



Department of Sociology

Sociology of Persecution (SOC 678)

Credits: 3

Undergraduate & Graduate course. General education.

Instructor: Ivan Ermakoff
Professor
8101 Social Science Building
email: ermakoff@ssc.wisc.edu

Instructional Mode: all face-to-face

Credit hours: This course meets as a group 150 minutes per week (two 75-minute sessions) and carries the expectation that you will spend an average of 3 hours outside of class for each class period. In other words, in addition to class time, plan to allot an average of 6 hours per week for reading, writing, preparing for discussions, and/or working on the term paper.

Course description

Persecution is an ever-threatening question posed to humanity. This course explores the causes, processes and impacts of group persecution across different historical settings from a multiplicity of theoretical perspectives. We will pay close attention to the perpetrators' motivations, the machinery of persecution policies, the behaviors of state agents, and the range of attitudes and strategies displayed by potential victims.

Prerequisites

Students need to have had an introductory course in sociological theory (for instance Soc 475). The course will be taught at an "advanced undergraduate" level. It will also be appropriate for graduate students who plan to work on the subject.

REQUISITES FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Each student may earn up to 100 points based on:

1. Attendance and quality of participation in class discussion: 20 points possible.

The class format is centered on lectures and on in-class discussions. Regular attendance and participation are required. You must complete the reading(s) listed for each session before the class in which we discuss them. You should not expect to do well in the course without regular attendance and thoughtful participation in class discussion.

This course meets as a group 150 minutes per week (two 75-minute sessions) and carries the expectation that you will spend an average of 3 hours outside of class for each class period. In other words, in addition to class time, plan to allot an average of 6 hours per week for reading, writing, preparing for discussions, and/or studying for quizzes and exams for this class.

Attendance is worth up to 8 points and thoughtful participation up to 12 points. You can earn up to 8 points if you do not miss classes and up to 12 points if in each session you demonstrate a thoughtful reading of the texts by answering the questions I raise in class or by posting relevant questions and comments on the discussion board created for each session.

Each unexcused absence will take 4 points off your attendance and participation grade. I will grade the quality of your participation on the remaining points.

Please communicate with me before class if you become ill or if emergencies arise so that I am aware of your circumstances and I can excuse your absence. If many emergencies arise in the course of the semester, I will ask you to document them.

Discussion is intended to help you get a handle on the readings. Some weeks you will divide into small discussion groups for part of a class.

Except for students with special needs, no laptop or electronic device will be allowed in class. In case of remote courses, I urge you to take handwritten notes. Several studies underscore that students who took notes on laptops performed worse on conceptual questions than students who took notes longhand.

See for instance: Mueller, Pam A. and Daniel M. Oppenheimer. "The Pen Is Mightier Than the Keyboard: Advantages of Longhand Over Laptop Note Taking." *Psychological Science* 25 (6), 2014: 1159-1168.

2. Four response papers (three-page long): 20 points possible.

For each paper, your assignment is to take one (and only one) required reading in the syllabus and write a short essay engaging the central argument(s) of the reading.

The paper is due at the beginning of the class in which we will discuss the reading. I will not accept papers handed in at the end of class.

All the papers should be numbered (from one to four) next to the paper title.

You may not submit more than one paper on the same day. If you submit two papers on the same day, you will lose half of the points earned for the second paper, which means that you should not wait until the last weeks of the semester to hand in your short papers.

NOTE: I recommend that you submit at least two papers before the mid-term exam so that you prepare best for the exam.

Important requirement

In addition to the hard copy handed in at beginning of the class in which we will be discussing the reading, you will have to submit an electronic copy of your paper to the Turnitin web site: www.turnitin.com before class. Turnitin is the anti-plagiarism software used by the Sociology Department.

I will not grade papers that will not have been submitted to Turnitin.

Instructions for submitting the electronic copy

- (1) Go the Turnitin web site: www.turnitin.com.
- (2) Click on the New Users at the top of the homepage. The new user wizard will open and walk you through the profile creation process.
- (3) To create a profile, you must know the **class ID number** and the **enrollment key**. Once you finish creating your profile, you will be logged in to Turnitin.
- (4) Click this name to open your portfolio for this class.
- (5) To submit a paper, click the *submit* button. The paper submission page will open.
- (6) The submission title should be the title of the reading.
- (7) Then click the *browse* button and locate your paper on your computer.
- (8) After having selected your paper, click submit to upload your paper.

For further information, please follow this link for the student quickstart:

https://guides.turnitin.com/01_Manuals_and_Guides/Student_Guides/01_QuickStart_Guide

This quickstart will help you get started with Turnitin and will walk you through the steps for submitting your first paper.

Directions for the short papers

These papers should not exceed 3 double-spaced typewritten pages and should have three parts:

1. The first part is a summary of the argument. This part should synthesize the main arguments. Which problem is being addressed? What are the author(s)'s major theses? Which terms and concepts are central to the argument? How does the argument get supported? This summary should be short and synthetic. Long summaries are not better summaries. I encourage you to limit your summary to one page.

I will assess the quality of your summary in light of two criteria: (1) did you get the main points? and (2) How *precise and accurate* is your summary? It is crucial that you identify and clearly define key concepts. It is also crucial that you summarize the main points *in your own words*. You should not rely on quotes. The purpose of this exercise is to assess whether you clearly understood the concepts and the arguments under review. That is why quotes are not appropriate. Furthermore, your summary needs to be *precise and accurate*. If you say “Valentino views the decision to engage in mass killing as strategic,” and do not specify what is properly strategic about this decision, your summary remains wanting. The same remark applies if you are making basic interpretive mistakes. A good summary is a prerequisite for a good grade since in the remaining of the paper, you will be expected to comment on the reading.

2. The second part of the paper presents the reading’s contribution: How does the author(s)’s argument expand, challenge, or refine previous readings or previous theories? To what extent does this argument contribute to the theoretical and empirical understanding of the issue under consideration?

3. The third part is a critique of the reading: This part should provide a critical evaluation of the reading. What are the strengths and the weaknesses of the argument? What is left ambiguous, underdeveloped or unaddressed in the present reading? Which type of investigation could overcome these limitations?

Both your analysis of the contribution of the reading and your critique of its strengths and weaknesses are your comments proper. I will grade your comments by taking into account their relevance and the extent to which they are precise and well-informed. If you say: “this reading is important” or “Valentino is wrong” but do not elaborate these two assertions in light of specific points or examples, your comments do not fulfill their goal.

The paper should indicate page references whenever it refers to claims and concepts advanced in the required reading.

Each paper will be worth up to 5 points: 2 points for the summary, 2 points for your comments (presentation of the reading’s contribution and critique), and 1 point for clarity.

3. One classroom presentation (10 points possible)

During the semester, you will be required to give one classroom presentation on one required reading.

This presentation will be on one of the required readings assigned for the session. It should *not* be on a reading which you are discussing in a response paper.

In your presentation, you should assume that everyone has carefully read the material. The main purpose of the presentation is *not* to offer a detailed summary of the reading, but to provide an evaluation of the reading, and to launch the discussion.

Structure of the presentation

The presentation should not exceed *10 minutes* and should be organized as follows.

First, summarize in a few introductory sentences the main argument or the main points of the reading. This introduction should not exceed 3 minutes.

Second, outline the claims you are going to make to provide a critique of the reading. This critique can be positive and/or negative.

Third, elaborate one at a time the claims that you have outlined and, as you proceed forward in the course of your presentation, indicate which claim you are elaborating.

Questions for your consideration

To organize your thoughts, you may want to consider the following questions:

What are the strengths and the weaknesses of the argument?

How does the author(s)'s argument expand, challenge, or refine previous readings or previous theories?

To what extent does this argument contribute to the theoretical and empirical understanding of the issue under consideration?

What is left ambiguous, underdeveloped or unaddressed in the reading?

Which type of investigation could overcome these limitations?

After you presentation, I will invite your fellow students to ask questions and make comments. You will then the opportunity to respond.

Breakdown of the grade

I will grade your presentation as follows:

2 points for the summary: is it precise and accurate?

6 points for your critical assessment of the reading: are the claims that you are making regarding the reading, clear, relevant, well-grounded and documented?

2 points for the organization of the presentation: do you clearly lay out the points that you are going to make? Is the presentation clearly organized and easy to follow?

The sign-up sheet for the presentations is available on Canvas: see the "Pages" tab.

4. A mid-term examination: 20 points possible.

This mid-term examination will be in the form of an in-class short answer and essay examination.

5. A final examination: 30 points possible

The actual content of the final exam will be announced in class before the exam.

LEARNING OUTCOMES: UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Beyond the specific substantive and methodological content I will cover in this course, the requirements I have just listed as well as my lectures have been designed to achieve the following instructional objectives designated as priorities by the Department of sociology:

- Critically Evaluate Published Research. Sociology graduates will be able to read and evaluate published research as it appears in academic journals and popular or policy publications.
- Communicate Skillfully: Sociology majors write papers and make oral presentations that build arguments and assess evidence in a clear and effective manner.
- Critical Thinking about Society and Social Processes: Sociology graduates can look beyond the surface of issues to discover the "why" and "how" of social order and structure and consider the underlying social mechanisms that may be creating a situation, identify evidence that may adjudicate between alternate explanations for phenomena, and develop proposed policies or action plans in light of theory and data.
- See Things from a Global Perspective: Sociologists learn about different cultures, groups, and societies across both time and place. They are aware of the diversity of backgrounds and experiences among residents of the United States. They understand the ways events and processes in one country are linked to those in other countries.
- Conduct Research and Analyze Data (quantitative or qualitative). Although professional quality research requires graduate-level training, we expect that all undergraduate majors will be able to conduct small-scale research in which they formulate a research question, collect data, analyze results, and draw conclusions.
- Prepare for Graduate School and the Job Market: Students use their social research skills to identify opportunities for employment or further study, assess their qualifications for these opportunities, and identify strategies for gaining the necessary knowledge and experience to improve their qualifications. Students are encouraged to develop and maintain portfolios of their written work and educational experiences to aid them in preparing applications and to learn how to present their work.

GRADING: UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

The grade will be based on the following breakdown:

Participation in class discussions = 20 points

Four response papers = 20 points

One class room presentation = 10 points

Midterm examination = 20 points

Final examination = 30 points

The final grade will be based on total number of points accumulated during the semester: 100-91 points is an A, 90-86 an AB, 85-81 a B, 80-76 a BC, 75-66 a C, 65-56 a D, below 55 a F.

REQUISITES FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

1. Class participation (20 points)

The class format is lectures and in-class discussions. All graduate students are expected to attend weekly class meetings and to participate actively in discussion throughout the semester.

2. One classroom presentation (10 points)

During the semester, you will be required to give one classroom presentation on a required reading.

The presentation will be on one of the required readings assigned for the session. You should assume that everyone has carefully read the material. The main purpose of the presentation is *not* to offer a detailed summary of the reading, but to offer a critical evaluation of the reading, and to launch the discussion by evaluating the main issues and arguments under examination. Therefore, the “summary part” of your presentation should be concise and very clear.

Your presentation should not last more than *ten* minutes. Please calibrate your time accordingly.

I will expect you to use this presentation as an opportunity to develop and hone your skills as a lecturer. Your presentation should elicit the interest of an undergraduate audience and should motivate students to be active participants in the Q&A session.

I recommend that you announce very clearly the main points you will be elaborating in your introductory remarks.

I will grade the presentation as follows: 2 points for the summary: is it precise and accurate? 6 points for your critical assessment of the reading: are the claims that you are making regarding the reading, clear, relevant, well grounded and documented? 2 points for the organization of the presentation: do you clearly lay out the points that you are going to make? Is the presentation clearly organized and easy to follow?

The sign-up sheet for the presentations is available on Canvas: see the “Pages” tab.

3. Four short memos (each on one required reading) (20 points)

In addition to your presentation, you will need to prepare four short comments (no more than 200 words each) on two required readings. Each comment should highlight a point that seems to you relevant and important about the reading whether this point relates to a problem, a limitation, a flaw, a contribution, an insight, an innovation or a strength of the reading.

The readings that you will present should not be the subject matter of one of these memos.

You will send me your comment as a Word attachment by email with the subject heading “Comment # - name of the author commented” at the latest by noon on the Sunday preceding the session devoted to the reading.

In addition, you will post your comment on the discussion board of Canvas at the latest by noon on the Sunday preceding the session devoted to the reading.

4. Term paper (50 points)

You will be expected to write a term paper on any topic connected to the themes of the course. This can be a research proposal or a paper addressing a clearly defined substantive problem. The length should be in the 15-page range (double-space).

To help you think about, and write, your term paper without having to rush in the last two weeks of the semester, I will ask you:

first to submit a one-page prospectus. This prospectus will outline the subject matter of your paper, the research question you will address as well as the sources and the references on which you plan to draw;

second, to send me a first draft of your paper (no longer than 10 double-space pages).

We will devote one additional meeting (time to be determined) to the discussion of your drafts

The term paper should be a research paper and to involve original research: I expect you to go beyond the readings studied in class.

It will be due on the last day of class.

Breakdown of the grade for the term paper

Clarity of research question and statements	10
Consistency of claims and arguments	10
Paper organization and structure	10
Originality and insightfulness	10
Relevance of the references	10

LEARNING OUTCOMES: GRADUATE STUDENTS

Beyond the specific substantive and methodological content I will cover in this course, the requirements I have just listed as well as my lectures have been designed to achieve the following instructional objectives designated as priorities by the Department of sociology:

- **Critical Thinking about Social Processes and Social Phenomena:** The purpose of this seminar is to learn how to discern and theorize the logics of social processes beyond commonsensical notions and understandings.
- **Critically Evaluate Published Research.** We will read and evaluate published research as it appears in academic journals and popular or policy publications.
- **Communicate Skillfully:** the seminar will be based on lectures, class discussions and oral presentations. Class discussions and oral presentations are intended to help you learn how to organize and deliver a critical evaluation in a clear and effective manner. This skill is crucial in many different occupation settings beyond academia.
- **Conduct Research and Analyze Data:** the term paper should be based on some original research on your part.

GRADING: GRADUATE STUDENTS

The grade will be based on the following breakdown:

Participation in class discussions = 20 points

One classroom presentation on a required reading = 10 points

Four short memos = 20 points

Term paper = 50 points

The final grade will be based on total number of points accumulated during the semester: 100-91 points is an A, 90-86 an AB, 85-81 a B, 80-76 a BC, 75-66 a C, 65-56 a D, below 55 a F.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

As with all courses at the University of Wisconsin, you are expected to follow the University's rules and regulations pertaining to academic honesty and integrity.

According to UWS 14, academic misconduct is defined as:

1. seeks to claim credit for the work or efforts of another without authorization or citation;
2. uses unauthorized materials or fabricated data in any academic exercise;
3. forges or falsifies academic documents or records;
4. intentionally impedes or damages the academic work of others;
5. engages in conduct aimed at making false representation of a student's academic performance;
6. assists other students in any of these acts.

By enrolling in this course, each student assumes the responsibilities of an active participant in UW-Madison's community of scholars in which everyone's academic work and behavior are held to the highest academic integrity standards. Academic misconduct compromises the integrity of the university.

Cheating, fabrication, plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration, and helping others commit these acts are examples of academic misconduct, which can result in disciplinary action. This includes but is not limited to failure on the assignment/course, disciplinary probation, or suspension. Substantial or repeated cases of misconduct will be forwarded to the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards for additional review.

For more information, refer to: <http://www.studentconduct.wiscweb.wisc.edu/academic-integrity/>

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The University of Wisconsin-Madison supports the right of all enrolled students to a full and equal educational opportunity. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Wisconsin State Statute (36.12), and UW-Madison policy (Faculty Document 1071) require that students with disabilities be reasonably accommodated in instruction and campus life.

Providing reasonable accommodation for students with disabilities is a shared faculty and student responsibility. Please inform me of your need for instructional accommodations by the end of the third week of the semester, or as soon as possible after a disability has been incurred or recognized. I will work either directly with you or in coordination with the McBurney Center to identify and provide reasonable instructional accommodations.

Disability information, including instructional accommodations as part of a student's educational record, is confidential and protected under FERPA.” <http://mcburney.wisc.edu/facstaffother/faculty/syllabus.php>

If you wish to request a scheduling accommodation for religious observances, send an email by the end of the third week of the course stating the specific date(s) for which you request accommodation; campus policy requires that religious observances be accommodated if you make a timely request early in the term.

See the university's web page for details: <https://kb.wisc.edu/page.php?id=21698>

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Diversity is a source of strength, creativity, and innovation for UW-Madison. We value the contributions of each person and respect the profound ways their identity, culture, background, experience, status, abilities, and opinion enrich the university community. We commit ourselves to the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, outreach, and diversity as inextricably linked goals.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison fulfills its public mission by creating a welcoming and inclusive community for people from every background – people who as students, faculty, and staff serve Wisconsin and the world.” <https://diversity.wisc.edu/>

READING MATERIAL

The readings for each week are grouped under two categories: required and recommended. All participants should be prepared at class time to comment on, and critique, the required readings. Additional readings are recommended for delving deeper into a topic and preparing for preliminary examinations.

The books indicated below have been ordered at the University Book Store.

These books are also on reserve at the College Library.

Braun, Robert. 2019. *Protectors of Pluralism: Religious Minorities and the Rescue of Jews in the Low Countries during the Holocaust*. Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Browning, Christopher R. 1998 [1991]. *Ordinary Men, Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*. New York: Harper.

Finkel, Evgeny. 2017. *Ordinary Jews: Choice and Survival during the Holocaust*. Princeton, New Jersey; Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Fujii, Lee Ann. 2009. *Killing Neighbors: Webs of Violence in Rwanda*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hinton, Alex Laban. 2005. *Why did they kill? Cambodia in the shadow of genocide*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

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

Mamdani, Mahmood. 2020. *When Victims Become Killers. Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mann, Michael. 2005. *The Dark side of Democracy: explaining ethnic cleansing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milgram, Stanley. 1974. *Obedience to Authority*. New York: Harper.

Petersen, Roger D. 2001. *Resistance and Rebellion. Lessons from Eastern Europe*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Straus, Scott. 2006. *The Order of Genocide. Race, Power and War in Rwanda*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Su, Yang. 2011. *Collective Killings in Rural China during the Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Swaan, Abram de. 2015. *The Killing Compartments: The Mentality of Mass Murder*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Valentino, Benjamin A. 2004. *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the Twentieth Century*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

All the other required readings are available on Canvas.

Introduction

Part I: Frameworks

I recommend that for each class you read the readings in the order listed in the syllabus.

Often, we will pursue the discussion of one reading across two weeks. This will help you memorize readings and the different points we will be making about them. Both the midterm and the final exams will ask specific questions about the readings.

Modernity

Mann, Michael. 2005. *The Dark side of Democracy: explaining ethnic cleansing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 1: pp. 1-26, 30-33; Chapter 2: pp. 34-40.**

Mann, Michael. 2005. *The Dark side of Democracy: explaining ethnic cleansing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 4.**

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1989. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Chapter 1: "Sociology after the Holocaust."

Recommended readings:

Naimark, Norman M. 2001. *Fires of Hatred: Ethnic Cleansing in Twentieth-century Europe*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kuper, Leo. 1981. *Genocide. Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Moore, Robert I. 2007. *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950-1250*. Second edition. Malden, MA: Blackwell. Chapters 1 ("Persecution") and 5 ("A Persecuting society").

Engineering

Moore, Barrington. 2000. *Moral Purity and Persecution in History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. **Preface, chapter 3 (pp. 59-78), Epilogue.**

Weitz, Eric D. 2003. *A Century of Genocide. Utopias of Race and Nation*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press. **Introduction, Chapter 3.**

Mann, Michael. 2005. *The Dark side of Democracy: explaining ethnic cleansing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 11: "Communist Cleansing: Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot."**

Threats and Fears

Larner, Christina. 1984. *Witchcraft and Religion. The Politics of Popular Belief*. New York: Basil Blackwell. **Chapters 2-3.**

Lehmann, Hartmut. 1988. "The Persecution of Witches as Restoration of Order: The Case of Germany, 1590s-1650s." *Central European History*, 21(2): 107-121.

Briggs, Robin. 1996. "Many Reasons Why: Witchcraft and the problem of multiple explanation," pp. 49-63 in *Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe: Studies in Culture and Belief*, edited by Jonathan Barry, Marianne Hester, and Gareth Roberts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mamdani, Mahmood. 2001. *When Victims Become Killers. Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. **Chapter 7: "The Civil War and Genocide."**

Recommended readings:

Trevor-Roper, H. R. 1968. "The European Witch-craze of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," pp. 90-115, 128-147.

Waite, Gary K. 2007. *Eradicating the Devil's Minions: Anabaptists and Witches in Reformation Europe, 1525-1600*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press. Introduction and Chapter 1

Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E. 2008. *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: chapter 7: pp. 252-272.

Uvin, Peter. 1999. "Ethnicity and Power in Burundi and Rwanda: Different Paths to Mass Violence," *Comparative Politics*, 31(3): 253-271.

Domination, Competition

Tolnay, Stewart E., E. M. Beck. 1995. *A Festival of Violence: an Analysis of Southern Lynchings, 1882-1930*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. **Chapter 2, Chapter 3, Chapter 6.**

Jones, Jennifer A. 2022. "'They Are There with Us': Theorizing Racial Status and Intergroup Relations," *American Journal of Sociology*, 128(2): 411-461.

Wilkinson, Steven I. 2004. *Votes and Violence: Electoral Competition and Ethnic Riots in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 1, chapter 5.**

Recommended readings:

Blumer, Herbert. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position," *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 1(1): 3-7.

Olzak, Susan. 1990. "The Political Context of Competition: Lynching and Urban Racial Violence, 1882-1914." *Social Forces* 69:395-421.

Nirenberg, David. 1996. *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. Introduction pp. 1-10, Chapter 1, chapter 4.

Part II: Policies

Identifying, classifying, demonizing

Mamdani, Mahmood. 2020. *When Victims Become Killers. Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton: Princeton university Press. **Chapter 3: "The Racialization of the Hutu/Tutsi Difference under Colonialism."**

Hinton, Alex Laban. 2005. *Why did they kill? Cambodia in the shadow of genocide*. Berkeley: University of California Press. **Chapter 5: "Manufacturing difference"**

Swaan, Abram de. 2015. *The Killing Compartments: The Mentality of Mass Murder*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. **Chapter 6.**

Recommended readings:

Given, James B. 1997. *Inquisition and medieval society: power, discipline, and resistance in Languedoc*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press. Chapter 2: The Technology of Documentation.

7. Contexts and strategies

Valentino, Benjamin A. 2004. *Final Solutions*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. **Introduction, Chapter 1: pp. 9-15, Chapter 3: "The Strategic Logic of Mass Killing."**

Krain, Matthew. 1997. "State-sponsored Mass Murder." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 41(3): 331-360.

Straus, Scott. 2015. *Making and Unmaking Nations: War, Leadership, and Genocide in Modern Africa*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. **Chapter 2.**

Recommended readings:

Melson, Robert. 1992. *Revolution and Genocide: on the Origins of the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Martin, Terry. 1998. "The Origins of Soviet Ethnic Cleansing," *Journal of Modern History*, 70(4).

Midterm

Decisions

Valentino, Benjamin A. 2004. *Final Solutions*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. **Chapter 5: "Ethnic Mass Killings: Turkish Armenia, Nazi Germany, and Rwanda."**

Midlarsky, Manus I. 2005. *The Killing Trap. Genocide in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 5 ("A Theoretical Framework"), Chapter 7 ("Realpolitik and loss").**

Browning, Christopher R. 1992. "Beyond 'Intentionalism' and 'functionalism': The Decision for the Final Solution Reconsidered," pp. 86-124 in *The Path to Genocide: Essays on Launching the Final Solution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Recommended readings:

Friedländer, Saul. 1989. "From Anti-Semitism to Extermination," pp. 3-31 in *Unanswered Questions: Nazi Germany and the Genocide of the Jews*, edited by François Furet. New York: Schocken Books.

Marrus, Michael R. 2000. *The Holocaust in History*. Toronto: Key Porter. Chapter 3.

Katznelson, Ira. 2005. "To Give Counsel and to Consent": Why the King (Edward I) expelled his Jews (in 1290)," pp. 88-126 in *Preferences and Situations*, edited by Ira Katznelson and Barry R. Weingast. New York: Russell Sage.

Part III: Agents

Ordinary

Browning, Christopher R. 1992. *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*. New York. **Chapters 1-4, Afterword.**

Hinton, Alex Laban. 2005. *Why did they kill? Cambodia in the shadow of genocide*. Berkeley: University of California Press. **Chapter 6.**

Milgram, Stanley. 1974. *Obedience to Authority*. New York: Harper. **Chapters 1-4, 5-7, 9.**

Recommended readings:

Hilberg, Raul. 1992. *Perpetrators Victims Bystanders*. New York: Harper. Pp. 20-74 (chapters 2-6), pp. 269-282 (endnotes).

Arendt, Hannah. 1994[1963]. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: a report on the banality of evil*. Revised and enlarged edition. New York, Penguin Books. Chapters 2-5, chapter 8.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1989. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Chapter 6.

Motivations, Compartments

Straus, Scott. 2006. *The Order of Genocide. Race, Power and War in Rwanda*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. **Chapters 4-6.**

Swaan, Abram de. 2015. *The Killing Compartments: The Mentality of Mass Murder*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. Chapter 8

Scripts and emulation

Fujii, Lee Ann. 2009. *Killing Neighbors: Webs of Violence in Rwanda*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. **Introduction, chapter 3, chapters 5-6.**

Su, Yang. 2011. *Collective Killings in Rural China during the Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 1, chapter 5.**

Recommended readings:

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. 1993. *Lynching in the New South: Georgia and Virginia, 1880-1930*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. Chapter 1: pp. 17-48.

Part IV: Facing persecution

Resisting

Einwohner, Rachel L. 2003. "Opportunity, Honor, and Action in the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising of 1943," *American Journal of Sociology*, 109(3): 650-675.

Finkel, Evgeny. 2017. *Ordinary Jews: Choice and Survival during the Holocaust*. Princeton, New Jersey; Oxford: Princeton University Press. **Introduction, chapter 7.**

Petersen, Roger D. 2001. *Resistance and Rebellion. Lessons from Eastern Europe*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 1, chapter 4.**

Recommended readings:

Krall, Hanna. 1986. *Shielding the flame: an intimate conversation with Dr. Marek Edelman, the last surviving leader of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising*; translated by Joanna Stasinska and Lawrence Weschler. New York: Henry Holt.

Maher, Thomas V. 2010. "Threat, Resistance, and Collective Action: The Cases of Sobibór, Treblinka, and Auschwitz," *American Sociological Review*, 75(2): 252-272.

Todorov, Tzvetan. 1996. *Facing the Extreme*. Translated by Arthur Denner and Abigail Pollak. New York: Holt. Pp. 121-140.

Rescuing

Varese, Federico Varese and Meir Yaish. 2000. "The Importance of Being Asked: The Rescue of Jews in Nazi Europe," *Rationality and Society*, 12: 307-334.

Braun, Robert. 2019. *Protectors of Pluralism: Religious Minorities and the Rescue of Jews in the Low Countries during the Holocaust*. Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **Introduction, Chapter 2, Chapters 5-6.**

Recommended readings:

Hilberg, Raul Stanislaw Staron, and Josef Kermisz (eds.). 1979. *The Warsaw diary of Adam Czerniakow: prelude to doom*; translated by Staron and the staff of Yad Vashem. New York: Stein and Day.

Dumitru, Diana and Carter Johnson. 2011. "Constructing Interethnic Conflict and Cooperation: Why Some People Harmed Jews and Others Helped Them during the Holocaust in Romania." *World Politics*, 63(1): 1-42.