instructors of record.

Modern Genocide earns one credit toward the six required in the History Department for four-year students and satisfies the one-term requirement for four and three-year students for a course at least 51% focused on non-western history. Classes meet three times a week for 50 minutes and homework for each meeting is estimated at 75 minutes. A trimester schedule, the spring term runs ten or eleven weeks. Anchored in Phillips Exeter Academy's tradition of Harkness pedagogy, classes are student-centered and discussion-based; the instructor facilitates discussion and does not lecture.

The core question driving History 558 is: What does it mean to be human? Studying humans under extreme upheaval, versus comfortable conditions, offers a chance to consider what binds humans across time and place, dissolving superficial differences of identity between humans such as ascriptions of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexuality, and gender. The goal of the course is to create a deeper comprehension of why humans devolve into systemic and intentional murder, identifying factors constant across time and place to suggest why and when genocide happens.

These myriad learning objectives are pursued through the structural framework and sequence of the curriculum, presented in Appendices I and II: by engaging students in selected historical cases where crimes against humanity are present, materials prompt students to

differentiate between qualitative, quantitative, and causal factors undergirding each case; the overarching pedagogical goal is to have students reflect upon past cases of genocide, mass atrocities, mass killing, and ethnic cleansing in order to offer them the conceptual tools and critical thinking skills for a clearer understanding of our current twenty-first century world. The curriculum, presented in the Appendices as two different iterations of the course in 2023 and 2024 provides paradigmatic instances that can frame discourse and evaluation of unfolding events where mass atrocities and human rights violations unfold. Importantly, the History 558 curriculum at Phillips Exeter Academy aims to stimulate creative problem-solving and policy rationales aimed at deterrence and prevention of future conflict around crimes against humanity. The course also spends considerable time framing normative exploration of questions asking about the best paths toward rectifying harms in the aftermath of genocide, galvanizing reconciliation, and achieving reparative justice (at both the communal and individual level of analysis).

Setting the Stage for a Successful Classroom Environment

Teaching comparative genocide over the years offers many lessons. Crucial work involves setting the stage to establish a constructive learning environment. A few takeaways include, that instructors have found useful in preparing students to take on the challenging content raised by genocide, include:

Check your personal views and politics at the classroom door. With such an emotionally charged syllabus, instructors need to be extra careful to resist the temptation of sharing personal views. While any syllabus will inherently offer clues – intentionally or unintentionally – to pedagogical biases and preferences, a comparative focus on genocide necessitates a neutral approach to scholarly analysis of cases, including current events. Questions and comments by the

instructor both on current events and assigned readings suggesting personal opinion inevitably shut down open inquiry and collective, student-led discussion. In asking instructional questions around a seminar table, work to remain as open ended as possible.

From the first day of class, make it clear from the beginning that the nature of the content is disturbing and psychologically difficult to process. While it should seem obvious to any student electing to study genocide for the term, establishing the difficulties and expectations of class discussion early on is essential. While the content can be, at times, overwhelmingly emotional, establish that the course is one of intellectual, not emotional exploration. We tell our students that we do not gather to discuss how tragic events are, to make conclusions between different levels of suffering between victims, or to expound on how instances of mass atrocity and genocide make us feel. Rather, students need to understand that class is a time to investigate how and why events happened and consider what we can learn from them. Since it is impossible to anticipate how different content impacts different students, avoid offering selective “trigger warnings.” Instead, make it clear from the syllabus and/or course description that difficult material and topics are regularly addressed. While the course is an analysis of past events in an effort to draw lessons for the present and future, establish clearly collective expectations for talking about genocide. This is especially crucial when using survivor testimony. Make it as explicit as possible that the material wrestles with the experience of real people who deserve our utmost respect and full attention.

Stick to the syllabus. While instructors often rejoice when learning becomes personal or students make connections to the present, in order to create an equitable and productive learning environment, it is essential to keep discussion to the material shared on the syllabus. Encourage students to form personal connections, but make it clear that they need to keep these personal

connections and anecdotes to themselves, or to develop them in a course journal. During class, the only material up for discussion is what the students are responsible for – anything and everything on the syllabus. Avoid letting students share personal or family stories during class discussion; this can set up the false pretext that some students are experts or can speak for a group. Avoiding family histories and links to current events also helps keep an open and equitable learning environment and diminishes the risk of students appearing to care more than others, or alternatively, being able to establish a claim on owning history.

The Syllabus: Where the Real Work Happens

As all instructors know, much of our job rests in the ability to craft an excellent syllabus. Initially created in 2013, the *Modern Genocide* syllabus is regularly updated and adjusted. Yet the course remains comparative in nature, harnessing the power of case studies to draw both unique and universal lessons from genocide.⁷ Key lessons in approach include:

Establishing Frameworks and the Importance of Definitions. The first unit of the course focuses on establishing the comparative nature of the course; each genocide is dealt with individually, yet students are encouraged and expected to reflect and update their learning as the term progresses. Assignments include readings on basic human needs and how and why they are aggravated. Essential to this first unit is learning the history of the term genocide and wrestling with its definition. Students learn about Polish-Jewish lawyer Raphael Lemkin, his introduction of the word genocide in his 1944 book, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, and his instrumental role

⁷ As previously noted, the 2023 and the 2024 versions of the course syllabi for History 558 are presented in Appendices I and II.

in getting genocide added in international law.⁸ Due in large part to Lemkin's efforts, genocide was first recognized in 1946 by the United Nations General Assembly and codified as an independent crime by the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide on December 9, 1948, entering into force on January 12, 1951.⁹

Students consider the importance and meaning of making genocide a legal crime requiring punishment. They also focus on the importance and meaning of the role of intent in the definition.

Article II states: In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.¹⁰

With the legal definition and context for the term established, students are asked to craft their own working definition of genocide during Unit 1. They are allowed to use (and credit) an existing definition, modify or combine existing definitions, or craft their own. A shared document is created for students to consider their peers' work, and the document serves as a basis for discussion. The role of intent serves as an anchor through the course when analyzing what constitutes genocide. The document remains active, and students are encouraged to edit and update their definition at any time.

The Value of Explicit Case Studies and How to Select Them

⁸ U.S. Holocaust Museum, Coining a Word and Championing a Cause: The Story of Raphael Lemkin," accessed February 6, 2025, <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/coining-a-word-and-championing-a-cause-the-story-of-rafael-lemkin>.

⁹ U.N., Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948), accessed February 6, 2025, https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocities-crimes/Doc.1_Convention%20on%20the%20Prevention%20and%20Punishment%20of%20the%20Crime%20of%20Genocide.pdf. The Convention became enforceable in 1951 under Article XIII.

¹⁰ U.N., Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948) (accessed February 6, 2025, https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocities-crimes/Doc.1_Convention%20on%20the%20Prevention%20and%20Punishment%20of%20the%20Crime%20of%20Genocide.pdf).

Returning to the goal of learning from the past to better understand our present and future, case studies serve as explicit learning opportunities to evaluate what is distinct in each case study and what is universal during genocide. The Holocaust serves as Unit II in the course and the first case study of genocide. The course proceeds with a unit each on Cambodia, Rwanda, and the former Yugoslavia. While contemporary times offer too many other options, there must be a solid rationale for the selection of cases by the instructor. Why did we select the Holocaust, Rwanda, Cambodia, and the former Yugoslavia for this course? And why proceed in this order? The following is a truncated articulation of the reasoning behind these decisions.

The Holocaust is the starting point and natural progression from the study of Lemkin and the creation of the course. For many, the Holocaust serves as the epitome of genocide; it should not be ignored. While Unit I serves as a roadmap for the course through the establishment of framework and definitions, the Holocaust serves as the homebase for comparison through the term. Even with the rise of antisemitism and conspiracy theories, no respectable academic or institution in the U.S. denies the Holocaust or claims it was not a genocide. The amount of documentation and evidence is deep and plentiful, with no end of excellent material to consider.

From the Holocaust, the course moves to a study of Cambodia (1975-1979). This case study offers a valuable opportunity to challenge and (re)assess the definition of genocide. The Khmer Rouge and Pol Pot were responsible for the death of roughly 25% of the Cambodian population. What were their intentions? Did they want to eliminate all Cambodian people? Students consider distinctions made between different minority groups, such as ethnic Chinese, ethnic Vietnamese, and Muslim Cham, but most who died under the Khmer Rouge were ethnically Khmer. How does this square with the U.N. definition of genocide in the Convention (1948)? Students return to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum's definition of the

Holocaust, offered during Unit II, during this unit: “The Holocaust was the systematic, state-sponsored persecution and murder of six million Jews by the Nazi regime and its allies and collaborators.”¹¹ What does this definition mean for non-Jewish victims, including Slavs, Roma-Sinti, the disabled, and dissidents? How do we understand deaths outside of the targeted group intended for destruction? To what extent does the label genocide matter in understanding these events and unnecessary deaths?

Rwanda (1994) is the next unit, offering another challenge to understanding genocide outside the popularized understanding of the Holocaust. Instead of a long-planned progression of extermination from ghettos to death camps harnessing modern technology under the cloak of WWII, approximately one million Rwandans were murdered in just 100 days, often hacked to death by machetes held in the hand of a neighbor. Rwanda raises questions around the process of dehumanization and drivers explaining why people kill. While the Jewish population in Germany was less than one percent in 1933,¹² Hutus and Tutsis lived in close proximity, often intermarrying, prior to the downing of the airplane carrying Rwandan President Juvenal Habyarimana and the start of genocide. Students wrestle with what caused neighbors and families to pivot from going to Church together one day to working until the whistle to massacre subhuman “cockroaches” the very next.¹³

The next unit brings in the complexities of the former Yugoslavia during the Bosnian War of 1992-1995. Highlighting the overlap in time with the Rwandan genocide, the unit includes an opportunity to assess the responsibilities and difficulties of nations in labeling and confronting

¹¹U.S. Holocaust Museum, "Learn about the Holocaust," accessed December 30, 2024, <https://www.ushmm.org/learn/learn-about-the-holocaust>.

¹² U.S. Holocaust Museum, "Germany: Jewish Population in 1933," accessed 12/30/24, <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/germany-jewish-population-in-1933>,

¹³ Jean Hatzfeld, *Machete Season: The Killers in Rwanda Speak* (New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Girox, 2006).

genocide under the UN definition. It also offers another complex challenge by raising the possibility of genocide from multiple sides. Additionally, it questions the distinctions and reasons between terms used and misused: genocide, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity.

The final unit of the term offers an intentional effort to reflect and consider lessons. Readings and individual research offer students the opportunity to pursue efforts of justice, reconciliation, and prevention. While the course is focused on answering the essential question *what it means to be human*, it closes by also offering students time to process what can be learned through a term-long study of genocide and how we proceed.

How to Frame Each Unit: The Importance of Historic Context and Diverse Sources

Each case study begins with a thorough and diverse overview of the historic context leading up to genocide. No respectable study of genocide is complete without background, offering information and arguments on what led to violent disruption. Once the historic groundwork is laid, students can wrestle with what happened during genocide.

What sources are used is as important as which case studies are selected. Across the term in *Modern Genocide*, students read from a variety of perspectives, including historians, victims, and perpetrators. The importance of perspective is reinforced in this process. The lessons learned, perhaps, also differ based on the experience of the author. Part of the diversification of source work includes not only reading from different voices, but also incorporating difference types of materials. Essential to the course is the intentional effort to bring a visual perspective, to create a sense of time and place for students. Each unit offers required exposure to see and hear from the place and people involved, those who acted as perpetrators, bystanders, and victims, or who alternatively did not fit well into any of those classification, or who inhabited multiple rolls throughout the same case.

As in selecting readings, the choice of visuals is also important. One consideration for instructors to weigh is the difference between documentaries and popular film. Overwhelmingly, *Modern Genocide* uses documentaries and photos to bring location and people alive - to humanize them - in a way the printed word can fall short. While students are bombarded with videos and images on their phones, they need training on how to interpret and put into perspective visual sources. We practice analytical reading daily across multiple disciplines, but few students are educated in how to analyze film or photos, so we approach them as sources of education rather than entertainment or as a means of galvanizing classroom participation through shock value. Hearing directly from individuals who organized, participated in, or were victims of genocide helps students identify the humanity and commonality in their own lives with others.

Learning from genocide necessitates the ability to see perpetrators and victims as human, individuals with agency even if their choices were limited in the moment. Much like printed testimony works to individualize experiences beyond large numbers of victims, film can create a deeper connection for students as they work to understand motives, decisions, and consequences. Removing the added complexity of what is accurate or sensationalized by sticking to documentaries helps negate the doubts and questions popular film can raise. Still, some popular film has merit in the classroom setting. If appropriately framed, popular film can be used to discuss the role of film in education and across a broader audience. Both documentaries and popular film offer opportunity to train students to evaluate visual sources, move beyond the emotional impact some visuals are curated to create, and discern the difference between information and propaganda.

The Value of Experiential Learning

The course was created, not surprisingly, based on personal academic interests and the background training of the instructors. In the process of preparing for and updating the course, tremendous knowledge and understanding was gained through travel and interviewing individuals involved in these events. While not available to all, conducting research on location and directly learning from participants offers incalculable insight and offers a distinct advantage for the instructor when teaching about genocide. If possible, creating opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning is also transformative. Time and money constraints make it difficult to visit the site of each case study, but there are museums, traveling exhibits, and speakers willing to talk with students about their experiences. Direct interactions with artifacts and individuals are impactful learning opportunities for students.

Assessment

Like in all courses, instructors of genocide must craft assessments reflecting the values and goals of the course. *Modern Genocide* is taught at a private boarding school embracing discussion-based learning called Harkness. Thus, half the final grade is determined by the quality and helpfulness of a student's regular class participation. The other half is the average of their writing. No tests are given in this course. Rather, in the 2023 iteration of the course students were asked to write a brief 3-page response paper at the end of each case study. These papers forged an opportunity for students to synthesize and polish their intellectual, not emotional, response to the unit. It is intentionally open-ended, inviting students to pursue a line of inquiry or theme they find most compelling. Consequently, some students write on different ideas in each unit while others develop and deepen their thinking on one idea over time, ultimately enhancing the comparative nature of the course.

As one of the co-authors of this paper reflected upon the design of the syllabus for the spring of 2024, given the heightened prominence of *South Africa v. Israel* in the ICJ in combination with the unfolding ICC prosecution as well as the sustained war between Israel and Hamas in the Gaza Strip, which saturated the public sphere with daily reports and images of the human rights atrocities occurring in the Palestinian territories, the instructor modified previous paper assignment expectations. For the 2024 iteration of *Modern Genocide* the instructor required students to write seven, 2-4 page (double-spaced) reflection pieces. By requiring students to write more frequently, the instructor believed this could be an outlet for students to process the content of class discussions and practice developing analytical arguments. The design of requiring more frequent written reflections also intended to have students respond at more regular intervals to course content for the purposes of providing a space for students to respond to current events based upon their consultation of class materials, develop ideas on the page that they felt uncomfortable sharing in the educational space of a small, secondary-level seminar, while also helping to explain the instructor's choice to omit content pertaining to the Israel-Hamas war from integration into the syllabus' schedule of reading assignments.

Exeter students enrolled in History 558 also have time for independent research on a topic of their choosing during the final unit. Popular selections for students include topics around justice and international courts. Other students prefer to dig deeper into a question raised through an earlier response paper with a deeper focus on one of the earlier case studies. Others use the opportunity to explore a genocide not covered in the course. In the 2024, iteration of the syllabus students worked in small groups to perform collective research on the Armenian genocide (1915-16), Darfur (2002-2006, 2019-2013), or Myanmar (2016 - present). All topics are approved by instructor and culminate in both a written paper and presentation to the class.

Like the expectation of crafting, revisiting, and updating their definition of genocide through the term, ending with an independent research project empowers students to pursue individual interests, take ownership for their ideas, and see their potential and implications - even when those implications map on to current events unfolding in the twenty-first century.

Observations Over Time

With over a decade of experience teaching *Modern Genocide*, there is some noteworthy change over time in the student body and their experience. An initial assumption by the instructor that students had a baseline understanding of the Holocaust proves increasingly false. The rise of antisemitism and media coverage of war in the Middle East run concurrently with a startling lack of understanding around how and why the Holocaust happened. While the instructor initially assumed few students would be familiar with details of Cambodia or Rwanda, all case studies require careful groundwork to establish historic context and understanding of events leading up to each genocide, as well as consistent scaffolding to investigate and discuss details during and after the genocide.

Additionally, students are increasingly ill-equipped at handling emotional reactions and focusing upon intellectual inquiry. Discussion is less robust in recent years, while students report consistently positive impact and appreciation for exposure to the material and questions raised in anonymous end-of-term evaluations. Visual material is now assigned for private viewing outside of class so students can process at their own speed; group viewing proves too difficult for many students. There is also a recent rise in misinterpreting or misunderstanding texts. While reading comprehension concerns in our post-Covid classroom are consistent, the risks run particularly high when dealing with genocide. Instructors need to pay careful attention to student comments or writing suggesting misunderstanding and offer opportunity for clarification.

Final Lessons from Teaching Modern Genocide

The Value of a Comparative Case Study Approach. By covering four genocides across the globe over several decades, students learn the particulars of each genocide while being able to boil down what remained consistent and essential in each. Not only does this approach work to draw connection between different people and places, but it also universalizes the stages of one of the greatest problems facing modern civilization. While acknowledging the uniqueness of each genocide, the approach ultimately aims to elevate the commonalities through comparative historical-analysis.

The Importance of Diverse Perspectives and Sources. A strength to the syllabus is the intentional incorporation, in addition to the work of historians, of both perpetrator and victim voices in each case study. Training students to understand and evaluate written and visual material is an intentional goal of the course. Reading, seeing, and hearing from individuals who directly participated in these events is crucial. Demonizing or labeling groups instead of evaluating the actions and choices of individuals leads to othering and lack of understanding. In the effort to understand what makes us human, we need to see the humanity in all. Personal testimony, interviews, and documentaries are excellent ways for students to connect with people in the past to better understand themselves and our world today. Investigating humans under the very worst conditions, such as genocide, helps student internalize what it means to have agency and essentialize the human experience.

Stay Anchored in the Syllabus. While a primary course goal for students is to learn from the past to arm themselves with the skills necessary to evaluate current events and create a better future, this is accomplished by avoiding discussion of the present. While students are allowed to select current events for their independent research, instructors do not select case studies without

an element of distance and finality to them. The early establishment of course expectations and explicit development of key definitions is essential. Returning frequently to the definition of genocide and offering students opportunities to create and update their own definition works to empower students going forward while learning from our darkest moments in the past.

Appendix I (History 558 in 2023)

HI 558: Genocide in the Modern World

Spring 2023

Mrs. Leah Merrill

lmerrill@exeter.edu

Texts (please have a print copy of):

Panh, Rithy. *The Elimination: A Survivor of the Khmer Rouge Confronts His Past and the Commandant of the Killing Fields*. New York: Other Press, 2012.

Hatzfeld, Jean. *Machete Season: The Killers in Rwanda Speak*. New York: Picador, 2003.

Handouts: Located in our Course Reader unless noted otherwise.

General Information: This course examines a reoccurring reality in our world. Over the term we hear from numerous perspectives, including: victims, killers and historians. The material is layered and can be emotionally difficult. We address each genocide individually while also seeking overarching connections and commonalities, asking core questions to see what binds these events. Your careful preparation and consideration of the homework is an explicit responsibility, as is thoughtful and respectful participation. We watch a number of documentaries and films over the term, and you are responsible for securing a legal copy of each item, which is listed in advance on the syllabus. Over the term you will write a series of short papers, generally one after each case study. Students are responsible for being familiar with course guidelines and department policy on plagiarism. I do not accept late papers. I do not grant extensions. Get it in by the time it is due. I don't offer rewrites. The plagiarism policy states that students may not turn in written work or take credit for work that is not their own. Consult the library for proper footnote and bibliography formatting. Your final grade is determined by averaging your written work (50%) and your class participation grade (50%). Please bring print copy of readings to class. Please feel free to be in touch with me at any point if you have questions or want additional feedback on how you are doing in any area of the course.

Syllabus

I. Getting Started - Establishing Questions, Definitions, and a Comparative Framework

1. Introductions. Read this 3/17/22 article from Anne Applebaum in *The Atlantic* before (yes, before) our first class. <https://www.theatlantic.com/books/archive/2022/03/arendt-origins-of-totalitarianism-ukraine/627081/>

If you can print it, please do. Normally, class is a no-tech space; all materials are print copy. If you cannot print this before class, it is ok to have your laptop up for our discussion of this article.

2. Clarifying the Issues: Daniel Goldhagen, *Worse Than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity*; "What is Genocide?" articles (3).

In what way does Goldhagen's piece "clarify the issues"? What is your response to his views on Truman as a mass murderer? Of eliminationism as a concept?

3. *Worse Than War*: Documentary. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vsMe7QvqpaU>
Ervin Staub, *Overcoming Evil*. Class release to complete this large assignment.

4. Human Rights, Woman, What It Means To Be Human: Rittner and Roth, *Chronology, 1937 – 2011* and Rittner's "Are Women Human?" from *Rape: Weapon of War and Genocide*.

What does it mean to be "human"? Are human rights "universal"? What are "women's rights"? What do you make of the question "are women human?"

Email your working definition of genocide to lmerrill@exeter.edu the night before class and bring a copy with you.

II. The Holocaust

5. The Genocide of the Jews: “Introduction to the Holocaust” by USHMM; Ian Kershaw, *To Hell and Back*; Timothy Snyder, *Black Earth*; Eric Lichtblau’s “The Holocaust Just Got More Shocking” from the NYTimes.

What role do ideology, economics, and politics play in the genocide against the Jews?

How do you understand the relationship between the Holocaust and the War?

6. From the Survivors: Charlotte Delbo, “Voices” and Primo Levi, “Shame” from *Art from the Ashes: A Holocaust Anthology*. View Alain Resnais’ *Night and Fog*

<https://vimeo.com/189672641> (*Nuit et Brouillard*) 32 min.

What does it mean to live “next to Auschwitz”? To be enveloped in the skin of memory?

How does the Delbo piece challenge your notion of memory? of experience? What are your reactions to Levi’s exploration of the feelings of shame, or guilt? To what extent are the survivors not the “true witnesses”?

7. *Hannah Arendt*. Film. 2012. 1 hour, 53 minutes. Available on Amazon Prime and other sites. Judith Butler and H.E.A.R.T. articles.

No formal class meeting today. However, I will be available during the format if you want to drop in to discuss the upcoming essay. No need to have much or anything written, happy to just talk out ideas quickly. Otherwise, release time.

8. Essay 1: The Holocaust.

See separate assignment sheet for details. Release time. Essay due by end of format. Submit both a hard copy to the class AND email as a PDF to: lmerrill@exeter.edu by the end of the format.

Mind the deadline; I don’t take late papers.

III. Cambodian Genocide 1975-1979

9. A Kidnapped Nation?: Ben Kiernan in *Century of Genocide*; www.yale.edu/cgp

According to Kiernan, why did this genocide happen? Who were the victims and who were the leaders?

10. *Cambodia’s Curse: The Modern History of a Troubled Land* by Joel Brinkley. Preface-32 and 337- 357.

While reading Brinkley’s account of Cambodia, consider: What does it mean to be a democracy? To what extent “does your heart break” for Cambodia? Do you agree that these are “the most abused people in the world” (xix)?

11. *The Elimination: A Survivor of the Khmer Rouge Confronts His Past and the Commandant of the Killing Fields*. Rithy Panh. 1-55.

As you read Panh’s work, consider: What does it mean to be human? To be evil? How do you view Duch? Panh? What can we learn from this testimony?

12. *The Elimination*. 55-111.

13. *The Elimination*. 111-167.

14. *The Elimination*. 167-221.

15. *Enemies of the People*, Thet Sambath documentary (2009). (Readily available, including Amazon) Release time to watch film. You might also find this archived PBS site helpful (as in, read this): <http://archive.pov.org/enemies/film-description/>

16. *The Elimination*. 222-268.

17. Essay Due – see separate sheet for prompt. Due by end of format. Release time.

IV. The Rwanda Genocide 1994

18. Overview of the Issues: Rene Lemarchand in *Century of Genocide*; Jared Diamond *Collapse*. 4/30 (Daniel pp)

To what extent was the genocide in Rwanda about ethnic hatred? How convincing is Diamond's argument about the role of population pressure?

19. *Machete Season: The Killers in Rwanda Speak*: Jean Hatzfeld. Preface, Chronology, 10-46 and 66-76. 5/2 (Augusta pp)

20. *Machete Season*: 108-113; 140-147; 157-182. 5/4 (Manan pp)

21. *Ghosts of Rwanda*: Documentary (2005). 5/6

<https://www.kanopy.com/en/exeter/video/233509>

Release time to view and process documentary. Start thinking about your upcoming response paper.

22. *Machete Season*: 202-253. 5/9 (Will pp)

23. Essay Due – see prompt. Due by the end of the format. Release time. You know the drill. (5/10)

V. Former Yugoslavia

24. Genocidal Violence in the Former Yugoslavia: Martin Mennecke in *Century of Genocide* and “The Reckoning” from Tony Judt’s book *Postwar*.

What is Judt’s argument? To what extent do you agree with it? Does Mennecke?

25. *No Man’s Land*. Film. (2001. 98 minutes. Set in a trench during the Bosnian war.) Available on Amazon Prime and other locations. Release time for film.

Also, check out this article about the film. But read it after you watch the film:

<https://filmquarterly.org/2006/09/01/no-mans-land/>

26. War, Rape and Hatred in Bosnia: “War Rape” by Christina Morus in *Rape*; “The War on People...” by Salvenka Drakulic and “The Science of Hatred” by Tom Bartlett in the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Selma refers to herself as a “person without an identity.” What could she mean by this?

How does Selma’s story reflect some of the unique ways women are affected by war?

How unique are these stories to Bosnia in comparison to the other places we have studied? We will discuss the film in class, as well.

VI. Lessons and Conclusions

27. Final Project: Decide on your prompt option. See Canvas Files for prompt details.

If you are not selecting Option 1, email me by end of class today to seek approval for your alternative. No class today, but I will be in the classroom if you want to discuss your work. If I do not hear from you by the end of class today you must write on option 1.

28. Release time to work on final.

29. “Easier Said Than Done: The Challenges of Preventing and Responding to Genocide” by Bridget Conley-Zilkic and Samuel Totten in *Century of Genocide*.

In addition to your thoughts on the reading, come to class prepared to discuss the question: What does it mean to be human? How does the material this term shape your answer to this question? What lessons do we take away from our work in History 558? Be prepared to give a brief overview of your final project if you are not writing on prompt 1 (2 minute summary of topic and argument). This is our final discussion.

30. Release time to work on final.

31. Final Paper Due.

Please email as a PDF and paste your work into the body of the email. I don't need a hardcopy. I will return all work electronically for this paper.

Thank you for your interest in and commitment to the study of genocide, and the human condition. May it not end here. I wish you all the best, LMM

Appendix II (History 558 in 2024)

HISTORY 558: GENOCIDE IN THE MODERN WORLD PHILLIPS EXETER ACADEMY SPRING 2024 Academy 129

Liza Williams, Ph.D.
lwilliams@exeter.edu

Office hours:
Tuesday or Thursday, 2:05 – 2:35 pm, or by appointment

Course description: This course studies the history of genocide in the 20th and 21st centuries, exploring both the patterns and unique circumstances of this global issue. Students will read and hear from historians, victims, and perpetrators. We will draw upon case histories from the Holocaust, Cambodia, the Balkans, and Rwanda, with some attention given to the Armenian genocide and the genocide in Darfur. We will explore the root causes of genocide, especially considering how economic, political, and social factors produce this phenomenon. Throughout our term, we will assess international responses to genocide, the Responsibility to Protect norm, as well as efforts at reconciliation, reparation, and justice. The comparative nature of the course creates a framework to draw broad lessons about what leads to genocide in the modern world; enables us to assess the behavior, actions and inaction of various groups involved; and pushes us to consider how these lessons could be applied to prevent such crimes in the future.

Materials:

- Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem* (Available for purchase at PEA bookstore)

Supplementary Texts will be distributed to you as hard copies in class. Films can be accessed via Kanopy, which is accessible to you via the Class of 1945 Library.

Requirements:

Each student has a responsibility to participate in class – to ask and answer questions, offer ideas and opinions, and respectfully respond to classmates' comments. Class participation will be considered for the quality and regularity of your comments, not just the sheer number of comments. Reading attentively and thinking critically about what you read each night is the best preparation for class participation.

My advice: mark up the texts in a way that will help you organize and locate key facts, concepts and generalizations. Write questions and comments that you have about what you've read in the margins. Then, take notes *after* you finish reading. Develop the habit of raising questions of your own about the reading, to enhance your understanding and to offer during class the next day. Look for connections, question the significance of events and decisions, and find specific evidence to support developing themes raised by the course. Unless instructed to bring a computer to class, you will not need any fancy technology. In fact, please do not bring any computers to class unless instructed to do so.

Please arrive on time to class and plan so that you are well rested and can remain attentive for our entire meeting. Also, please be aware that small disruptions can have significant impact on the comfort of others in a seminar setting. Therefore, please minimize distracting behaviors (place cell phones away and off, avoid eating, etc.).

Standards for Evaluation:

Your final grade will be calculated based on the following requirements, described briefly below:

1. Class Participation (30%) – Quality participation does not come in one form, but rather in many forms. You should come to class every meeting having read the assigned material carefully and be ready to engage in discussion about it. Every student has a responsibility to participate in class. Effective participation includes careful listening and thoughtful response to other points of view. Be prepared, as well, to offer questions that you think are raised by the assigned readings. Remember, asking questions of others is an effective way to advance a discussion in a constructive manner.
2. Journal submissions (60%): There are **seven** of these reflection papers due throughout the term. Each submission should be between 2-4 pages in length (double-spaced, standard font and margins). The purpose of these journal submissions is for you to respond constructively to course readings and materials. The focus of your entries should be distinct, engage with several course readings and materials, and be at least partially analytical in its objectives.
 - a. Journal #1 – due via Canvas at the beginning of class on Tuesday, 3/26
 - b. Journal #2 – due via Canvas at the beginning of class on Tuesday, 4/2
 - c. Journal #3 – due via Canvas **at the end of class** on Friday, 4/19 (course release time)
 - d. Journal #4 – due via Canvas at the beginning of class on Tuesday, 4/30
 - e. Journal #5 – due via Canvas at the beginning of class on Tuesday, 5/7
 - f. Journal #6 – due via Canvas at the beginning of class on Thursday, 5/16
 - g. Journal #7 – due via Canvas at the beginning of class on Thursday, 5/23
3. Group research project (10%): You along with several of your classmates will conduct research on historical cases of genocide in Armenia, Darfur or Myanmar. You will present your findings in a brief oral report during our last class meeting. A separate assignment sheet will be distributed to you explaining the expectations of this project.

The following standards should be helpful to you in understanding how your written work and participation will be evaluated. (Note that + and - grades will also be used to fine tune evaluations along with numerical grades.)

A Writing: clear and ambitious thesis, excellent analysis and use of research and course materials; exceptionally thorough proofreading and editing.

Participation: regular, exceptional, insightful contributions reflecting extraordinary preparation and engagement with readings.

B Writing: clear and relevant thesis, good analysis, effective use of research; generally effective proofreading and editing.

Participation: regular and constructive contributions; good preparation and engagement with readings.

C Writing: clear but weak thesis, adequate analysis, adequate use of research and/or class materials; adequate but inconsistent proofreading and editing.

Participation: irregular contributions reflecting adequate preparation and engagements with readings.

D Writing: confused and weak thesis, minimally adequate analysis, minimally adequate use of research; weak and inconsistent proofreading and editing.

Participation: infrequent contributions that reflect minimally adequate preparation or engagement.

E/F Writing: indiscernible thesis, weak or nonexistent analysis, inadequate use of research and class materials; evident lack of proofreading and editing.

Participation: contributions (frequent or not) that reflect inadequate preparation or engagement.

Our Inclusive Learning Space: This course has been designed to ensure that students from diverse backgrounds and perspectives are well supported so that students' learning needs are addressed both in and out of class, and that the diversity that students bring to this class is viewed as a strength, benefit, and resource. Given the immensely challenging nature of the subject of genocidal violence, it is imperative that there be an atmosphere of trust and safety in our classroom. Let's work together to create a learning space in which we actively listen to each other and show respect for all worldviews expressed in our discussions. It is likely that some of the material in this course will evoke strong emotions. When this happens, please be respectful of others' feelings and be mindful of your own. Let's also try to give grace to each other as we take this intellectual journey. Please let me know if something said or done in the classroom, by me or other students, is particularly troubling or causes discomfort or offense. If this occurs, there are several ways to alleviate some of the discomfort or hurt you may experience:

1. Discuss the situation privately with me. I am always open to listening to your experiences, and I want to work with you to find acceptable ways to process and address troubling issues.
2. Discuss the situation with the class. If you are upset by something said or done during class, it is likely that there is at least one other student in the class who had a similar experience. Open and honest discussion, especially when it is about something as challenging as the causes of genocide or responses to it, enhances the ability of all class participants to have a fuller understanding of the ideas we encounter in our readings.
3. Notify me of the issue through another source such as your faculty adviser, a different trusted faculty member, or a peer. If for any reason you do not feel comfortable discussing the issue directly with me, I encourage you to seek out another, more comfortable avenue to address the issue so that you do not feel alone. For example, you can contact the History Department Chair, Dr. Kent McConnell to speak with him about any troubling issues that may arise.

In the interest of being universally inclusive, I ask the following of you:

- To the extent that you are comfortable, please seek me out if you have an issue that influences your learning (you are second language learner, you have a learning disability, psychological disability, etc.). We can work out any necessary arrangements or course modifications. All conversations will be held in strict confidentiality.
- If you desire accommodations regarding religious holidays, please let me know so we can modify the schedule of requirements accordingly.

Absence Policy: You are expected to arrive on time for class. Unexcused absences, lateness, and leaving class for extended periods of time while class is in session will all result in a reduced class participation grade.

History Department's Academic Honesty Statement:

Part of the mission of the History Department is to train students to be critical thinkers in the discipline of history. In doing so, the department expects students to be invested in their education and fully participate in their learning. Regular contributions to Harkness discussions are one measure of this process, but

students are also asked to produce work outside the classroom that constitutes a measurement of this work. The expectation that accompanies these assessments in all their various forms is that students are producing work largely on their own merit, utilizing on-campus resources such as the library staff, Writing Center and peer tutoring when warranted. Because graded assessments are to be representative of a student's understanding and conveyance of scholarly materials, students may consult faculty on campus or family members, but in a limited capacity as critic, not a writer. Students may not purchase papers online, use artificial intelligence to produce written materials, or engage with automated electronic interfaces that generate substantial improvements to a formal assessment. It is worth recalling that plagiarism is the unacknowledged use of another person's ideas or words (or in the case of technology a computer-generated algorithm) and these practices either violate this rule or may misrepresent the level of knowledge and vocabulary acquisition by a student.

LLM and Generative AI: For this class, do not use these forms of artificial intelligence to complete assignments. This means that you should not use it for idea development, source suggestions, organizing themes, constructing an outline, drafting summaries, comparative analysis or drafting sections of written work. It is not permitted.

Late Policy:

If major assignments are submitted after the deadline, they will receive a full letter-grade deduction for each 'day' elapsed. For instance, if an assignment is due at 11 am and it is received at 2 pm on the same day, the paper is one 'day' late. If an assignment is due at 11 am and turned in at 1 am the next day, the paper is two 'days' late. After 4 'days' have elapsed, an assignment will be ineligible for credit. Extensions are only granted in the case of extenuating circumstances, medical emergencies, or upon advice from a dean.

Plagiarism: Students are responsible for adhering to course standards for academic integrity and must familiarize themselves with all course policies prohibiting plagiarism and requiring fluid standards of citation.

Schedule of assignments:

Part I: Conceptualizing Genocide

Tuesday, 3/19: Course introduction: What is genocide?

- U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, "What is Genocide?" (January 2024). Available at: <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/what-is-genocide>
- Gregory H. Stanton, "The 8 Stages of Genocide" (1998). Available at: <https://people.brandeis.edu/~teuber/Stanton,%20Briefing%20Paper,%20%20Eight%20Stages%20of%20Genocide.pdf>
- Recommended film: *Watchers of the Sky* (2014), available for free on Kanopy: <https://www.kanopy.com/en/exeter/video/140765>

Thursday, 3/21:

- Meghna Manaktala, "Defining Genocide," *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice* 24, no. 2 (2012): 179-186.
- United Nations Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect, *The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 75th Anniversary* (December 2023). Available at: https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/publications-and-resources/Genocide_Convention_75thAnniversary_2023.pdf

Friday, 3/22:

- Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Worse Than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity*, pp. xi, pp. 3-32.

Tuesday, 3/26:

- Ervin Staub, *Overcoming Evil: Genocide, Violent Conflict, and Terrorism* (Oxford UP, 2011), pp. 100-129.
- **Journal entry #1 due (please submit on Canvas)**

Thursday, 3/28:

- Carol Rittner and John K. Roth, eds., “Chronology, 1937 – 2011” in *Rape: Weapon of War and Genocide* (Paragon, 2012), Preface.
- Carol Rittner, “Are Women Human?” in *Rape: Weapon of War and Genocide*, ed. Carol Rittner and John K. Roth (Paragon, 2012), Chapter 1.

Part II: The Holocaust

Friday, 3/29:

- Ian Kershaw, *To Hell and Back: Europe, 1914 – 1919* (Viking, 2015), pp. 356 – 377.

Tuesday, 4/2:

- Timothy Snyder, *Black Earth: The Holocaust as History and Warning* (Tim Duggan Books, 2015), pp. 207-212.
- **Journal entry #2 due (please submit on Canvas)**

Thursday, 4/4:

- Lawrence L. Langer, ed., *Art from the Ashes: A Holocaust Anthology* (Oxford UP, 1995), selections.

Friday, 4/5:

- Tadeusz Borowski, *This Way for the Gas, Ladies and Gentleman* (1959), pp. 29-49.
- Eichmann Handouts: Judith Butler, “Hannah Arendt’s Challenge to Adolf Eichmann,” *The Guardian*, August 29, 2011; “The Bureaucrat Killer”

Tuesday, 4/9:

- Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, I-IV.

Thursday, 4/11:

- Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, V-VII.

Friday, 4/12:

- Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, IX, XV.

Tuesday, 4/16:

- Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Epilogue and Postscript.

Thursday, 4/18:

- Course release time to accommodate watching *Hannah Arendt* (2012), a film directed by Margarethe Von Trotta. You can access the film for free through Kanopy, here: <https://www.kanopy.com/en/exeter/video/4694934>

Friday, 4/19: Class does not meet.

- **Journal entry #3 due (please submit on Canvas)**

Part III: The Cambodian Genocide

Tuesday, 4/23:

- Ben Kiernan, “The Cambodian Genocide 1975 – 1979” in *Century of Genocide: Critical Essays and Eyewitness Accounts*, edited by Samuel Totten and William S. Parsons, 341 – 361 (Routledge, 2009), Chapter 11.

Thursday, 4/25:

- Joel Brinkley, *Cambodia’s Curse: The Modern History of a Troubled Land* (Public Affairs, 2011), Preface, Introduction, and Chapter 1.

Friday, 4/26:

- Joel Brinkley, *Cambodia’s Curse: The Modern History of a Troubled Land*, Chapter 17 and Epilogue.

Tuesday, 4/30:

- Hannah Ellis-Petersen, “Khmer Rouge leaders found guilty of genocide in Cambodia’s ‘Nuremberg moment,’” *The Guardian*, November 16, 2018.
- Seth Mydans, “11 Years, \$300 Million and 3 Convictions. Was the Khmer Rouge Tribunal Worth It?” *New York Times*, April 10, 2017.
- **Journal entry #4 due (please submit on Canvas)**

Part IV: The Rwandan Genocide

Thursday, 5/2:

- René Lemarchand, “The 1994 Rwanda Genocide,” in *Century of Genocide: Critical Essays and Eyewitness Accounts*, ed. Samuel Totten and William S. Parsons, 482 – 504 (Routledge, 2009), Chapter 15.

Friday, 5/3:

- Jared Diamond, “Malthus in Africa: Rwanda’s Genocide,” in *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*, 311 – 328 (Viking 2015), Chapter 10.

Tuesday, 5/7:

- Jonathan Glover, “Rwanda,” in *Humanity: A Moral History of the Twentieth Century* (Yale UP, 2012), pp. 119-122.
- Nicholas Kulish, “In Rwanda, Finding Echoes of Germany,” *New York Times*, May 9, 2014.
- Megan Specia, “How a Nation Reconciles after Genocide Killed Nearly a Million People,” *New York Times*, April 25, 2017.
- **Journal entry #5 due (please upload on Canvas)**

Part V: Genocide in the Former Yugoslavia: Bosnia Herzegovina and Kosovo

Thursday, 5/9:

- Tony Judt, “The Reckoning,” in *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945* (Penguin Press, 2005), 665-685.

Friday, 5/10:

- Martin Mennecke, “Genocidal Violence in the Former Yugoslavia: Bosnia Herzegovina and Kosovo,” in *Century of Genocide: Critical Essays and Eyewitness Accounts*, ed. Samuel Totten and William S. Parsons, 507 - 547 (Routledge, 2009), Chapter 16.

Tuesday, 5/14:

- Jonathan Glover, “The Tribal Trap,” in *Humanity: A Moral History of the Twentieth Century* (Yale UP, 2012), pp. 123-132.
- Christina M. Morus, “War Rape and the Global Condition of Womanhood: Learning from the Bosnian War,” in *Rape: Weapon of War and Genocide*, eds. Carol Rittner and John K. Roth, 45-59 (Paragon House, 2012).

Part VI: UN Policies and Politics: Responsibility to Protect (R2P)

Thursday, 5/16:

- Bridget Conley-Zilkic and Samuel Totten, “Easier Said Than Done: The Challenges of Preventing and Responding to Genocide,” in *Century of Genocide: Critical Essays and Eyewitness Accounts*, ed. Samuel Totten and William S. Parsons, 609 – 635 (Routledge, 2009), Chapter 18.
- **Journal entry #6 due (Please upload on Canvas)**

Friday, 5/17: Course release time to accommodate optional field trip to the Auschwitz Exhibition in Boston, MA on Sunday, 5/19.

Sunday, 5/19: “Auschwitz. Not long ago. Not far away.” We will depart Exeter around 9 am for a viewing at 11 am. Please let me know if you’d like to attend.

Tuesday, 5/21:

- Ramesh Thakur, “The Responsibility to Protect at 15,” *International Affairs* 92, no. 2 (2015):415-434.

Thursday, 5/23

- Nicholas Idris Eramah, “Humanitarian Intervention, Syria and the Politics of Human Rights Protection,” *The International Journal of Human Rights* 21, no. 5 (2017): 517-530.
- **Journal entry #7 due (Please upload on Canvas)**

Friday, 5/24:

- Krishnadev Calamur, “The Misunderstood Roots of Burma’s Rohingya Crisis,” *The Atlantic* (25 September 2017).
- Md. Ali Siddiquee, “Portrayal of the Rohingya Genocide,” *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics* 5, no. 2 (2020): 89-103.
- Timothy McLaughlin, “Why the U.S. Finally Called a Genocide in Myanmar a ‘Genocide,’” *The Atlantic* (21 March 2022).

Last Class (5/27): We meet in Room 129. **Student groups will present** upon one of three cases: the Darfur case, the Myanmar case, or the Armenian case. Details of assignment to be distributed at midterm.

