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Consider this text in a loose-leaf or an e-book version, now with LearningCurve and available in LaunchPad.

This brief-by-design narrative is truly global and focuses on significant historical trends, themes, and developments in world history. Author Robert W. Strayer provides a thoughtful and insightful synthesis that helps students see the big picture. Following each chapter's narrative are collections of primary written and visual sources organized around a particular theme, issue, or question so that students can consider the evidence the way historians do.
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Includes Bedford's high quality content all in one place, from the complete narrative e-book to primary documents, maps, images, videos, assignments, activities, and more.

Offers both formative and summative assessment, including short-answer, essay questions, multiple-choice quizzing, and LearningCurve, an adaptive learning program created to get students reading before class.

New from the Bedford Series in History and Culture
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Editor’s Note:

We mark in this issue the twentieth anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda. A special section of this issue of the Bulletin, curated by Dr. Phillip A. Cantrell of Longwood University, is dedicated to examining new approaches to the problem of genocide in World History. The section opens with a careful consideration of the connections between imperialism and genocide and then moves into a discussion of “academic space” and the incorporation of the topic of genocide into the classroom. The section concludes with two annotated syllabi for world history courses that place the history of genocide front and center.

As always, the Bulletin seeks to publish “short-form” essays on all aspects of historical scholarship including pedagogy, research, or theory. Topics may include the prehistoric, ancient, medieval, early modern, modern, and contemporary periods. Articles may include model syllabi or assignments, if applicable. Or, if you would like to guest-edit a selection of essays on a particular theme, please contact me at jpoley@gsu.edu.

With all good wishes,

Jared Poley
From the Executive Director

Dear Friends,

It has been my great pleasure to serve as Executive Director of this wonderful organization. I can absolutely say that the relationships I have formed in the WHA will last a lifetime—something I see repeated with many members as well. Especially gratifying for me is seeing the commitment of so many people towards the common goals of the WHA. I sincerely appreciate the wide-array of support that we receive in the headquarters – from people taking on committee work, task force jobs, Executive Council work, and important moral support.

Since my last letter to you in the Fall, we will have had three more symposia: one in Fremantle, one in Hanoi, and one in Barcelona. We are also deeply involved in planning for our summer conference in Costa Rica, which is on course to be our largest conference since Beijing. If you have not made plans to attend yet, please see how reasonably priced it is to attend and that this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity will be filled with fun, friendship, scholarship, and learning in a magical setting.

In 2015, we will meet for our annual conference in Savannah, with the Hyatt as the conference headquarters, and we will be offering additional symposia which cater to smaller and more focused groups. Please contact me or the Conference Committee Chair with your suggestions on future sites for both conferences and symposia.

WHA has also completely redone its website to be more user-friendly; we hope you will agree. Please send us your comments on not only how we can improve the site to better meet your needs, but make the WHA all it can be.

Thank you again for your membership and continued support of the association.

Sincerely,

Winston Welch
Executive Director
Letter from the President of the World History Association

Craig Benjamin, Grand Valley State University

Dear Colleagues,

It is with a great sense of pride and honor that I take up the position of President of the World History Association for 2014 and 2015. I am conscious of the great world historians who have preceded me in this office and will endeavor to live up to the high standards they have set in advancing the mission of the WHA. I want to begin this welcome message by thanking our dedicated and hard working Secretariat, Winston Welch and Jackie Wah, and also the members the Executive Council, for their tireless work on behalf of the WHA over the past several years. In particular I offer my heartfelt thanks to those EC members whose terms have just ended—former Secretary Kerry Ward, and EC members Merry Wiesner-Hanks, Alan Karras, and Paul Jentz. At the same time I would like to welcome new VP Rhett, and new EC members Grace Chee, Rick Warner, new Secretary Maryanne Rhett, and new EC members Grace Chee, Bram Hubble, Michele Louro, and Denis Gainty. These new members contribute to a formidable team with the drive and energy to carry the WHA forward to continuing success in the years ahead. On behalf of all WHA members, I also offer sincere and heartfelt thanks to immediate past president Marc Jason Gilbert for doing such a sterling job under often challenging circumstances.

The WHA is the only professional association dedicated to advancing the cause of world history globally. It is made up of committed members just like you — professional historians, community college professors, K-12 world history teachers, policy makers, and interested members of the public. In short, it is made up of people from all walks of life who believe absolutely in the value of world history, and the critical role it can play in shaping a more positive future. The WHA has been carrying out its mission splendidly over recent months, hosting successful 2013 symposia in Western Australia and Vietnam. As I write, another symposium is about to begin in Barcelona, Spain, which I am certain will be another tremendous success for our Association. One example of just how deeply international academics, teachers and administrators appreciate the outreach efforts of the WHA is that the Vietnamese Minister of Education personally made time to officially open our conference in Hanoi.

In July this year we will be holding our 23rd Annual Conference at the Marriott Hotel in San Jose, Costa Rica - an extraordinary country with a profound commitment to its environment. We already have a rich program of panels and roundtables organized, including a keynote address that will be delivered by leading environmental world historian and WHA member Professor John R. McNeill of Georgetown University. I very much look forward to personally welcoming you all to Costa Rica where, as well as enjoying the rich intellectual and pedagogical fare on offer, perhaps you might also join my wife Pamela and me on the pre-conference day tours, and particularly on one of the superb post-conference tours that Winston Welch has organized, exploring the rich biodiversity of the country.

On other matters, negotiations from our conferences and symposia, an extraordinary country with a profound commitment to its environment. We already have a rich program of panels and roundtables organized, including a keynote address that will be delivered by leading environmental world historian and WHA member Professor John R. McNeill of Georgetown University. I very much look forward to personally welcoming you all to Costa Rica where, as well as enjoying the rich intellectual and pedagogical fare on offer, perhaps you might also join my wife Pamela and me on the pre-conference day tours, and particularly on one of the superb post-conference tours that Winston Welch has organized, exploring the rich biodiversity of the country.

Along with the financial contributions that will be forthcoming from UH Press, and of course profits from our conferences and symposia, an equally critical pillar of our financial stability is your membership dues, and...
Jerry Bentley Book Prize in World History

The American Historical Association invites donations to endow a Jerry Bentley Book Prize in World History, which will honor Professor Bentley’s tireless efforts to promote the field of world history, and his signal contributions to it, over a career tragically cut short by his recent death.

Over the past twenty years, the field of world history has developed into one of the most vibrant and energetic areas of the discipline—with a growing volume of books and monographs published in the field, and an expanding presence in history departments and doctoral programs. Professor Bentley played an indispensable role in the development of the field. He began his career as a scholar of Renaissance Italy, but quickly became one of the leading figures in the world history movement of recent decades. He was the founding editor of the Journal of World History, and served as its editor from the first issue in 1990 until shortly before his death. He wrote one of the landmark works in the field in 1993, a study of cultural interactions within Eurasia entitled Old World Encounters. Through his work with the World History Association, the College Board Advanced Placement program, and his teaching at the University of Hawaii, he helped to elevate world history into a thriving field of both scholarship and pedagogy.

The Jerry Bentley Book Prize in World History will be awarded to the best book in each calendar year in the field of world history. Any book published in English dealing with global or world-scale history, with connections or comparisons across continents, in any period will be eligible. As with all of the book prizes that the American Historical Association awards, its elected Committee on Committees will choose members of a distinguished review panel to review all books submitted for the prize. Most books will be submitted by their publishers, but anyone can submit a book for consideration. The prize will be awarded at the AHA’s annual meeting in the first week of January, as part of the Association’s awards ceremony.

Donations can be submitted either online http://www.historians.org/donate/ or by check made out to the AHA and mailed to Bentley Prize c/o Robert B. Townsend, Deputy Director, American Historical Association, 400 A St., S.E., Washington, DC 20003. For further information, contact the fundraising co-chairs appointed by the AHA, Alan Karras (karras@berkeley.edu) or Merry Wiesner-Hanks (merrywh@uwm.edu); the prize committee also includes David Christian, Sharon Cohen, Karen Jolly, and Kerry Ward. All contributions are tax deductible.
It is possible to identify a number of shared features in conflicts between hunter-gatherers and market-oriented stock farmers in settler colonies across the globe that served to intensify hostilities and tilt the balance toward genocide. This analysis explores those factors that I consider fundamental to promoting genocidal outcomes in clashes of this kind. While there were many other contributors to exterminatory violence between hunter-gatherers and commercial stock farmers, and each conflict was unique, the primary facilitators identified here were not only common to case studies globally but also instrumental to escalating the violence to genocidal levels.

The nature of commercial stock farming

In the first instance, the nature of commercial stock farming itself was a major contributor to the escalation of bloodshed to genocidal levels. One of the crucial dynamics at play in pastoral settler colonies was the rapid occupation of sweeping expanses of land characteristic of capitalist stock farming especially when entering virgin territory. Unlike colonizing crop farmers who tended to be sedentary, marking out longer term occupancy of land with fences and hedges, and tending to expand incrementally and contingously, commercial stock farmers needed extensive pastures and were inclined to be on the move. Stock-keepers were usually engaged in a constant search for pasture and water, particularly in drier environments. Indeed, dry spells and drought accelerated their dispersal beyond the fringes of colonial settlement. They were generally not bound by the confines of ranches even where they laid formal claim to such holdings. Registered farms on pastoral frontiers were often used as bases from which flocks and herds were moved in transhumant fashion and vast stretches of countryside were treated as communal grazing. Distance from ports and markets was far less of a concern to stock farmers than their crop-growing counterparts as in most cases animals were capable of transporting themselves to desired destinations. This was especially true of animals raised for meat.

Case studies across the temperate colonial world confirm that settler advances were relatively slow and conflict with indigenous localised until colonies turned to large scale pastoral farming. Few colonies were established as pastoral ventures from the start and it was usually growing demand from the metropole or some sector of the global trading network that sparked the shift to commercial stock farming. Increasing demand for their produce encouraged stock keepers to expand their flocks and herds, as well as their official landholdings and to move into new territory beyond the limit of colonial settlement. Economic booms usually set in motion spectacular frontier advances and the rapid stocking of land, especially with cattle and sheep, but also with pigs, goats, horses and other domesticated animals. Not only did stock farmers shift frontiers rapidly and occupy the best land, they also commandeered resources critical to the survival of hunter-gatherer communities. Commercially farmed herds and flocks consumed large amounts of land for grazing and water, and routinely exceeded the land’s carrying capacity. This damaged the ecosystem, often altering it permanently for the worse. Invasion by commercial stock farmers had an immediate, and often devastating, impact on the region’s foraging societies whose seasonal migrations were disrupted, and whose food supplies and other foundations of life were severely compromised. The introduction of large numbers of domesticates undermined indigenous hunting, fishing and gathering activities to the extent that communities might soon be suffering malnutrition or even be facing starvation. Conflict was almost unavoidable as both hunter-gatherers and stock farmers were in direct competition for the same environmental resources, especially land, water and game. Foraging bands suddenly found that they were denied access to sacred locales, traditional hunting grounds and watering places such as springs, pools and river frontages. Livestock contaminated and exhausted water supplies, trampled edible plants, disrupted foraging activities and displaced herds of game, a primary source of food for hunter-gatherer peoples. Importantly, colonists decimated herbivore populations - whether antelope in Africa, bison in North America, kangaroos in Australia or guanaco in Latin America - and other wild animals with their guns, permanently
settler stock for sustenance. \(^5\) The result, almost inevitably, was spiraling levels of violence as afflicted indigenous peoples resisted encroachment, and settlers in turn retaliated, usually with excessive and indiscriminate force. Hunter-gatherer communities typically resisted settler invasion using guerrilla tactics of raiding and maiming stock, slaying herders isolated out in pastures, and attacking farmsteads, usually at night. Stock farmers responded with individual acts of slaughter, informal militia activity, and on occasion, initiated retaliatory offensives in alliance with colonial state forces. Such conflicts often culminated in open warfare and exterminatory onslaughts on the part of colonial society. The weakness of the colonial state and its tenuous control over frontier areas gave settlers, who had access to arms, wide discretion to act against indigenes.

There is another significant way in which the nature of stock farming amplified violence against indigenous peoples. Given the need for extensive landholdings or a transhumant lifestyle to graze animals, stock-keeping settlers were widely dispersed in small numbers across open landscapes. They were thus vulnerable not only to attack but also to severe economic setbacks from indigenous retaliation. This set up an anxiety-ridden existence for stock farming communities, making them prone to over-reaction to threats, as well as to pre-emptive violence against perceived enemies. They were usually suspicious of all indigenes, and fearful of raids, revenge attacks, uprisings, or collusion with indigenous servants. Frontier stock-keepers seldom went about their business unarmed and were constantly alert to the possibility of indigenous aggression. Situations of pervasive anxiety punctuated with sporadic violence are likely to give rise to extreme othering of enemies. And hunter-gatherers were prone to the harshest forms of racial stereotyping because their lifestyle placed them at the polar opposite of European settler societies’ perception of themselves as “civilised” and part of humanity’s highest incarnation. This undoubtedly weakened settler restraints against violence toward, or the killing of foragers, especially where their labour was not deemed essential. It is no surprise that in pastoral settler societies shoot-on-sight vigilantism, informal militia activity, and even state-sponsored eradicatory drives were common. \(^6\)

International capitalist markets

A second dynamic tipping the balance toward exterminatory violence was that access to world markets and a concomitant desire among colonists to accumulate wealth encouraged both intensive exploitation of natural resources for short term gain as well as a resort to annihilatory practices to eliminate obstacles or threats to the colonial project be they vegetation, animals or indigenous peoples. This impulse, although present from the very start of European colonisation, intensified markedly with European industrialisation and the rapid growth of world markets through the nineteenth century. Settler rapacity excited by opportunities for profit during economic booms often proved deadly for indigenous communities. Ensuing busts and retreat of pastoral frontiers seldom resulted in much of a reprieve for hunter-gatherer communities as in many cases the damage had already been done and it was usually a matter of time before abandoned land was re-occupied again.

The privatisation and commodification of natural resources, especially land, a defining characteristic of capitalist economies, undermined foraging societies fundamentally. Systems of land tenure based on exclusive usage, fixed boundaries, registration of title deeds, alienability and permanent settlement were completely foreign to hunter-gatherer world views and effectively excluded them from legal ownership of vital resources. Privatisation generally meant the permanent loss of such resources and that settler claims were backed by the legal apparatus and ultimately, the armed might of the colonial state. Economic and political imperatives invariably resulted in the colonial state supporting settler interests and land confiscations, even in cases where both metropolitan and local governments tried to curb frontier violence and restrain settler aggression.

Their ability to claim legal title to natural resources in many instances gave settlers cause for going on the offensive against indigenous peoples and, no doubt, reason for justifying such violence to themselves. Although different legal regimes applied to different colonies, one is nonetheless able to generalise about the impact of the role of law in the making of mass violence in settler regimes broadly. Significantly, the absence of the rule of law on the frontier favoured settlers who had superior firepower and were generally able to confiscate land and resources as well as perpetrate violence against indigenes with impunity. Much of this violence was committed with the knowledge and connivance of the colonial state. And when the rule of law was eventually implemented with the closing of the frontier, it was heavily biased in favour of settlers, and operated as an instrument for confirming their claims to the land and consolidating their control of it. \(^7\)

The access that frontier communities had to world markets, their metropole and settled parts of colonies also meant access to resources, technologies and ideologies that made mass violence toward indigenes all the easier to perpetrate, and extermination all the more comfortable to contemplate. Ships carrying men and supplies with which to settle and conquer; guns and ammunition with which to kill; horses and wagons with which to transport goods inland; centralised political institutions through which to organise dispossession and mass violence; and a wide array of tools, the sophistication of which indigenous societies could not hope to match, were among the more obvious advantages frontier settler society derived from continued contact with its Western wellsprings. Less tangibly, such contact helped reinforce the ideological underpinnings of violence perpetrated against indigenous peoples. Cultural and religious chauvinism, ideas of European racial superiority and entitlement, as well as jingoistic imperialism, were fortified by continued settler contact with their European and colonial bases, and played important parts in promoting violence toward indigenes.

Racial ideologies

A third common characteristic favouring exterminatory violence was the influence of Western racist thinking that dehumanized the hunter-gatherer way of life as an utterly debased form of existence, comparable in many respects
to that of animals and proof of theirracial inferiority. Foragers were cast as the lowest of the low in the racial hierarchy, with particular groups often the object of speculation that they formed the ‘missing link’ between humans and animals. Hunter-gatherers were generally perceived as not owning their territories but merely residing on them, much as animals do, because they were allegedly not making productive use of it. Though modulated by local imperatives, the generalised image of unused land inhabited by dangerous, godless savages bereft of morality, reason or any form of refinement, and importantly, obstructing the advance of “civilisation” and economic development, usually underlay settler rationales for both land confiscation and accompanying mass violence. Stereotyped as immune to “civilizing” influences and their labour unsuited to settler needs, hunter-gatherer populations were often regarded as expendable.

One of the consequences of racial thinking was that supposed racial traits were generally regarded as inherent and the entire “race” being judged in terms of them. Blanket racial condemnation of the “savage” helped foster indiscriminate as well as exterminatory violence. Commercially-based pastoral settlers across the globe thus had little difficulty justifying the killing of indigenous women and children as well and did so in remarkably similar fashion, claiming that the women bred bandits and that children grew up to become enemies. “Nits make lice” reasoning was an inexorable part of racist discourse.

Racist theorising, especially from the latter part of the nineteenth century when Social Darwinism became popular, often anticipated the dying out of “the savage.” This further encouraged violence against indigenes and fostered an extirpatory attitude within frontier society as their demise was seen as inevitable, the outcome of an inexorable law of nature of the fit supplanting the unfit. Settler killing of indigenes could thus be interpreted in a positive light, of being in step with nature and ridding humanity of an encumbrance. Because forager subsistence needs were irreconcilable with those of the settler economy, colonial society viewed the foraging way of life as one to be eliminated, whether neutralized by means of segregation in reserves, forced acculturation into some subordinate status in the colonial order, or outright extermination. In many cases the forces propelling settler expansion radicalised over time in ways that favoured the most extreme of these options; where commercial stock farming was the mainstay of the colonial economy, they nearly always did.

Although often cast in racial terms and shot through with racist rhetoric, genocidal struggles between hunter-gatherers and commercial stock farmers were not primarily racial in nature. They were essentially about incompatible ways of life vying for the same scarce resources and the right to occupy the land. Racist ideology played an essentially enabling and justificatory role in these conflicts. Racism provided a rationale for disposing indigenes and their dehumanisation made it easier to ignore their suffering, exploit, kill or exterminate them. That economic competition rather than race was at the heart of these conflicts is demonstrated by Edward Cavanagh’s study of the Griqua, a mainly Khoikhoi-speaking people in the northern Cape. After successfully turning from subsistence to commercial pastoralism in the 1810s and 1820s as a result of market opportunities opened up by British occupation of the Cape Colony, the Griqua became as enthusiastic and deadly slaughterers of San as European colonists and effectively cleared the Transorangia region of hunter-gatherer bands.

Superior military technology

A fourth contributor to genocidal outcomes in clashes with hunter-gatherers was the advanced military technologies available to insurgent pastoral settlers, which gave them huge advantages in situations of conflict. Superior technologies of war both aided processes of dispossession and played a role in escalating violence to exterminatory levels. Not only did their big military advantage make mass violence easier to perpetrate, but meant that colonial forces, both formal and informal, could act with relative impunity. This technological gap also helped to confirm settler views that their enemies were racially inferior.

Most obviously, access to firearms gave settlers and their surrogates massive military ascendancy over hunter-gatherer adversaries. Even the relatively primitive front-loading muskets available prior to their replacement by rifles in the latter half of the nineteenth century were far superior to the stone-age weapons used by hunter-gatherers. Muskets had a range far greater than that of forager weapons such as spears, darts, or bows and arrows - at least double the distance of the last-mentioned, which had the furthest reach. This allowed colonists to pick off enemies from a safe distance. Guns fired in volleys were particularly effective when the enemy was massed together. From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, the availability of much more accurate and rapid-firing rifles greatly tilted the balance in favour of colonists. Pistols were used in closer engagements, as were sabres and knives.

Horses not only gave colonial fighters the ability to cover long distances rapidly but also manoeuvrability and advantages of height in close skirmishing. Horses were particularly effective in flat open country with low scrub and were invaluable in situations requiring hot pursuit. The combination of guns and horses amplified the settler military advantage in warfare for, as historian William Kelehe Storey explains, the pairing allowed colonial forces to travel like cavalry and attack like infantry. Small contingents of armed, mounted settler militia were thus able to defeat much larger throngs of indigenous fighters on foot using traditional weapons.

For all these advantages, stock farming communities in many cases nevertheless had difficulty quelling hunter-gatherer resistance. The basic reasons were that frontier areas were vast, pastoral settlers thin on the ground, environments often hostile, and the target populations sparse, mobile, self-reliant and exceedingly well adapted to their surroundings. In general, settlers’ military advantage did not count all that much on the frontier unless their fire-power could be concentrated at strategic times and places. This was vital to allowing relatively small groups of colonists to confiscate land and destroy indigenous populations. Conflict on pastoral frontiers in many instances radicalised to the extent that settler violence became indiscriminate and virtually every indigene a potential
victim irrespective of age or gender. Demographic imbalances

Demographic imbalances played a significant role in the genocidal destruction of indigenous societies in various ways. Most obviously, the sheer weight of numbers and resources that settler colonial projects were able to muster would in time and with continued immigration overwhelm hunter-gatherer societies. The communicable diseases interlopers carried, to which indigenes had low immunity, compounded these inequalities. Disease often wreaked a toll greater than direct killing and sometimes indigenous communities were compromised even before direct contact was made.

A related factor was that on most frontiers severely skewed gender ratios led to excessive sexual violence toward indigenous women. The more remote and undeveloped the frontier, as pastoral frontiers tended to be, the greater the gender disparity was likely to have been. On some pastoral frontiers the ratio between settler men and women was as high as 10:1. What is more, frontier men tended to be a hard, uncompromising and rough lot who behaved in sexually predatory ways toward indigenous women in particular. This, together with racial stereotyping of indigenes as barely human, led to rampant sexual violence toward native women and the spreading of venereal disease. Assault, abduction, rape and sexual slavery were common on many frontiers. Venereal infection was sometimes so widespread it was a major hindrance to the ability of communities to reproduce themselves biologically. Not only were infected women often unable to conceive or bear foetuses to term, but sexually transmitted diseases by themselves sometimes killed large proportions of populations - on occasion surpassing other diseases and direct killing in impact. Sexual violence was thus of central import to the destruction of indigenous societies.

The nature of hunter-gatherer society

Finally, the nature of hunter-gatherer society itself contributed to genocidal outcomes when faced with an aggressive settler pastoral presence. Whereas the hunter-gatherer way of life in some ways was extremely resilient, it in other ways was vulnerable when under sustained attack or when it faced prolonged disruption of economic activity. Hunter-gatherer society was inherently resilient because it consisted of small social groups scattered over large areas, often in inhospitable and remote landscapes. It was, in addition, extremely flexible, mobile, superbly adapted to its environment, and able to live off the land. On the other hand, because hunter-gatherer communities subsisted off the current offerings of nature, were dependent on seasonal cycles of regeneration, and produced virtually no surplus, the severe ecological disruption and despoilment caused by invading commercial stock farmers represented an immediate and acute threat to their foundations of life.

Foraging societies were also vulnerable in other ways when faced with prolonged, systematic violence. Because of its small scale and relative lack of social differentiation, almost any form of organised violence against foraging peoples took on the aspect of total war, and bloodshed on any appreciable scale started assuming genocidal proportions at the level of the band and of socio-linguistic groupings. That there was likely to be a blurring of distinctions between warriors and non-combatants in hunter-gatherer society, and that settler violence was often indiscriminate rather than targeted at fighters or stock raiders, made this doubly so. It was not unusual for entire indigenous communities to be held responsible for the actions of a few or of individuals, and for collective punishments in the form of massacres and random killings to be meted out. The small scale social structure of forager societies also meant that women and children usually found themselves in the frontline of fighting and thus extremely vulnerable to being slaughtered or captured. Being taken prisoner, which in most cases meant serving as forced labourers or being integrated into colonial society as a servile status, was an integral part of the genocidal process because it was as destructive of indigenous society as killing its members. A clearcut pattern in settler mass violence toward hunter-gatherer society was to slay the men, take those women not killed as domestic and sexual drudges, and to value children as sufficiently malleable to be trained for a life of servile labour.

The dispersed format of their social order meant that hunter-gatherer fighters were routinely outnumbered in hostile engagements, even when attacked by relatively small militia or paramilitary units because individual hunting bands seldom had more than eight or ten men of fighting age and often no more than four or five. Forager bands, though they did not have hereditary leaders, were on occasion able to combine fighting forces under the command of temporary war chiefs. They were, however, unable to sustain such initiatives for long as the lack of centralised political structures must have made co-ordination difficult. More to the point, hunter-gatherers did not produce enough of a surplus to maintain anything resembling an army in the field. The low densities of hunter-gatherer societies was an asset for as long as invading settlers lacked the strength or the will to embark on systematic killing campaigns against them. It appears to have become a decided liability when colonists went on concerted, eradicatory drives.

Conclusion

The cumulative effect of the six fundamental factors identified here go a long way toward explaining why, in sustained clashes between foragers and commercial stock-keepers, exterminatory violence was not so much an aberration as normative. The counter-example of San communities in Botswana’s Ghanzi district cautions against making absolute claims in this regard, though. The San communities of the Ghanzi district of western Bechuanaland did not suffer exterminatory violence when colonised in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by Afrikaans-speaking Boer stock farmers from the Cape Colony partly because they were able to exploit different ecological niches to those appropriated by these settlers and partly because they received some protection from the colonial state and missionaries. The region was relatively rich in game and the Ghanzi settlers were not eradicatory in their hunting practices, leaving the San with a major source of sustenance largely intact, in addition to the plant foods they were able to forage in open spaces between widely scattered settler farms. This meant that initial contact was far less conflictual, allowing for a means of rapport to develop between the two groups, for relations
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and promising field of study. But it has not been a study without problems. Attempting to understand how environmental factors affect the prospect of genocide is littered with landmines. One of the most prominent is environmental determinism, “characterized by the various limitations posed by the physical environment such as ways in which human development is altered or hindered by the environment.” In this particular study, environmental determinism is most visible in the Malthusian theory of population: the principle that human populations grow exponentially while food production grows at an arithmetic rate.” In Rwanda, for example, related concepts such as carrying capacity and unsustainable agricultural land practices appear frequently to support or allude to Malthusian ideas. Fortunately, such deterministic models are now fading within the scholarly literature. They are being replaced by literature that can best be described as “environmental agency,” or the influence environment holds over certain events. The primary difference between determinism and agency is that the former dictates the outcome whereas the latter influences it. Combined with other undeniable factors drawn from social, political, economic, and historical circumstances, the environment and its agency is an important concept to understand the origins of these twentieth century atrocities.

The genocides in Namibia and Rwanda differ dramatically in many respects; perhaps the most important factor among these is the period in which they take place. For German South West Africa (today’s Namibia) the genocide that plays out between 1904 and 1908 had all the markings of a colonial atrocity, similar to those in German Tanganyika (1905) and the British Sudan (1898). However, the main difference between these atrocities and the Namibian genocide rests, like Rwanda’s, with the physical evidence of genocidal intentions. Namibia’s extermination order, written and pronounced by German military commander Lothar von Trotha near the end of the war stated:…[T]he Herero people must... leave the land. If the populace does not do this I will force them with the Groot Rohr (cannon). Within the German borders every Herero, with or without a gun, with or without cattle, will be shot. I will no longer accept women and children, I will drive them back to their people or let them be shot at…

What precedents led to this announcement? Scholars of the genocide have locked their gaze on the immediate political precedents triggering the war and its consequential genocide. The narrative usually begins in January 1904 with German South West Africa Governor, Theodor Leutwein, called to quell a rebellion in the south of the country. During the German government’s absence from the capital, the Herero of central Namibia, having suffered repeated injustices under German administration and anticipating a further loss of political and economic power, took the offensive
and attempted to win back control over their territory. Jan-Bart Gewald is the one major detractor in this event as he argues for intentional German miscommunication and aggression in 1904 so that German forces can further marginalize Herero, and gain more control over the country. The thrust of these arguments privilege a political-economic interpretation that is part and parcel of the colonial literature published in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s; in a nutshell, the predictable scenario follows as such: colonizer seizes control of colony, establishes unjust rule, and then the colonized rebel (or are forced to rebel) when they see an opportunity to establish the upper hand. The critique favors the conventional story-telling mode of Africa’s colonial history. In Namibia’s case, it is unnecessarily shortsighted despite a wealth of knowledge that precedes these events.

In Namibia, the rinderpest episode of 1897 plays an important role in understanding the environmental antecedent to Namibia’s genocide. Rinderpest, a virgin soil epizootic, had an immense impact on the pastoral populations throughout the continent, but especially its southern region where the vast majority of societies relied on cattle raising. In Namibia, rinderpest had a particularly devastating impact on Herero society in the country’s central region. Estimates suggest as many as 95 percent of Herero herds were lost to the disease, devastating Herero political, economic and social livelihoods. In the following year, a deadly cocktail of human diseases rode on the coattails of rinderpest. Scarvy, typhoid, malaria, and anthrax killed upwards of 10 percent of the population in places like Otjimbingswe and Omaruru. Drought, locusts, and another bout of rinderpest emerged between 1899-1902, further upsetting the stability of Herero society.

There is no accounting for why, despite a tremendous amount of evidence, scholars have not made the connection between massive environmental changes and the oncoming genocide of 1904. What this study suggests is the start of a more rigorous inquiry and set of connections couched in a specific context of environmental aesthetic and death (discussed below) that Herero populations witnessed between 1897 and 1903 and responded to in 1904. This critique does not necessarily challenge the political interpretations of who started the war and consequently genocide. Rather, intends to add to the existing interpretations of how and why events like this begin. Understanding the roots of the Namibian war and genocide should be refocused to begin at the onset of the 1897 rinderpest episode.

The arrival of rinderpest at this time begins a near continuous series of environmental challenges and disasters leading into the 1904 genocide. There are two major reasons why the origins of this war and genocide should begin in 1897. First, and foremost, the effects of rinderpest, as all scholars of Namibian history accept, changed the social, political, and economic realities of Herero society drastically; it was a blow that German colonial authorities never allowed this society to recover from after 1904. Secondly, this series of environmental catastrophes, coupled with the arrival of German settlers and their alteration of the built environment, led to a profound aesthetic change in Hereroland. It was a change so severe and alienating that Herero felt compelled to act against the colonial power in an attempt to regain control over this region of the country. Germany not only took up the war to suppress this uprising but capitalized on it by ordaining the extermination of Herero for pastoralism could no longer be used for this purpose after rinderpest and so the German government acquired and sold it to its own population. The emerging aesthetic changes in the landscape, punctuated by increased settler homes, fences, and other culturally specific materials used for pastoral purposes, gave cause for grievance among the former Herero landowners of the region.

The period leading up to Namibia’s war and genocide can be further informed by Val Percival and Thomas Homer-Dixon, scholars with interdisciplinary backgrounds in international, conflict, political, and environmental studies. In their essay, “Environmental Scarcity and Violent Conflict: The Case of Rwanda,” they cite four hypotheses linking environmental scarcity, defined as “scarcity of renewable resources,” and violence to the eventual genocide in Rwanda; this, they state, must be determined in the causal mode. The hypotheses include: 1) High levels of grievance; 2) Transition from Authoritarian rule; 3) Manipulation of Ethnic Identity; and 4) Elite insecurity in the Context of the Arusha Accords. This model is methodically and convincingly argued in the case of Rwanda and so too can be in Namibia.

In Rwanda, Percival and Homer-Dixon conclude that while the first three play a role in the increasing tensions that eventually led to genocide, they ultimately had a “limited, aggravating role in the recent conflict.” The authors conclude that violent conflict ultimately came about through hypothesis four, the actions of the elite and armed forces who were unaffected by environmental scarcity. Therefore, despite a vast amount of evidence pointing to environmental scarcity in Rwanda, Percival and Homer-Dixon argue that it plays only a secondary role.

The first three hypotheses connect to and inform the case example of Namibia. The first, “high levels of grievance,” is seen throughout this period. Germans targeted Herero-owned cattle to extract bile and inoculate their own herds during the epizootic. In doing this, the Germans heightened tensions between themselves and their Herero neighbors. German farmers benefited from this inoculation campaign and, in the end, gained increasing control over the livestock economy in the region. The decimation of Herero herds at the hands of the Germans also created opportunities for increased German settlement in Namibia’s central region. Land formerly used by Herero for pastoralism could no longer be used for this purpose after rinderpest and so the German government acquired and sold it to its own population. The emerging aesthetic changes in the landscape, punctuated by increased settler homes, fences, and other culturally specific materials used for pastoral purposes, gave cause for grievance among the former Herero landowners of the region.

The second hypothesis, “transition from authoritarian rule,” must be retrofitted to address the case of Namibia. In the end, however, it appears to be a legitimate cause emanating from environmental scarcity. Throughout much of the early colonial period, the Germans and Herero operated as independent national entities in Namibia. The Herero nation, like Germany, enjoyed a powerful position in the region. The population shaped their own political,
social, and economic policies in the decades prior to German colonization. On the eve of rinderpest’s outbreak, both Germany and Herero continued to function independently, despite some minor changes within the Herero political leadership structure and the Germans recent defeat of a marginal Herero faction in the east of the country. Between 1897 and 1903, the series of environmental calamities (rinderpest, human disease, droughts, locusts, etc.) exacted a dramatic change on the status of rule in Namibia. Germany clearly gained the advantage during this period by taking advantage of Herero misfortunes. And, although there remained a formal and mutual recognition of recognition of each other’s independent status through the eve of war, the writing was on the wall. Germany was poised to overpower their Herero counterparts. The only remaining question was how.

“Manipulation of ethnic identity” hypothesis number three, relates well to Namibia’s case. In Percival and Homer-Dixon’s analysis, the two competing ethnic groups, Hutu and Tutsi, exhibited all the attributes needed for “severe ethnic conflict” including: “[1] institutionalized group boundaries and stereotypes, [2] an experience of ethnic domination by one or more groups, the strong perception by one group that the opposing ethnic group has external affiliations, and [3] ethnically based parties with no significant interethnic coalitions.” In colonial terms, Namibia matches these indicators. Point one had already begun to be carved out prior to rinderpest when Germany mandated territorial boundary lines separating Herero from Nama while also setting aside land for German settlement within Hereroland itself. Point two is slightly weaker in the Namibian case but is nevertheless relevant. German colonial power, based on the notion of cultural superiority, had really only begun to reveal itself after rinderpest with increased German abuse of Herero. These events are precursors to the ethnic domination that played out in the war and genocide of 1904-1908.

Point three parallels the Namibian example in the German colonial state’s vision of the colony and its principles. Beyond interethnic relations and the general political treaties forged between Germans and Herero, no other forms of interethnic relationships were allowed; in fact, most types of relationships were legally forbidden under colonial law. All points here stemmed from or were exacerbated by the environmental challenges and consequential scarcity witnessed in central Namibia between 1897 and 1904.

The comparison between Rwanda and Namibia splits on the final hypothesis, “elite insecurity.” Percival and Homer-Dixon argue that this particular hypothesis trumps the collective strength of the previous three hypotheses. In short, they argue that a small-but-influential population (unaffected by environmental scarcity) successfully introduced interethnic conflict into the country; the vast majority of Rwanda’s population (affected by environmental scarcity) had little if anything to do with ethnic animosities between Hutu and Tutsi but those exhibited by the Hutu elite. The elite also built up the army at this very moment, increasing it from 5,000 to 35,000 within two years and “integrate[d] the RPF [Rwandan Patriotic Front] and the army into a new national force.” The elite and armed forces did not suffer directly from these “structural adjustment measures, declining food production, and the general economic malaise [that]… hurt the majority of Rwandans.” Because of this privileged population, Percival and Homer-Dixon argue that Rwanda’s genocide cannot be one that is heavily influenced by environmental scarcity.

In Namibia, most German’s (inclusive of officials and settler populations) took advantage of and benefitted from the environmental calamities that created scarcity for their Herero neighbors. Without rinderpest and myriad other diseases and plagues that affected Herero and their country (causing the land and its population to become severely weakened), the route to war and genocide is far less certain. Germans were certainly intent on gaining control of Namibia; they even exhibited ideas about ethnic superiority that match closely with the Hutu elite in the early 1900s. However, their ability to create a situation ripe for genocide was unlikely to take root without the environmental precedent. Firstly, Germans were an extreme minority in the country. They totaled approximately 4,000 while Herero were thought to number 80,000; it would have been extremely difficult for Germans to amass enough strength to overthrow Herero before 1904 without the assistance of military reserves in the metropole. It was only after the genocide that reduced the Herero population to approximately 16,000 that Germans could exert influence over their Herero neighbors. Secondly, Herero-owned cattle population fell severely during the rinderpest episode. The demographic decline in cattle numbers allowed for Germans to seize control of Namibia’s colonial cattle industry, formerly controlled by Herero.

For these environmental reasons, among others, the Germans were able to detect and seize the opportunity to take control of central Namibia. The demographic and consequential environmental collapse in this region between 1897 and 1904 gave Germans an advantage. This rising German power, however, threatened to expire if they allowed Herero to successfully rebuild their society from the ashes rinderpest and disease. If we are to privilege Gewald’s account of the war and genocide’s origins, then German officer Leutnant Zürn’s goal was to undercut the reemerging Herero society he saw in late 1903 and early 1904. Zürn sought to convince German settlers that Herero aggressions against them were imminent and so he worked a conflict into the plan, allowing the Germans a pretext for declaring war against the Herero people.

In this context, Percival and Homer-Dixon’s fourth hypothesis is very dependent upon interpretation. If we see the German elite exhibiting no indications of environmental scarcity, for they appear to be doing just fine in acquiring land and living in many different parts of the colony, we are then left with nothing to link these significant environmental changes to the genocidal war. This would be plausible considering the authors’ collective emphasis on direct causation between the environment and all players in these genocides. This approach, however, is overly narrow and pragmatic.
when pointed at the Namibian case example. If we pay close attention to the goals and actions of German colonialism, this hypothesis is extremely useful.

German colonialism emphasized Lebensraum (living space) as one of its stated goals for its settler population. According to German settlers and sympathizers in the metropole, the goals of achieving adequate living space had not been met by the early twentieth century. Therefore, continuing German land hunger in Namibia may inform this final hypothesis. In short, the Germans suffered environmental scarcity according to their own colonial settlement policies. As a result, scarcity led to the genocide as a final solution to this problem. The ideology in arriving at this conclusion is counterintuitive; land opened up by rinderpest and other diseases did not satiate German settler’s thirst for land but seemed to encourage it. German Geographer Carl Schmidt supports this idea through mapping German settlement in the colony, showing the growing trend of settler-claimed space in 1895, 1903, and 1911. Claimed settler space in the country grew noticeably in 1903 (after rinderpest and disease) and 1911 (after the war and genocide). The ideology of German land scarcity allows the environmental precedents of genocide a prominent place in the literature. Rinderpest and the consequential waves of disease and pestilence have often been portrayed as a curious spectacle in the historical literature, little else. Percival and Homer-Dixon’s model breathes new life into this event and allows environmental scarcity in Namibia to play a meaningful role to understand the linkages between environment and genocide.

Rwanda’s genocide has been given far more cross-disciplinary and global attention than Namibia’s. The Rwandan event teems with cross-disciplinary and analytical literature; so is not difficult to locate possible analyses that may be applicable to the Namibian example. However, the literature and theory regarding the environmental precedents of genocide in Namibia to inform the Rwandan case example proved to be much more difficult. Unsurprisingly, the vast majority of literature on the Namibian genocide is situated in law and history. And, as noted above, the reasons for its genocide beyond political or economic reasoning is slim; environmental analysis is virtually absent. However, some ideas that can and should be applied to both examples are found in the literature on environmental aesthetic and dearth. In this section, my essay aims to establish the usefulness of such theoretical models, apply them to Namibia and then begin to discuss how they might work in Rwanda.

There are two overlapping theoretical ideas that can be meaningfully added to and expand the understanding of genocide in Namibia and Rwanda: environmental dearth and environmental aesthetic. Ideas about environmental dearth emerge from Tamara Giles-Vernick’s book Cutting the Vines of the Past: Environmental Histories of the Central African Rainforest. “Dearth is an old word in English, but it richly evokes the senses of deprivation, scarcity and mourning.” Later, Giles-Vernick notes that:

The discourse of dearth, loss, and disconnection... came to mean many things in different contexts.
In the villages it came to signify depopulation, death, and the loss of senior male authority. In agricultural spaces [people] spoke of hunger and disconnection from networks of authority.

The elasticity of this term and its application hold great promise to better understand environmental origins of genocide.

Combined with environmental dearth is the much wider theoretical idea of environmental aesthetic. Nathalie Blanc defines it as “a science that seeks to determine the factors that shape our understanding of and the creation of natural and built environments which produce an aesthetic type of satisfaction... as such [it] determine[s] how a feeling of community emerges through the creation of a shared aesthetic of the environment.” Environmental aesthetic embraces the natural and built environments and allows for both to figure into how communities erect, destroy, imagine, and attempt to rebuild their surroundings. Moreover, this construct allows for the physical and imagined (or idealized) environment to be considered side by side.

Both theories fit well into the examples of Namibia and Rwanda. In Namibia, the radical change to the central Namibian landscape between 1897 and 1904 resulted in the genocide shortly thereafter. Combined with land alienation, poor treatment by Germans, and an erosion of political power, conflict was inevitable. The profound aesthetic change in the environment marked by a land without cattle, the rise of fencing, and of other German living aesthetics (houses, windmills, and other German settler paraphernalia) likely gave rise to collective Herero collective ideas that they were on the verge of environmental dearth, a situation set in motion by rinderpest, human death by disease and pestilence. According to the Herero view, this combination of drastic changes had to be reversed. If change was not curtailed, it would lead to a situation in where the environment would be changed beyond recognition and so erase the Herero cultural landscape. To reverse this trend, Herero embarked on an aggressive attempt to restock the land with cattle. This was only partially successful, for German settlers continued to arrive in this part of the colony; they also continued to create an aesthetic that became increasingly foreign to Herero eyes. By 1904, these factors resulted in tensions that came to a head; the eventual result was the Namibian genocide.

Using the concepts of aesthetic change and environmental dearth may lend support to better understand and establish the connections between the environment and Rwanda’s genocide. To date, most who have argued for a connection between the environment and genocide use overpopulation, drought, carrying capacity, and unsustainable farming techniques as primary sources of evidence. These arguments, while useful, are diffuse, often simplistic, and complicated by strong evidence suggesting that genocides emerge from a number of other legitimate factors.

Jared Diamond’s Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed is somewhat dismissive of the Rwandan genocide’s ethnic and political motivations. He instead focuses on Malthusian principles embracing the
ideas of overpopulation and resulting land degradation. Diamond’s basic argument is summarized as follows:

“Population pressure was one of the important factors behind the Rwandan genocide, that Malthus’s worst-case scenario may sometimes be realized, and that Rwanda may be a distressing model of that scenario in operation. Severe problems of overpopulation, environmental impact, and climate change cannot persist indefinitely: sooner or later they are likely to resolve themselves, whether in the case of Rwanda or in some other manner not of our devising.”

Diamond pins the problems of overpopulation and consequential conflict in Rwanda to two environmentally deterministic factors: 1) the rate of population growth and 2) farming methods that continue to place pressure upon and erode land. The combination of the two may undoubtedly lead to lack of proper agricultural soil and, perhaps, to conflicts over land. I empathize with his approach and assertion that land degradation may have led to the genocide. However, his route of arriving at this conclusion is shallow. Suggesting that a country’s reproduction and farming practices lead to genocide is misguided, not to mention ethnocentric (Diamond cites Rwanda’s teenage mother percentage and its lack of mechanized agriculture as targets for solving the problem). Both reasons privilege Malthusian theory. To cement his point, Diamond uses following quote from a Tutsi teacher:

All these people who were about to be killed had land and at times cows. And somebody had to get these lands and those cows after the owners were dead. In a poor and increasingly overpopulated country this was not a negligible incentive.

The shortcomings of Diamond’s critique are apparent. He ignores the possibility that Rwandans may indeed be able to solve problems of spiraling population growth and land management without killing each other. The idea of killing for space amidst a growing population, while attractive, is ultimately shortsighted and limited in its approach. Even Stephen Brosha, who targets ideas similar to Diamond (“population and land pressure coupled with unsustainable agricultural practices”), as causes for the genocide argues that Malthusian theory “… does not take into account the ability of societies to adapt to increase carrying capacity and avoid crisis, through technological advances or other means.”

Evidence discussed by Vadi Moodley, Alphonse Gahima, and Suveshnee Munien also challenges Diamond’s premises. These authors suggest that a number of other environmental factors were at play and figured into the realization of Rwanda’s genocide. Focusing on two Rwandan towns, Butare and Cyangugu, Moodley et. al. offer a healthy balance of reasons for the 1994 genocide, writing: “the roots of the Rwandan genocide lie in the country’s colonial legacy, misunderstanding of democracy and other indirect factors such as the working of the world market, massive poverty, class divisions within Rwandan society, and the cynical indifference of the Western ruling classes.” Also complicating matters were the myriad of events and circumstances happening in Rwanda in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Moodley, et. al. posit: “almost every Rwandan household was affected by at least one of the following: economic crises, civil war, internal displacement, mass emigration, political transition, returning refugees, destruction of natural resources…”

Acknowledging the complexity of late modern Rwanda and the historical precedents of its genocide helps to maintain a balance of factors that figured into this event.

In spite of this move away from Malthusian forms of environmental determinism, the environmental factors contributing to events of genocide continue to focus on specific factors, not ideas. As stated above, Stephen Brosha focuses on “population and land pressure coupled with unsustainable agricultural practices.” Moodley, et. al. focus on deforestation, farming and agricultural activities, housing, and the incidence of malaria as environmental precursors to the genocide. The fact that an array of physical indicators is being employed and tested to understand their impact on the environment and, consequently, the genocide is certainly a step in the right direction.

Environmental aesthetic and death can be extremely useful as a principle to gather together a variety of environmental factors that have been used to explore the roots of Rwanda’s genocide. Even in this brief survey of three works focused on environmental preludes to genocide, we’ve seen a number of plausible factors that attempt to explain the precedent. Diamond, Brosha and Moodley, et. al. focus largely on the physical attributes that may have led to the violent events of 1994. The combination of many of these descriptors together forms a scene of intense environmental change throughout the country. Like the Namibian case, Rwanda underwent intense environmental change in the years before its genocide. Rwandans across most ethnic and socio-economic lines would certainly have been affected by the changes surrounding them, as Moodley et. al. suggest above. Consequently, as witness to “economic crises, civil war, internal displacement, mass emigration, political transition, returning refugees, destruction of natural resources,” and “population and land pressure coupled with unsustainable agricultural practices,” Rwandans, like Namibians, were negatively affected and likely responded to these changes in an attempt to regain control over and eventually rebuild the land aesthetic to its former, familiar state. Rwandans, in part, opted for genocide due to the emergence of environmental dearth. To reverse this trend, a part of society took out its frustration on others to preserve their preferred aesthetic from the threat of environmental dearth. How this exactly played out should be left to the experts.

To look at it optimistically, Rwanda’s genocide has been a robust teaching moment. In exploring this tragedy, much can be gained from its preceding events and its legacy; it can also inform similar events in world history. Likewise, genocides such as Namibia’s, may be able to better inform our understanding of what transpired in Rwanda. The reciprocities explored in this piece are just a beginning to a deeper and more meaningful exchange of information towards understanding these events. Understanding the environmental
components of genocide in a historical context is in its infancy. Nevertheless, this sub-discipline offers sophisticated and unprecedented models to explore world environmental histories and genocides in ways predicated by agency, not determinism.
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Academic Space and the Cambodian Genocide
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"...a society cannot know itself if it does not have an accurate memory of its own history."

--Youk Chhang, Director, Documentation Center of Cambodia.

How does a society reconcile its history in the aftermath of genocide? How does such a society (re)construct a violent narrative that will become part of its national identity which includes both perpetrators and survivors while promoting national reconstruction and reconciliation? Additionally, what role does the academic community play through its research and dissemination of knowledge of genocide toward that end? At a recent conference on Imagining Cambodia, we were asked to “imagine” what a post-conflict Cambodia would look like. For us, our imagined Cambodia would no longer suffer the visible scars of genocide and that meaningful national reconciliation transpires in a democratic context. For us, the historical narrative of the Khmer Rouge would no longer be held hostage to the political interests of the governing elite. Our imagined Cambodia would no longer face the “pedagogical challenges” that hinder the instruction of genocide education within Cambodia wherein learning about genocide can become a fruitful endeavor (Dy 2009).

For us, that image of Cambodia also recognizes the importance of teaching the Cambodian genocide beyond the borders of Cambodia so that awareness of this genocide widely takes its place in university settings alongside other genocides of the 20th century that include Armenia, Rwanda, and the Holocaust.

To that end, our essay is primarily prologue because we begin by asking two questions that encompass two themes. First, how much “academic space” does academia devote to our overall understanding about the Cambodian genocide and second, what is the context of genocide education in Cambodia today and how does it compare to our efforts in Western institutions of higher education. The context of genocide education is important because we believe that education forms the backbone of prevention. On the surface, the idea of genocide prevention appears to be a simple task. In an ideal world policymakers, international organizations (IOs), grassroots activists, the media, and the academic community, would work in tandem to sound the alarm at the specter of this heinous crime and avert the tragic loss of human life. In reality, when genocide occurs, outside states rarely muster the needed political will to halt, let alone deter genocide, and they often circumvent action (political, economic, or military) in defense of their own national interests. The much heralded 2008 “Preventing Genocide: A Blueprint for U.S. Policymakers”, better known as the Albright-Cohen Report, did little to inspire the scholarly community who remain critical of this unilateral policy proposal that would sound the genocide alarm mostly when U.S. interests are threatened (Semelin 2009; Feierstein 2009; Strauss 2009). IOs face similar criticism for their failure to stop genocide, because the veto power of the members of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) shields the permanent member’s allies from UN condemnation and potential action, specifically, Russia and Syria, China and Sudan Additionally, the 2005 United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) resolution in support of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) as a new norm of international life has done little to avert further loss of life, i.e. the inaction of the United States in regions such as Darfur. The challenge of genocide prevention is neither as straightforward as its label presumes nor does it conform to the logic of an ideal world ideal committed to averting the loss of life. For starters, the mere invocation of the “g-word” oftentimes creates a political battlefield because of the struggle over labels. When talking about genocide, words matter. If genocide prevention is to mean something then where does the primary task of genocide prevention lie? If states and IOs fail at stopping and subsequently preventing genocide, then wouldn’t it follow that prevention through education is the next step in a logical sequence?

Khamboly Dy contends that teaching the past through genocide education “is the only effective way to prevent future genocide and other grave human rights violations” (2009). Limiting our focus on genocide education to the classroom, especially as a mechanism to understand and prevent genocide, we have to ask which cases we should utilize in our educational campaign to inform our students. One would think that teaching a course on genocide would be a first step toward raising awareness. This is not as straightforward as it may seem. Given the large number of cases in the 20th century alone, teaching a course on comparative genocide in a 15 week semester invariably involves a trade-off between depth of a few select cases versus breadth of genocidal events across a larger span of time.

Our essay proceeds on an anecdotal note, which will explain our interest in this topic and our notion of academic space. Several years ago, the primary author of this paper began teaching an undergraduate course on comparative genocide. Aiming for more depth than breadth, I chose to include the following four cases: Armenia, the Holocaust, Rwanda, and Darfur. In developing this course I found that there was a wealth of resources readily available for me to develop a strong curriculum. Even though I developed this course for our majors (political science), the class began to grow in size and academic diversity as students from other disciplines began to enroll in this course as an elective. One of their course requirements is to present their research on a particular topic on one of the genocides under study. This could include discussion about a memoir, a film, art, rescuers, perpetrators, and so forth. One semester a student asked me why I did not include the Cambodian genocide in this course. My only reply was that I did not know enough about this genocide to include it in the course. I eagerly allowed this student to give her presentation on Cambodia and this is when Cambodia found me. I was determined that the following year when I taught this course again I would include a component on this genocide. Before I could “teach”
about Cambodia I had to immerse myself in the learning process. To that end I discovered many scholars from a range of disciplines spanning anthropology, history, literature, sociology, and even my own discipline, political science. My learning about Cambodia and the genocide proved to be far easier than organizing a course that included a component on this subject matter.

In terms of chronology, the tragedy of Cambodia is situated between the Holocaust and the Rwandan genocide. There is no disputing the facts that during the brutal reign of the Khmer Rouge between April 1975 and January 1979, the events that transpired in Democratic Kampuchea constituted genocide. For my first foray into teaching about the Cambodian genocide I wanted my students to delve deeper into the human side of this tragedy alongside the historical events. I also wanted them to gain a fuller understanding of what transpired beyond a classroom screening and discussion of The Killing Fields. Additionally, I wanted them to walk away from the experience empowered to take a stand against genocide whenever and wherever it occurs. In planning my course, I found that if I distributed my cases equally across the semester I could dedicate three weeks to the Cambodian genocide. My first instinct was to search the internet for sample syllabi of colleagues who might be teaching a similar course. I reasoned that surely anyone who taught a course on comparative genocide regardless of the discipline would include Cambodia in this chronological sequence. I was interested in exploring which texts and other reading materials they assigned and what type of assignments they included to serve as a guide. Much to my dismay, my initial search did not yield a flood of syllabi on teaching this genocide. I decided to try a more specialized search by focusing on scholars who have written and taught on some aspect of this genocide, such as Hinton, Kiernan, Chandler, etc. and from there I would extend my search. This method did provide me with some insightful topical information to include, but left me somewhat unfulfilled when it came to the pedagogy of the Cambodian genocide. I asked myself where were the Totten and Parsons and the Zorayan’s when it comes to the teaching and learning about the Cambodian genocide? Did anyone teach a course just on the particulars of the Cambodian genocide devoid of its comparative utility? This is what began our quest to understand both the pedagogy and scholarly attention given to this genocide and the development of what we call “academic space”. That is, in what context and to what extent is the Cambodian genocide taught at the college/university level, to what extent is this genocide given scholarly attention in the academic journals related specifically to the study of genocide, what is the context of scholarly research on this genocide and how is it disseminated, and how representative is research on the Cambodian genocide at meetings of scholarly associations germane to the study of genocide? Additionally, academic space must also include the existence of non-governmental associations that promote education about this particular genocide both within Cambodia itself and beyond its borders, such as the Documentation Center of Cambodia (DC-CAM). Our initial entry into this subject is limited to university courses, specialized journals and conferences and our preliminary findings are discussed below.

The Cambodian genocide is widely represented in numerous journals that are regionally specific to Southeast Asia and disciplinary specific journals. Our interest was in this genocide’s academic space in genocide specific journals. Our findings below do not take into consideration submission rates; rather, we confined our search solely to published featured articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Number of articles</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holocaust and Genocide Studies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genocide Studies and Prevention</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Genocide Research</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Holocaust and Genocide Studies Journal made its academic debut in 1986, prior to Rwanda yet after the Cambodian genocide. Of the twenty-five volumes, there is only one article on the Cambodian genocide. In the eleven years of its publication, Genocide Studies and Prevention, the flagship journal of the International Association of Genocide Scholars, there is one article on Cambodia in a comparative context. Cambodia is mentioned in two other articles but only peripherally and generally as part of wider, theoretical discussions. In the Journal of Genocide Research, the Cambodian genocide is featured five times throughout the journal’s 13 volumes.

The Cambodian genocide does not fare better at international conferences devoted exclusively to the study of genocide; in particular, the International Association of Genocide Scholars (IAGS) and the International Network of Genocide Scholars (INOGS). Of the thirty-two panels on the program at the inaugural conference of INOGS in 2009 only one paper about the Cambodian genocide was listed and it centered on analysis of the film S-21: the Khmer Rouge Killing Machine. In 2010, three papers out of thirty panels made their way onto the conference agenda. At the 2012 biennial meeting of the IAGS, a total of three papers were among the forty-six panels. At the June 2013 IAGS conference in held Sienna, Italy, there were a total of five papers presented out of 197, and three panels out of a total of sixty-four. What could explain this lack of academic space in genocide specific journals and conferences? Could it be that Cambodia occupies a “second tier,” as Alex Hinton noted, when it comes to the study of genocide, wherein Cambodia ranks just below Armenia, the Holocaust and Rwanda? If this is the case, then why? However, this lack of academic space also seems to come at a time when the status of genocide studies is experiencing tremendous growth across a number of disciplines and scholarship of the Cambodian genocide is growing as well.

In terms of academic space and the extent to which this genocide is taught in colleges and universities, our answer to this question began with a call for syllabi on the international association of genocide scholars website. To our dismay, only about eight colleagues posted replies with either attachments of their syllabi or links to their websites. Not unlike what we anticipated, it is rare to find a separate course on the Cambodian genocide; rather, it is taught within the context of a comparative genocide class, once again, chronologically sandwiched between the Holocaust and Rwanda.
Our work in collecting and analyzing syllabi used in the West, as confined to institutions located in the United States and Canada, led us to classify them by discipline and begin to identify how much time was being allocated to Cambodia and what literature was being used. The following twenty-four syllabi used are divided into the fields of psychology and anthropology, history, international relations, political science, sociology, philosophy/religion, and special topics courses. We found that of the syllabi collected on the teaching of genocide that mentioned Cambodia were most prevalent in the fields of history and political science with half of the results ending up in just these two fields. Keeping in mind that only syllabi which dealt with the Cambodian genocide were considered for this paper.

Of these twenty-four syllabi, ten allocate just one day to the study of the Cambodian genocide; two dedicate two days; seven dedicate three days; two dedicate four or more; two focus entirely on the subject and one broached the subject only in contrast to the Holocaust. The overwhelming majority of the texts used for readings are the books First They Killed My Father by Cambodian author Loung Ung and selections of A Problem From Hell by Samantha Power; an anthology which includes multiple issues relating to genocide in general. Half of the classes surveyed for this paper used either of these texts as their assigned readings. This begs the question why these two sources? Are these really the best sources of material for Cambodia? While they most certainly are well written and interesting pieces, our concern is that perhaps this is too limited a view.

Admittedly, this is a very small sample size but these are the search results and responses received to inquiries from various scholars in the field and only syllabi which contained a component on the Cambodian genocide were referenced.

It is worth noting that a resource packet for preparing a class on Cambodia has been assembled by two Cambodians, both social activists, which include a variety of published academic work to facilitate class development. The packet begins with the pre-Angkor period and covers up to modern day. Conspicuously absent from the references are the seemingly most popular texts by Ung and Power. Of course other standard bearers such as David Chandler and Ben Kiernan are peppered into both the syllabi and the resource packet. But not as much as Ung and Power who are the most consistently referenced in the course syllabi from universities.

Again, we are left with the question why so little academic space regarding Cambodia in the context of a comparative course on genocide? If we are not teaching about this genocide then we are not exposing future educators to the depths of this genocide and “never again” becomes a mantra confined to the study of the Holocaust and possibly Rwanda. Unlike teaching this genocide in Cambodia where political and economic factors cloud the dissemination of knowledge, these factors are not paramount in our university system in the West. Additional research might lead us closer to understanding why so little academic space is given to this genocide.

Any discussion about genocide education in Cambodia has to begin with the DC-CAM and its relentless efforts to search for truth, memory, and justice. Without dwelling on the political, social, and economic challenges that beset teaching about the Cambodian genocide in Cambodia, we will focus on some of the pedagogical issues. Khamboly Dy’s textbook, A History of Democratic Kampuchea (1975-1979), is the definitive history of the Cambodian genocide for use in schools across Cambodia. Written by a Cambodian, Dy’s text and accompanying teacher’s guidebook aims to promote democracy in Cambodia, generate dialogue and reconciliation, and connect the youth of Cambodia with their country’s recent past. As Dy notes, Genocide education in the post-KR era in Cambodia underwent several transformations. In the early 1980s, during the Vietnamese occupation, education about the genocide was politically charged and Cambodians were taught to both hate and fear the KR. By 1991, the KR took on the mantle of a folk tale. Between 1991 and 2000, as the various factions were vying for power, the period of the KR was removed from textbooks and not allowed into the curriculum. Education about the KR era was revised again in 2001 and limited to a few sentences. Part of the dilemma is that the current leadership in Cambodia have past ties with the KR. The authoritarian government headed by former KR cadre, Hun Sen, has been instrumental in shaping the collective memory of the past to his benefit. However, the entry of Dy’s textbook and its accompanying teacher workshops alleviated one of the pedagogical challenges to the study of the Cambodian genocide in Cambodia. The more crucial pedagogical challenges are the lack of qualified teachers, especially those trained in history and other social sciences, resources, along with educational reform which remains a particularly difficult challenge given the nature of the genocide/conflict.

As we noted in our introduction, this essay is primarily prologue. Our next step is to examine why this genocide is largely overlooked in the higher education curriculum and in the scholarly journals and genocide specific conferences. The Cambodian genocide is becoming more widely researched and the remaining senior leaders of the KR are presently on trial for genocide through the UN established tribunal—the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC).

We believe that the inclusion of the Cambodian genocide is vital in any discussion of genocide curricula. The qualities both unique and shared of this tragedy add to our deeper understanding of the preconditions necessary for genocide and the motivations of those who perpetrate. If we are serious in our efforts to prevent genocide, then it is incumbent on the academic community to expand and extend our scholarship to the general population in our shared determination to prevent genocide in the future.
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“Never Again?” Some Reflections and A Syllabus for A Class on Comparative Genocide

Louisa Rice
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

When I first proposed teaching a course on Comparative Genocide at my state comprehensive university, I had an idea that it would be a popular course, given the attractiveness of an existing course on the Nazi era. The intention of the new course was to take advantage of the perception of the topic so as to draw students in, and then, ideally, help them think about places and peoples they had not considered before (Rwanda, or the Armenians, for example). I particularly wanted to have students think about Genocide as a “world history” topic, one that connects us all and one in which we might all be implicated. Further, I hoped the course would genuinely introduce students to the practice of comparative study wherein they would begin to consider the utility and the potential problems associated with such an approach to history.

The choice of “textbook” here, Samantha Power’s *A Problem from Hell*, was crucial in enabling students to approach the topic from the perspective of something they already knew, as it grounded the class in a narrative that was quite familiar to most of my students (American history in the twentieth century). In addition, Power is clearly interested in uncovering the potential for American and/or international intervention as she tells the “story” of twentieth century genocide from an American perspective. This allowed us to address genocide as a “global” issue from the outset. As a class, we frequently re-visited Power’s thesis over the course of the semester, especially the idea that American policy towards intervention has been a success—as, she argues, lack of intervention has generally been the goal.

The class proposal itself provoked some concern from colleagues who thought that I might be excluding certain events from the syllabus which should or could be defined as genocides. The most straightforward and intellectually honest way of responding to such legitimate unease was first to begin the course by pointing out the 20th century bias of the class and underscoring the multiple interpretations of the term “genocide.” Second, students were to complete a research project as part of the class, and this project had to either look at one of the genocides we were covering by examining a specific feature in more depth OR needed to analyze an event that we were not formally covering in the class and discuss the merits of the term genocide being applied to this case. Several students in the class were pursuing a degree program in American Indian Studies and produced projects that considered the utility of describing national policies that have been applied to various indigenous peoples as “genocides.” Other students looked at the brutal programs enacted in Communist China and the Soviet Union as “genocidal.”

As the syllabus below indicates, the course was structured chronologically around the events of the twentieth century which most scholars have identified as “genocides” and which represent some global diversity. We began with definitions of genocide and discussions of comparative approaches to history before moving through events in the Ottoman Empire, Nazi Germany, Cambodia, Bosnia, Rwanda and Darfur. The required texts were not difficult monographs for the most part, but rather less theoretical works that addressed the topic in different ways; a concise overview of the Holocaust, a memoir of Cambodia and the accessible Machete Season which is organized around interviews of those who perpetrated the genocide in Rwanda. I did, however, want students to grapple with some of the key theoretical issues raised by each genocide; this was largely accomplished through film screenings and brief scholarly articles which analyzed concepts such as denial, the targeting of women and children, and the connections between “modernity” and genocide.

The course was popular, and the vast majority of students who enrolled were juniors and seniors majoring or minoring in history. Partly because of this, I decided that the students would themselves be responsible for creating discussion questions for each session’s reading. The class used the university’s online learning system to post and respond to questions before we discussed the reading in class. This usually produced a rich discussion; students often felt more responsible for responding to each other than to me.

Perhaps the most successful component of the class was a relatively early assignment that came after our segments on the Armenian genocide and the Holocaust. Students were asked to analyze the extent to which the Holocaust should or could be compared to other genocides. The prompt read as follows:

*The Holocaust has been viewed as the paradigmatic example of genocide by scholars and the general public alike. In the light of our readings and discussion thus far this semester, analyze the potential utility and limitations of employing the “Holocaust as model” when examining other cases of genocide.*

Students were then asked to consider the following as points of comparison:

*From scholarship on the Holocaust how “transferable” are our understandings of the following issues to other cases of genocide: ideology and motivations, the roles of various perpetrators, the culpability of various “bystanders” (including the International Community and especially the United States), the status and numbers of victims, legal prosecution and memory and remembrance?*

The responses were surprisingly astute analyses that frequently understood the “Holocaust as model” to be problematic, particularly from the perspective of “comparative suffering” or of labeling one experience as unique. This assignment also led us to the creation of working models for comparing genocides and thus was a product that the class referred back to in subsequent discussions.

In this particular iteration of the course, I taught several future social-studies teachers. It was clear that many of them were thinking through the possibilities of teaching about genocide at
the High School level. One student, Derek Schneider, developed and taught a lesson plan for 9th graders that emerged from his experience in the class. I am grateful for his willingness to share this work with me. Schneider’s lesson had the following, quite complex, objectives:

1) Identify difficulties presented by U.N. intervention in genocide
2) Relate genocides around the world to each other
3) Explain differences between specific genocides
4) Make inferences regarding the possibility of genocide prevention

His lesson built on previous work that students had completed regarding group identity and violence (most notably through a discussion of the Arab-Israeli conflict). The lesson itself involved students producing their own classifications of human rights, discussing the UN definition and then debating whether they would intervene to protect the human rights of others. Students were then taught about the concept of genocide before a screening of the PBS documentary Worse Than War. Schneider’s viewing guide for the film asked students to explain the difference between murder and genocide, to address why it is a difficult subject for scholars and explore why prevention has been difficult.

Finally, after a further discussion of intervention, students completed Schneider’s “on-demand” (or in-class, timed) writing assignment which asked them to consider the uniqueness of the Holocaust, to explain why genocide continues to happen after the “Never Again” pledge, and to suggest what might be done to “solve” the problem of genocide. Schneider reports that the lesson was very successful and that the framework of genocide allows him to both effectively cover twentieth century world history and to engage students in broader questions of injustice and prevention of human rights abuses.

Schneider’s lesson reminded me too of the much publicized story of the 1993 High School global geography class in Alliance, Nebraska which explored the topic of genocide for 9 weeks. The teacher, Tim Walz, explained that he wanted students to go beyond an understanding of the Holocaust as an historical event produced by “evil.” Instead, he asked them to study multiple genocides to determine why people follow the plans of genocidal leaders. Schneider reports that the lesson was very successful and that the culminating project of the class was to examine the contemporary political situation in a dozen states and to predict the place where genocide was most likely to occur. The fifteen and sixteen year-olds predicted a genocide in Rwanda just a few months before it began in April of 1994.

In contrast, as Samantha Power points out, Rwanda was of “marginal concern” to the U.S government in 1994 and many Pentagon officials could not remember if it was “Hutu and Tutsi or Tutu and Hutsi.”

This is not to say that all students of comparative genocide should be able to predict the next slaughter. It is, however, a very concrete way of showing the relevance of history to the present. Addressing the question of prevention, as Schneider did with his 9th graders and I attempted to do with undergraduate juniors and seniors is also a way of moving beyond the rather bleak and painful pattern of failures since the 1948 U.N convention and its commitment to the promise of “never again”. Indeed, during one rather disturbing discussion of the crimes committed in Bosnia, I distinctly remember one student insisting that she could not talk about genocide anymore and had essentially given up on humanity.

Rather than ask that student and her classmates to regurgitate facts about each genocide as a final exam, I asked them instead to write two take-home essays. The first addressed comparative themes (for example a question on why the genocides in Rwanda and Bosnia were ascribed to long-standing “ethnic” hatred, or on why the term “ethnic cleansing” has been introduced at all). The second question gave them the option of critiquing the U.N definition of genocide, or to propose a specific policy for the U.S. to adopt in order to combat future genocide by drawing on the lessons of the past. As one student concluded in her response to the latter question: “In short, future responses to genocide will be more effective if they are based on good information that is interpreted well and used to consider a variety of responses. In the past, the United States has been reluctant to become involved, but when Americans have acted, our actions have made a difference.” In the end, several students commented that they had been inspired by the class, and particularly by the notion that it was possible to make this difference, rather than to throw up our hands in response to such incomprehensible evil. As a teacher, the students’ general level of commitment to the class and what it represented beyond a letter grade, was also inspiring to me. While I cannot say that it is a class that I look forward to teaching, it continues to be an engaging and relevant subject matter that teaches us about the world, our national priorities and, ultimately, ourselves as human beings.
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COMPARATIVE GENOCIDE

FALL 2011

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course will examine the origins and forms of what has been the source of the twenty-first century’s greatest “crimes against humanity,” genocide. The paradigmatic form of genocide, the Nazi orchestrated Holocaust, will be central to the course, but we will also pursue in-depth studies of more recent genocidal acts in Cambodia, Rwanda, Bosnia, and Sudan. We will begin with definitions of genocide, before interrogating case-studies in greater detail. Some of our central questions will be: what commonalities are there between these actions against minority groups? Who and what defines these minority groups? What role does the idea of cultural/social death play in the instigation of genocidal acts? Our main goal, throughout, is to examine the causes of genocide, but we will also explore possible strategies for preventing and combating genocidal hatred, especially through international law and institutions.

OBJECTIVES

- To understand how genocide has been defined and how it relates to “mass killing” and “ethnic cleansing.”
- To be able to compare the causation and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Section: Genocides in World History</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>experience of genocide across time and space</td>
<td>Monday Sept 19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To analyze international responses to genocide and the potential for international political prevention and prosecution</td>
<td>Background to the Holocaust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To produce a framework for comparative analysis of genocide</td>
<td>Read: Bergen, preface-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To consider an aspect of genocide in more depth through the completion of a research bibliography and presentation</td>
<td>Wednesday Sept 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everyday life in Nazi Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Sept 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Machinery and the Final Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Bergen 101-243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED TEXTS</td>
<td>Week 4: The Holocaust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Power, <em>A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide</em></td>
<td>Mon Sept 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper Perennial, ISBN: 0-06-054164-4</td>
<td>Film: <em>Night and Fog</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowman and Littlefield, ISBN: 0-8476-9631-6</td>
<td>Willing Germans or Ordinary Men? The Browning/Goldhagen debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loung Ung, <em>First they killed my father: A daughter of Cambodia Remembers</em></td>
<td>Fri Sept 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picador, ISBN: 0-312-42503-1</td>
<td>Week 5: Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE SCHEDULE</td>
<td>Mon Oct 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1: Intro, terms and concepts</td>
<td>Introduction to Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed Sept 7</td>
<td>PAPER ONE DUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Wed Oct 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri Sept 9</td>
<td>Background to Genocide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power’s thesis, definitions and the issue of “comparative” study</td>
<td>Read: Power, 87-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Khmer Rouge and the execution of the genocide/American reaction</td>
<td>The Killing Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read: Power, 104-154</td>
<td>Mon Oct 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2: Armenia</td>
<td>Film: <em>The Killing Fields</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon Sept 12</td>
<td>RESEARCH TOPICS DUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 19th century prelude: nationalism, imperialism, racism</td>
<td>Wed Oct 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film: <em>The Killing Fields</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed Sept 14</td>
<td>Fri Oct 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Armenian genocide: a model?</td>
<td>Film: <em>The Killing Fields</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read: Power, 1 and Robert Melson, “The Armenian Genocide as Precursor and Prototype of 20th century genocide.”</td>
<td>Week 7: Cambodia/Definitions revisited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri Sept 16</td>
<td>Mon Oct 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be away at a conference. See film <em>Armenia: A Genocide Denied</em> (34 mins) from films on demand. D2L Discussion to follow.</td>
<td>Discussion: First they killed my father/The Killing Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Ung, entire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3: The Holocaust</td>
<td>Wed Oct 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Politicide, autogenocide, genocide?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Class” as a genocidal category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Oct 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genocide as a “modern” phenomenon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Weitz, “The Modernity of Genocides”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 8: Mid-Term/Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon Oct 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed Oct 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Oct 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion and Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Michael Sells, “Crosses of blood: sacred space, religion, and violence in Bosnia-Hercegovina”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 9: Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon Oct 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bosnia Eyewitnesses—discussion of first-hand accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed Nov 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The problem of “Balkanism” and rape as a genocidal tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Roy Gutman, <em>Newsday</em> articles on mass rape in Bosnia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Nov 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International responses to Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Power, 247-327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 10: Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon Nov 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background to Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed Nov 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machetes and the “modernity” thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Power, 329-389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Nov 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film: <em>Sometimes in April</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week 11: <em>Sometimes in April</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon Nov 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film: <em>Sometimes in April</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed Nov 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film: <em>Sometimes in April</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fri Nov 18
Discussion: Machete Season/Sometimes in April
Read: Machete Season, entire

Week 12: Rwanda and Aftermaths
Mon Nov 21
Rehabilitation?

Wed Nov 23
Kosovo
Read: Power 443-473
Paper TWO DUE

Week 13: Never Again?

Mon Nov 28
Discussion: Power’s conclusion
Read: Power, 475-516

Wed Nov 30
Genocide in Sudan

Fri Dec 2
Never Again? Revisiting our definitions.

Weeks 14 and 15: Research Presentations

---

Genocide in World History: A Course

Tom Taylor
Seattle University

The numbers are guessstimates; staggering, horrific guessstimates. How many people have been killed as a consequence of genocidal acts in human history? No one can say. What constitutes “genocide” is also widely contested. Terms are debated and individual cases are widely, and often bitterly, argued. We may never know the exact numbers who have died as a consequence of genocidal acts but we do know that the victims number in the tens of millions. We know that no part of the world has been immune from the scourge of their brutality and, sadly, over fifty years after the cry of “Never Again” echoed around the world after the liberation of the death camps of World War II, it remains a gruesome reality of our modern world.

UCOR 3640-01/INST 391, Genocide in World History, is a course that serves a range of students. It is an upper-division elective class for students majoring in History and International Studies. It is also a Social Science option for Module III--Global Challenges--of our new University Core. Given the range of students I did not assume any prior knowledge of the subject or any specific methodological training. As part of the University Core--Genocide in World History--also has a specific set of learning outcomes that must be addressed. (See syllabus). Central to these learning outcomes is deepening students’ engagement with the social sciences and learning to communicate persuasively in appropriate civic spheres.

In order to address the social science learning requirements of this course I designed my course around a series of case studies that could be comparatively analyzed based on a series of political science models. I focused on the twentieth century to give the course a more chronological coherency, especially as some of the students have had little history. While I think you can certainly make a case that genocide is not a “modern” phenomenon, Mark Levene’s article, “Why is the Twentieth Century the Century of Genocide,” argues strongly that genocide, as a political response to the challenges of modernization, is a twentieth century phenomenon.

Leven’s article is paired with Scott Strauss’ Contested Meanings. Straus does an excellent job of summarizing and critiquing the wide ranging and significant debates about the definition of the term genocide. It also introduces the theoretical issues I address in this class. The table summarizing key definitions and concepts is useful for students to have a framework for comparing our case studies.

Samantha Powers’ A Problem from Hell: America in the Age of Genocide serves as the text for the course. It provides a useful overview of the evolution of the concept of genocide in the twentieth century, focusing significantly on the life and work of Raphael Lemkin, the man who coined the term and led the charge for the creation of international laws for the prosecute and prevent genocide. It examines the history of genocide in the twentieth century through the lens of American foreign policy. Powers is highly critical of the failure of the US to intervene in numerous cases of genocide. Her viewpoints facilitate good class discussion and debate. Finally, given that Samantha Powers was recently named the US ambassador to the United Nations, her book provides the students insight into someone who is shaping international policies on genocide today.

Peter Maass’ Love thy Neighbor: a Story of War is the second book I use. It adds a powerful and gut wrenching look at how the genocidal wars in Yugoslavia developed in the 1990s. As a writer for the Washington Post, Maass was often in the middle of events and his reporting creates a visceral sense of what was happening on the ground. Genocide is often overwhelming in its scale and magnitude and Maass’ account brings the very human stories of genocide to life.

As an alternative to Maass’ book I would have had students read Philip Gourevitch’s We Wish to Inform You that Tomorrow we Will Be Killed With our Families: Stories from Rwanda (1999). It is powerful because it gives students some sense of what people in Rwanda felt and experienced as the events of 1994 unfolded. Because I have students watch the well-known film, Hotel Rwanda, I
Special Section: Genocides in World History

opted not to include the Gourevitch book. Debates about what constitutes genocide often revolve around the “numbers question”—how many were killed and what percentage of a given population was targeted. I wanted students to confront the challenges faced by researchers trying to answer these questions. For this section of the course I chose two articles, Brunborg, et al. “Accounting for Genocide: How Many Were Killed in Srebrenica,” and Verpooten, “The Death Toll of a Rwandan Genocide: A Detailed Analysis from Gikongoro Province.” Students were familiar with the general parameters of the stories behind each case. Brunborg’s study was used to prove a genocide crime by a Serbian general, Radislav Krstic, at Srebrenica. Prosecution required detailed records, including names, age and gender of each victim. Verpooten’s analysis of Rwanda uses national census registers and local communal records to ascertain the total number of Tutsis murdered in 1994. It is recognized as one of the most successful efforts to move beyond guesstimates and accurately assess the scale of the atrocity. Each study presents a clear discussion of methodology and sources so that students can develop their skills in quantitative literacy: the ability to read and evaluate quantitative arguments.

Finally, the course addresses recent developments in international responses to genocide, specifically the creation of the United Nations Office of the Special Advisor on the Prevention of Genocide in 2005 and President Obama’s Report on the Taskforce on Genocide in 2012. Most students have no idea how the United Nations works. There is little understanding of the nature and authority of the Security Council and its relation to the General Assembly. Few have examined the mandates of UN peacekeeping forces. Together they are a useful way to contemplate how the world handles conflicts.

The course culminates with a final project analyzing a case that we have not yet examined in class. Students have to argue, based on the various models we have examined, why their case constitutes genocide and examine the actions of the perpetrators and the international response to the event. In conclusion they have to make a proposal for the modification of UN or US policy toward genocide that would have prevented genocide. On the final day of class we use these papers to hold a mock international conference on the prevention of genocide. Students present their findings and we debate whether or not we can ever fulfill the promise of “Never Again.”

Genocide in World History
INST 391-02/UCOR 3640-01 (Social Science and Global Challenge)
Dr. Tom Taylor

Course Overview: The tragic reality of genocide in the 20th C will be examined through a variety of disciplinary perspectives—psychology, political science, philosophy, history and theology. Narrative and journalistic accounts, and films of genocide in Yugoslavia and Rwanda as well as will look at the representation of genocide in various media. Throughout the course we will examine the reasons why genocide occur and what, if anything, we can do to prevent genocide in the future.

Required Readings:

Required Texts that can be purchased in the book store.


The following articles are available online through the Lemieux Library database system: JSTOR.


The following articles are available online.

The following website is the UN Office of the Special Advisor on the Prevention of Genocide:

This website contains critical information on current issues related to the issue of genocide as well as links to the key historical documents relating to international law and genocide prevention. Report of President Obama’s Taskforce on Genocide:

Library Resources on Genocide:

Research Librarian Karen Giles has put together an excellent resource for this class: you can find it in the following two places on the library’s web page. Go to HISTORY http://libguides.seattleu.edu/content.php?pid=120450 it sits in the left column under course guide.

Core Learning Objectives: This course helps students:
1. Gain additional social scientific knowledge and improve their abilities to use rigorous social scientific thinking to answer questions and solve problems.
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2. Develop their abilities to reflect on and use relevant knowledge they have learned in other courses across a variety of disciplines.

3. Become effective writers, including writers of high quality academic prose.

4. Learn to engage in persuasive communication in appropriate civic spheres.

5. Deeply understand a major global issue or challenge (primarily through the perspective of a social scientific discipline).

6. Understand relevant cultural dimensions of the global challenges being studied and, when appropriate, develop awareness and skills in cross-cultural engagement.

Course Requirements:

There will be 3 quizzes (see schedule). Each quiz will cover materials read and discussed the previous week. Quizzes will be a combination of identifications and short essays. Each quiz will be worth 25% of the total course grade. Each quiz will be designed to be completed in approximately 20 minutes.

There will be a final paper due on the last day of class. As we will discuss the papers on that day there will be no late papers accepted without prior written approval from the instructor. Final paper is to be 12-16 pages in length (double spaced.) It is to examine a case study of genocide not covered in class (i.e. not Armenia, the Holocaust, Yugoslavia or Rwanda).

Paper should address the following issues:

1) 3-4 pages Brief Historical Background most specifically addressing the central reason why, according to the readings in this class, this case can be considered a case of genocidal action.

2) 3-4 pages. Examine the key actors in the events, particularly identifying the perpetrators and their actions. Section should summarize major arguments for holding perpetrators responsible for genocide.

3) 3-4 pages Analyze the domestic and/or international response to this case and assess whether that action was effective in preventing or at least minimizing the acts of genocide.

4) 3-4 pages Examining both the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide (1948) and the UN’s Responsibility to Protect (2005) make a concrete recommendation for the amendment of these laws to help insure that genocide never happens again.

Class Schedule:

July 22  Introduction and Overview
July 23  Genocide in Historical Perspective
Readings: Levene
July 24  Genocide in Comparative Perspective
Readings: Straus
July 25  Case I: Turkey and the Armenian Genocide
Readings: Powers, Preface, pp. 1-29. NYT article on Armenia

July 29  Case II: The Holocaust
Readings: Powers, pp. 31-46. Week One Quiz

July 30  The Holocaust, cont.

July 31  The Search for Justice: The UN Convention on Genocide, 1948

August 1  Case III: Yugoslavia
Readings: Maass, pp. 1-192

August 5  Yugoslavia, cont.
Readings: Maass, pp. 192-end

August 6  Case IV: Rwanda
Week Two Quiz

August 7  Movie: Hotel Rwanda

August 8  Numbers Game: Justice and Demography
Readings: Verpooten; Brunborg

August 12  The Search for Answers, The Search for Justice, The Search for Action
Readings: Powers, pp. 475-516

We will review essential materials on this website and examine Obama’s recommendations.
Week Three Quiz
UN Office of the Special Advisor on the Prevention of Genocide

Report of President Obama’s Taskforce on Genocide

August 14  Office Hours: Will be available for consultation on papers. NO CLASS

August 15  Class Conference:
UN Convention on the Prevention of Genocide,
Final Papers Due: NO EXCEPTIONS WITHOUT PRIOR APPROVAL
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Food as culture
The spread of foodways has usefully been compared to the spread of languages. Apart from its other important functions, food is an instrument of communication. It transmits values that have crystallized over time as well as economic and cultural elements typical of the society of the home country. Along with language, food is one of the strongest elements of identity binding migrant groups. The preservation of foodways by migrant communities, and the loyalty to tradition that is implied indicates attempts to conserve, protect, and retain aspects of the past or of the place of origin and production. Opposition to this tradition is found in the products a new country and the present can offer. It is evidently a cultural action that is almost mythological. The conditions regarding the environment, production, cultivation, consumption and the availability of raw materials are often completely different in the arrival location rather than the departure one.

Food is a means of identity. Each of us jealously holds our tastes close, and considers them in some way part of our particular nature. It distinguishes us from others—the anthropology and sociology of food have evidenced that taste is above all a question of culture. Harris has explored the enigmas of flavor from prehistoric times, sacrificial rites to fast food and has continued on to hypotheses regarding changes in food habits of population over time and diversity that are so radical that they seem inexplicable. Taste is not merely a question of individual preferences.

Therefore, food is also one of the main ways of entering into contact with another culture; eating foreign food is easier than learning a foreign language. The relative ease with which gastronomic habits can make contact helps the process of cross-cultural contact, mediation and mixture, which has characterized food since time immemorial.

As far back as ancient times, the Mediterranean was the crossroads where products and information were traded. In medieval times the crossroads became even more important as the blending of customs and traditions intensified, and new food cultures were the product of ancient Mediterranean traditions and equally ancient traditions originating in central and northern Europe. This very brief discussion would be incomplete without mentioning Jewish Kosher traditions and later Muslim ones, which also contributed extensively to the ever-changing kaleidoscope of regional gastronomy in Europe.

After the Industrial Revolution, migrational flows changed. The process of mingling and reciprocal influence has continued in different ways. In the following pages, we focus on migration flows consisting mainly of individuals and groups with a high degree of self-awareness that find strong identification in their food traditions and discuss how these generate important business as well as influence food cultures in host countries.

Identity, Religion, and Business
From Italy and Central Europe to America and ever since the beginning of the 19th century and the Industrial Revolution there have been different types and volumes of migration flows. In addition, an almost permanent migration of Jews in medium-long range migration inside Europe has influenced to a considerable extent the regions of the Old Continent and its cookery.

A fundamental aspect of these flows is that they occurred in two main directions: East to West and South to North. Migration from eastern areas toward Central Europe had a big impact on foods in countries like Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and France, although the impact on restaurants and catering was smaller. The process of gastronomic assimilation occurred through a physiological hybridization and the use of different ingredients rather than through restaurants or cafes.

Likewise, early migration from Italy did not lead to the widespread setting up of Italian restaurants. Until the 1870s-80s, most emigrants from Italy went to France and were seasonal. Home areas were mainly northeast and northwest Italy, the Triveneto and Piedmont regions, where diet was fairly similar to the diet in France, at least for poorer sections of the population. The seasonal nature of the migration was also decisive in preventing migrants from setting up Italian restaurants. They were not interested, or were unable, to create a basic socio-cultural fabric similar to the one they had left behind.

Italian immigrants to America, particularly those from northern Italy, established a different pattern. In the first place, migration was more structured. Often, migrants had no intention of returning to Italy; they left their home in order to build a new life overseas. Italian communities in the Americas tended to organize in a stable manner and provide Italian cultural and socializing mechanisms for themselves. They set up churches for regular attendance, shops, traditional holidays as well as
Inns and then restaurants. The trend to recreate compact, structured communities was followed in both North and South America, although in South America the communities were mainly rural and in the USA Italians tended to congregate in big cities. In New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, San Francisco and Buffalo, different versions of a “Little Italy” sprang up. These Italian neighborhoods fulfilled the need for a safeguard in a strange land with new laws and customs, a foreign language and where the food was unfamiliar and thus not liked. It was almost natural to try to recreate the flavor of Italy, if not of home itself, given that gastronomic traditions vary considerably from region to region over Italy. The somewhat paradoxical result was a fusion of Italian regional foods and techniques in the US, which were distinct and did not exist in Italy, into a national version of mixed Italian cuisines. This involuntary gastronomic syncretism was at its height in the 1890s, when Italian migration to the USA came increasingly from southern regions. Italian cookery in the USA therefore became indissolubly linked with foods from Campania, Sicily, Calabria, Abruzzo and Puglia. The best-known products were pizza and dry pasta, which were practically unknown in other regions of Italy. Although in the rest of the country, butter and lard were the main fats, it was olive oil as a product of the south that became best known in America. In this process, Italian restaurants in the USA played a key role. They were often set up, to feed Italian immigrants or supply ingredients and typical foods such as pasta, oil and wine. But they soon became popular with all sections of the population, thanks to the widespread interest in the exotic in American and British society. From the early years of the 20th century, Italian restaurants in the USA were ever more successful. The first pizzeria was opened in Manhattan in 1905 and from that time on, catering and restaurants, particularly the production and sale of pizzas, were a typical activity for Italian immigrants in America.

The history of Chinese restaurants in the West is very different from the history of Italian restaurants. It is likely that the first inexpensive Chinese restaurants targeted Chinese clientele, but they rapidly became popular with other groups. Demand in Europe and America exploded as soon as the restaurants stopped being places of luxury. This success led to a proliferation of Chinese eateries, and also involved emigrants from the Far East, especially South-East Asia. The fame of Chinese cuisine spread abroad well before the large flows of emigration out of China. The first Chinatowns in Europe grew at the beginning of the 20th Century, whereas large-scale migration occurred only at the end of the 1980s and beginning of the 1990s. But Chinese restaurants were to be found in big European and American cities from the 1960s. These were often high-class establishments targeting a rich clientele in search of novel gastronomic and cultural experiences. When mass migration to the West started, the situation altered, making Chinese food less expensive and accessible to everyone. The popularity of Chinese cuisine made restaurants a growth area, and they became one of the most important sectors for Chinese immigrants. In a sense, luxury became more democratic. Restaurants had previously been accessible only to the rich, but opened up to other levels of society in the 1980s and 1990s. Chinese restaurants became an inexpensive option for the less well off to try out new exotic dishes. The spread of Chinese take-away restaurants made the cuisine even more popular and the cultural emotional connotations that had made it successful earlier almost disappeared. Certain Chinese dishes today are part of the food experience of almost every European and American citizen.

Catering and restaurants for Muslims follow yet another trajectory, and the case of kebab houses is particularly interesting. The spread of kebab houses is linked to the increasing numbers of immigrants from various parts of the Muslim world. Muslim precepts on food and eating are of course extremely strict, and migrants often found it hard to find Halal foods in their destination country. While numbers were limited, there were individual solutions to the problem. But in the 1960s, the great westward flow started from Turkey, mainly towards Germany. A traditional dish for Turks had always been the donor kebab, and it was natural to open kebab houses targeting exclusively Turkish customers.

In this case as well, kebabs became popular with non-Turkish emigrant customers. Kebab houses, which were often kiosks, spread rapidly over Germany at the end of the 1970s. Therefore, when higher numbers of emigrants started arriving in Europe from the Maghreb and other parts of the Middle East, kebabs became the simplest and cheapest solution to finding Halal food. Few alternatives were available. Note that donor kebab for these new emigrants is not a typical dish; it is typically found in urban areas, in the Suk markets of the Eastern Mediterranean. Northern African peoples, as well as other Muslims around the world, traditionally eat lamb and mutton cooked in various other ways- not cooked as a doner kebab.

The success of the Turkish specialty especially in Germany was due to the large scale of Turkish and Slav Muslim emigration in the 1960s and 1970s. This process also created the conditions for a rapid growth in managerial organization. In the 1990s, there was a sort of “McDonaldization” of the kebab house and a limited number of franchises spread out all over Europe from Germany. Rising numbers of Turkish immigrants to Europe soon created demand in countries like Italy where such tastes and requirements had previously been relatively small.

Kebab houses are an unusual case of ethnic cuisine. In Europe and America, kebabs are almost exclusively commercially produced and are eaten by Muslims and non-Muslims alike. The clientele is still mainly Muslim, but non-Muslims, sometimes regular customers, account for a large share of demand. Kebabs tend to be consumed by younger people in informal settings and like Chinese food they have become an inexpensive and different type of food.
found a new food model in Germany but also adapted to their own needs is truly enlightening. We have seen how large-scale migration generates unforeseen effects on the gastronomy of migrating and host populations alike. As well as cultural and social elements, objective factors such as availability of ingredients and raw materials play a key role. There is in essence a process of hybridization through which immigrants’ food takes on local characteristics of the destination, which may differ widely from the home country. These adaptations meet the need to conform to the average taste of the host country or the need to rationalize or standardize traditionally artisan products, such as the kebab. They may also be transitions in the way a food is consumed. The final result is that around the world today we find Italian, Chinese and Turkish cuisine, which is radically different from the food in Italy, China and Turkey. The new Chinese restaurants with pizza on the menu and the kebab houses with pizzerias are the most recent frontier of this reciprocal ‘contamination’ that is becoming increasingly common in Italy and the rest of Europe.²⁰

These “split identity” restaurants show how pizza, Chinese food and kebabs have lost their “ethnic” dimension. They have become international dishes almost completely loose of the ties to a country or tradition. Many Americans, perhaps quite rightly, believe that pizza is an American dish and kebabs one of the main food products of Germany. The hybridization of cuisines is almost inevitable within global society and America represents the place where this is mostly evident. It is probably not by chance that the culinary multiculturalism that is in America is a reflection on the origins of the food.²¹ It is probably also possible to affirm that American food has more history than any other, only because its history is the history of all of the foods from the world…

The beginning of this paper stated that food is like a language, an instrument of communication and identity. The cases we discussed show that the element of communication is perhaps stronger, but the outcome of migration is the creation of new food identities which in their turn will be subject to meeting up with new cultures and traditions, as has always happened when groups of people are on the move.
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The World History Association is a community of scholars, teachers, and students who are passionately committed to the study of the history of the human community across regional, cultural, and political boundaries.

The 2014 World History Association Conference, co-sponsored by the University of Costa Rica, offers a wonderful opportunity to commune with an international community of world history scholars and teachers. The conference will be held at the Costa Rica Marriott Hotel San Jose, a beautiful colonial hacienda set on a 30 acre coffee plantation. Conference registration fee includes coffee breaks and two evening receptions. The conference venue, also the official conference hotel, will provide a wonderful backdrop to reconnect with colleagues from around the globe.

ACCOMMODATIONS
The Costa Rica Marriott Hotel San Jose offers unique architecture, deluxe accommodations, free high-speed wireless access, fitness center, outdoor pools, a golf driving range, fitness trails, four restaurants on-site, with others nearby, and includes breakfast. Special discounted rates available for registered conferees. Located only 4 miles from the airport and a short cab ride to the city center.

For more information about the WHA and to register for the conference, visit www.thewha.org.

San Jose, Costa Rica | July 16-18, 2014
Conference Themes:
“Latin America in World History”
and
“The Environment in World History”

WHY SHOULD YOU ATTEND?
• Cutting edge pedagogy
• Excellent keynote speaker
• A wide variety of panels, roundtables, and individual presentations
• Attendance by top scholars in the field
• Bridges the gap between K-12 teaching and scholarly work
• An opportunity to meet world history teachers and scholars from around the globe
• Refreshment breaks, opening reception, and closing reception included with registration
• CE graduate credit available
• Pre-conference tours of San Jose, Costa Rica
• Post-conference tours of surrounding areas
• Join a welcoming, collegial group of world history teachers and scholars for 3 days of scholarly presentations and social events

World History Association, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, 2530 Dole Street, SAK A-203, Honolulu, HI 96822-2383 USA
**This includes a complimentary one-year membership to the World History Association. However, if you wish to take advantage of the lower member rates, please consider joining or renewing your membership to the WHA by filling out your contact information above and the appropriate registration category below. The non-member conference rates also apply to retired, non-employed, and students conferees who are not current members.**

**GUEST EVENT PASS (For evening social events only. Must be accompanied by a registered conferee.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early up to 2/28/14</th>
<th>Regular 3/01/14-5/14/14</th>
<th>Late 5/15/14 &amp; after</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guest Pass</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>USD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members who reside outside the U.S., Canada, and Mexico, please add a $20 per year mail surcharge for publication shipping.
The official conference hotel, the Costa Rica Marriott Hotel San Jose, will also be the conference venue. Special rates for WHA conferees will be offered from July 13-20, 2014 with the possibility of extensions before and after the conference on a space-available basis.

Please note: • All conferees are required to make their own hotel reservations. 
• The WHA Discount Rate Code will be emailed to you once you register for the conference. 
• Please make your reservations early as discounted rooms are limited. 
• Rooms are offered on a first-come, first-served basis, and there is no guarantee that more rooms will be available at the discounted rate once our block has been reserved.

A NOTE TO CONFEREES

To keep registration fees and room rates affordable we request that you make your hotel reservations at our contracted hotel, the Costa Rica Marriott Hotel San Jose. The WHA is committed to a contractual obligation in order to bring the room rate below the normal rate. If you stay at a hotel other than the official hotel we may fall short of our housing obligations and will be financially responsible for any unfulfilled rooms. Thank you for this additional support.

ACCOMMODATIONS INFORMATION

OFFICIAL CONFERENCE HOTEL

Costa Rica Marriott Hotel San Jose
Heredia, Costa Rica
Phone: 888-236-2427 or 506-2298-0000

The Costa Rica Marriott San Jose offers unique colonial architecture and deluxe accommodations. Special discounted rates for registered conferees includes breakfast buffet. Located only 3 miles from the airport, and a short cab ride to the city center. You will receive a direct online link to hotel that includes the WHA discount code when you register for the conference. Rooms at the special conference rate are limited so make your reservations early. General information about the hotel is available here: www.marriott.com/hotels/hotel-information/travel/sjocr-costa-rica-marriott-hotel-san-jose/.

Rates: $138 per night for single occupancy; $152 per night for double occupancy; $26 per night per person (up to 2 additional people) Plus 13% hotel tax

By Costa Rican law a housekeeping fee and a bellman’s fee are not included in the hotel charge. These additional fees will be $2 USD per day for housekeeping and a bellman’s fee of $5 for check-in/check-out are additional and will be charged to your room.

• Breakfast buffet included
• Free WiFi access in rooms & conference area
• Business center
• Outdoor swimming pools
• Fitness center
• Jogging/fitness trails, tennis, golf driving range

ALTERNATE ACCOMMODATIONS

Courtyard San Jose Escazu
San Jose, Costa Rica
Phone: 888-236-2427 or 506-2208-3000

This alternative hotel is not an official conference hotel so no discount code is required.

We also suggest checking www.Hotels.com or www.TripAdvisor.com for other reasonably priced accommodations.

www.marriott.com/hotels/travel/sjocy-courtyard-san-jose-escazu/

Please check the WHA website at www.thewha.org for periodic updates and the Conference Program.
Three days of pre-conference tours will be scheduled in and around San Jose. Longer post-conference tours to sites along the coast are also planned. For more information, please check the official tour company’s website: www.travelexcellence.com/wha2014/.

Pre-Conference Tours | July 14-16, 2014
Tour 1 - San Luis Canopy - July 14
Tour 2 - Pacuare River White Water Rafting - July 14
Tour 3 - Doka Coffee, Poas Volcano, La Paz Waterfall - July 15
Tour 4 - Discovering San Jose City - July 16

Three-Day Post-Conference Tours | July 19-21, 2014
Tour 5 - Adventure in Arenal
Tour 6 - Adventure in Manuel Antonio
Tour 7 - Adventure in Monteverde
Tour 8 - Adventure in Pacuare River
Tour 9 - Adventure in Torugruero

One-Week Post-Conference Tours
Tour 10 - Costa Rica: A Bit of Everything | July 19-26
Tour 11 - Costa Rica Two Waves | July 19-25
Tour 12 - Volcano, Mountain, Beach Adventure | July 19-26

Valid passport required and either a round-trip ticket or proof of onward travel to another country required.

For those traveling from the U.S., Canada, or most European countries, no travel visas are required. For those arriving from other countries, please check with your local consulate for visa requirements.

Departure tax of $29 USD may be paid in advance through our official travel agent to avoid potentially long lines at the airport. Check the Travel Excellence website: www.travelexcellence.com/wha2014/, under Transfers for Departure Tax. The departure tax may also be paid through the front desk at your hotel.

The most authoritative and up-to-date information on Costa Rican entry and exit requirements may be obtained from the Consular Section of the Embassy of Costa Rica at 2114 “S” Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20008, telephone (202) 480-2200, or visit the website for the Embassy of Costa Rica: www.costarica-embassy.org. You may also obtain information from the Costa Rican consulates in Atlanta, Houston, Los Angeles, Miami, New York, or the honorary consulates in Minnesota and Arizona.

Additional information and extended FAQs can be found here: Costa Rica Conference Information & FAQs

Please check the WHA website at www.thewha.org for periodic updates and the Conference Program.
Many of the papers discussed whether cross-border or regional histories could always be studied as part of world histories. Ranabir Chakravarti of Jawharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India, ploed for a de-centering of Indian Ocean history from the twin shackles of the meta-histories of the nation-state and of restrictive regional histories by citing an absence of the nation-state in the Indian Ocean in the pre-1500 period. Reiterating the need for a different lens to study Indian Ocean history in the pre-1500 period, Chakravarti argued that although the Indian Ocean in the post 1500 period is studied by using approaches such as connected histories, a better idea would be to use the notion of braided histories to investigate the period before 1500. Suchandra Ghosh of Calcutta University, Kolkata, India, by contrast, highlighted the regional history of a universal religion, Buddhism, in a maritime space - the Isthmus of Kra - and mused whether the isthmus can be considered a site for world history in the ancient period. Amelia Polonia of the University of Porto concentrated on tidal currents, tigers, snakes and crocodiles menace this salt and freshwater estuary. A historic site of numerous conflicts between the Mughals, the Portuguese, the Arakanese and local kings, the Sunderbans contains countless estuarine port-towns, sites of global flows. It is home to some of the mightiest rivers of Asia. Around 400 interconnected tidal rivers flow through its 200 islands of mangrove forests among which the Matla River, on which we based ourselves, is one of the largest. This hint of the ozone, the intermingling of the saltwater with freshwater, was particularly apposite as the meeting opened with an overview of oceanic history as world history. Taking specific instances of histories of the Atlantic, the Pacific and the Mediterranean, Michael Pearson (Emeritus, University of New South Wales, Australia) opened the meeting by interrogating a history of the sea as world history, where the global approach, so far useful for geographers rather than the world systems approach, would also shed light on the new project towards writing a world history. Significantly, Pearson ended by bringing up the problems of writing a global history of oceans, taking the Pacific Ocean as an example, and rejected the category of the ocean as a universal template for world history.

Connections of a seemingly timeless and frozen space formed the nub of Rajesh’s paper. The rise of Tibet in the pre-Buddhist period was mainly due to the martial capabilities of the bonpo warriors following the pre-Buddhist Bon religion, something that never figures into world historical accounts. Rajesh also argued that recent exercises to identify ‘zomia’ as a non-state region are problematic in the Tibetan context as the Khampas of Eastern Tibet who are identified with zomia were one of the most vociferous supporters of the Dalai Lama’s state.

The discussion moved on in subsequent days to ways of constructing the world. J.-F. Salles of the Maison de l’Orient Mediterranée, Lyon, began with a description of world history in antiquity, noting that while the ‘world’ doesn’t appear in the earliest global book, the Bible, the idea of humanity does appear as a form of shared labour. Stressing exchanges in the early period, Salles saw a shift towards world history in Antiquity as the norms for writing history changed radically after Christ. Salles traced the shift from the world-view of the Greeks to the more limited worldview of the Romans, a narrower history that predominated in medieval Europe being inaugurated during the Roman period. Radhika Seshan from the University of Pune, India also engaged with the Alexandrine worldview and explored how the early European travelers such as Marco Polo, Nicolo di Conti and Varthema represented India, in the process of constructing a history of the world where India was substituted for Asia. This process ultimately culminated in an ideology of difference, which is now entrenched in historical discourse. Urvik Mukhopadhyay from the West Bengal State University tested another dominant discourse: the ideal of an Islamic city as world-historical category and its prevalence in different parts of the world as a historical reality. Mukhopadhyay questioned this ideal as template for world history. Taking as a point of departure the works of established Islamist scholars, she found that the ideal Islamic city with a precise and seemingly pre-ordained layout of mosque, market, madrasa and fort remained largely confined to the North African prototype and was therefore
inapplicable as a world historical model. Mukhopadhyay concluded that the idea of writing world history through the notion of unity and of shared urbanity by taking up the case of the Islamic city as model is not viable. Milinda Banerjee of Presidency University, Kolkata, also questioned world historical categories such as humanism and universalism in constructing a world history. The nineteenth century Bengali reformer Raja Ram Mohan Roy’s engagement with Persian, and not English, was seen to be a wider window to the world of his time. Banerjee interrogated Roy’s personality and situational context to understand how far the main currents of world history shaped his idea of eclecticism, emphasizing Pomeranz’s notion of aggregation since Roy synthesized many different currents. The influences shaping Roy were examined and it was posed whether he was skeptical of global and local history. Banerjee concluded that Roy’s exercise can be seen as an exemplar of engaging with world history and thus offers possibilities to be re-read in newer ways. However, Banerjee asked: is the cross-cultural always global?

Rila Mukherjee, Institut de Chandernagor, in her summarizing up noted that world history cannot obviously be the history of the world. Bentley’s idea of the world history as not covering the history of the world is valid and the problem needs to be pegged at the points of reference. Yet, text books in India point to a narrow view of the world and a definition of world history is yet to be satisfactorily attempted. So what constitutes a global or world history? Mukherjee felt that since the two terms were used interchangeably throughout the meeting, it was important to question their lineages and understand their construction in the twentieth century. Tracing the shifts from universal histories and encyclopedias to the Annales project of total history, Mukherjee pointed out that global history has had two meanings: in the French sense it is seen as the successor to total history, while in the American and English sense it is synonymous with world history. Foucault was against global history because, according to him, history is thereby brought into a pre-determined future, and he preferred a histoire generale instead, but Foucault’s critique of global history and the alternative he suggested was not sufficiently explored. Dirlik’s critique of world history was debated and it was felt that the major criticism against a world historical approach is the death of distance. So space and time become important components in writing a world history. Braudel’s writing raises the question of how far sea space is central to political imaginaries. The question is whether world history is becoming the new regional history? Engaging with Chakravarti and Ghosh, Mukherjee felt many newer possibilities, which are revealed by the region and promise to be truly transhistorical, could emerge in the writing of a world history in the future. However, a problem remains. Large-scale generalizations are essential to a world historical approach but are modified in light of new research, leading to the centrality of the region and local networks. One such example is the now-debunked notion of luxury goods underpinning Roman trade with India, as pointed out by Chakravarti. But the question of diverse regions remains, just as the problem of ‘time’ in world history continues to linger. How do we solve these? While scale, typicality, aggregation and capacity for abstraction remain the four points of reference in writing a world history, Mukherjee pointed out, in response to Banerjee’s paper, that universal categories can and do change over time, bringing in Michel de Certeau as example.

Beginning with the keynote, what was visible was a certain ambivalence about the term ‘world’ history. The difference between ‘world’, ‘global’, ‘regional’, and ‘local’ were considered by most of the presenters, and there was generally a consensus about the problems inherent in the historiography of the use of the terms themselves. Are the cross-cultural and the transregional/transnational always global? On the whole, what was clear was that the entire workshop was as much concerned with problematising world history as it was with the ways of writing world history.

One question that was not asked directly, but was part and parcel of many of the papers was, should it be ‘world history’ or ‘world histories’? To this would have to be added the ways in which the world has been conceived of over time; in other words, the spatio-temporal dimensions of the idea of ‘the world’, and how these have been delineated in historiography. Traditionally, the ‘world’ has been the inhabited world; but what of the oceanic spaces, or the deserts, which, if nothing else, have to be traversed, in order to get from one inhabited area to another? Are these worlds in themselves, or are they merely spaces to be crossed to get to spaces?’

The proceedings will be published in the Asian Review of World Histories as a special issue in 2015.

**Vietnam in World History**

Marc Jason Gilbert
Hawawii Pacific University

An international symposium titled ‘Vietnam in World History’ sponsored by the World History Association, the Vietnam History Association and host Vietnam National University-Hanoi University of Social Sciences and Humanities, was held on December 28-31, 2013. This symposium was the result of two years of planning by Hawaii Pacific University’s NEH Chair in World History, Marc Jason Gilbert, whose presidency of the WHA was critical in obtaining the support of its Vietnamese host. The on-site presence of WHA Executive Director Winston Welch insured that the program ran smoothly and the receptions, housing and travel arrangements were exceptional. At the host university’s request, Gilbert gave a workshop in world history for 350 secondary school teachers drawn from every province of Vietnam on the morning before the conference. Leading Vietnamese historians joined in later sessions devoted to examining the relevance of world history for Vietnamese students. The symposium attracted papers from 80 international scholars, who offered new perspectives on ancient civilizations, maritime trade, the Cold War, colonialism, and globalization, among other subjects. The symposium closed with a workshop-focused panel for university instructors that was attended by 30 Vietnamese faculty. Future world history conferences at Vietnam National University-Hanoi University of Social Sciences and Humanities are planned. Interested parties can contact Gilbert at mgilbert@hpu.edu for further information.
Executive Council Members and Officers Update

The beginning of January marked the end of office for three Executive Council members and the start for others. WHA sincerely thanks Merry Wiesner-Hanks, Alan Karras, and Paul Jentz for their dedicated service over the last three years as Executive Council members. We appreciate their time and opinions to direct the affairs of the WHA as it changes to new realities.

Merry continues to serve on the WHA Bentley Book Prize Committee, and Paul continues to serve in his role as WHA Conference Committee Chair. Thank you to Merry, Alan, and Paul for your service to the WHA!

WHA was truly fortunate to have so many great people willing to stand in the elections in the Fall of 2013 for new three-year term members of the Executive Council to replace those whose terms had ended. Grace Chee, Bram Hubble, and Michele Louro were elected to three year terms, while Denis Gainty was elected to serve out the remainder of Maryanne Rhett’s term, who was elected as Secretary for the next two years. We sincerely thank Kerry Ward, who so well-served the WHA as Secretary these last four years.

Our incomparable Carolyn Neel was reelected Treasurer, and Rick Warner was elected to Vice-President/President Elect. Finally, Marc Jason Gilbert’s term as President came to a close after two very busy years filled with WHA matters. The entire WHA community owes a special thanks to Marc for his dedication to the association and the enormous amount of time and effort he put forth these last two years.

The Office of President is now in the very good hands of Craig Benjamin from Grand Valley State University, who will lead a devoted group of volunteer members and the WHA into the next two years.

All of the good people above represent the best that the WHA members are, and are the heart of a vibrant, volunteer-led community. For all those who have served or will serve on the EC, its publications, conferences, and the WHA Committees, the WHA membership thanks you!

--Winston Welch
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Free Workshops on Teaching About Islam & World History

Georgetown University’s Alwaleed Bin Talal Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding offers teacher workshops at no cost to school districts, community colleges, university outreach centers, private schools, civic organizations and other institutions in the US and Canada. Schedule a customized workshop program selecting from nine interdisciplinary content modules, including:

- Basic Islamic beliefs and practices
- World religions in history and geography
- Cultural exchange in art and sciences
- Geography and demographics of the Muslim world
- Contemporary hot-button issues

Attendees receive handouts, access to extensive teaching resources, and certificates of attendance. Lunch is provided for full-day workshops. Workshops are conducted by ACMCU Education Consultant Susan Douglass, who draws on over 20 years of expertise in history education, curriculum design, and teacher training.

For details and registration visit: http://acmcu.georgetown.edu/workshops/
or e-mail SusanD@cmcuworkshops.net
Call for Submissions

Special issue of the
World History Bulletin

Indigenous and World Histories

The World History Bulletin is accepting submissions for a forthcoming issue focusing on “indigenous and world histories” under the guest editorship of Paul Jentz (North Hennepin Community College). Authors may consider all aspects of historical scholarship, including research, pedagogy, or theory. Course syllabi with commentary on teaching comparative genocides or genocide in world history are especially desirable. Interested authors should contact Paul Jentz at pjentz@nhcc.edu.

Authors should keep in mind that the World History Bulletin’s audience is composed of specialists in a diverse range of historical fields and periods, in addition to K-12 teachers. Thus, articles should be made as clear and accessible as possible for this diverse readership. The World History Bulletin publishes articles of varying lengths; although submissions between 500 and 5,000 words will be considered, we are especially interested in contributions of 1,500-3,500 words. The deadline for submissions is July 30, 2014.
Call for Submissions

Special issue of the

World History Bulletin

Empire and The Great War

The World History Bulletin is accepting submissions, under the guest editorship of Dhara Anjaria, for a forthcoming issue (Spring 2015) on European colonial empires. To mark the centenary of the Great War (1914-1918), submissions revolving around Empire and the Great War are especially welcomed. Themes include, but are not limited to, colonial engagement with the war, the impact of the war on imperial geopolitics, and post war treaties and imperialism. Submissions should be sent to Dhara Anjaria at dhara.anjaria@gmail.com

Authors should keep in mind that the World History Bulletin’s audience is composed of specialists in a diverse range of historical fields and periods, in addition to K-12 teachers. Thus, articles should be made as clear and accessible as possible for this diverse readership. The World History Bulletin publishes articles of varying lengths; although submissions between 500 and 5,000 words will be considered, we are especially interested in contributions of 1,500-3,500 words. The deadline for submissions is August 30, 2014.
NEW, RECENT, AND FORTHCOMING from Oxford

FRAMEWORKS OF WORLD HISTORY
Networks, Hierarchies, Culture
Stephen Morillo
2013
Combined Volume 976 pp. paper $67.95
Volume One: To 1550 536 pp. paper $49.95
Volume Two: Since 1350 592 pp. paper $49.95

PATTERNS OF WORLD HISTORY
Brief Edition
Peter von Sivers, Charles A. Desnoyers, and George B. Stow
2012
Combined Volume 960 pp. paper $67.95
Volume One: To 1600 636 pp. paper $49.95
Volume Two: Since 1400 576 pp. paper $49.95

THE CULTURES OF THE WEST
A History
Clifford R. Backman
2012
Combined Volume 960 pp. paper $59.95
Volume One: To 1750 448 pp. paper $39.95
Volume Two: Since 1350 496 pp. paper $39.95

THE OXFORD MAP COMPANION
One Hundred Sources in World History
Patricia Seed
2013 272 pp. paper $29.95

THE WORLDS OF MEDIEVAL EUROPE
Third Edition
Clifford R. Backman
June 2014 624 pp. paper $54.95

FRANCE AND ITS EMPIRE SINCE 1870
Second Edition
Alice L. Conklin, Robert Zaretsky, and Sarah Fishman
June 2014 512 pp. paper $54.95

MENDOZA THE JEW
Boxing, Manliness, and Nationalism
A Graphic History
Ronald Schechter and Liz Clarke
2013 240 pp. paper $19.95

THE WORLD TRANSFORMED 1945 to the Present
Michael H. Hunt
2013 512 pp. paper $39.95

THE WORLD TRANSFORMED 1945 to the Present
A Documentary Reader
Second Edition
Michael H. Hunt
June 2014 350 pp. paper $29.95

THE VIETNAM WAR
An International History in Documents
Mark Atwood Lawrence
2014 240 pp. paper $24.95

A MODERN HISTORY OF JAPAN
From Tokugawa Times to the Present
Third Edition
Andrew Gordon
2013 432 pp. paper $49.95

THE MODERN MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA
A History in Documents
Julia Clancy-Smith and Charles Smith
(Pages from History)
2013 352 pp. paper $39.95

THE STRUCTURE OF SOVIET HISTORY
Essays and Documents
Second Edition
Ronald Grigor Suny
2013 752 pp. paper $54.95

TRANSATLANTIC AFRICA 1440–1888
Kwasi Konadu
(African World Histories)
March 2014 176 pp. paper $16.95

AFRICANIZING DEMOCRACIES 1980–Present
Alicia Decker and Andrea Arrington
(African World Histories)
March 2014 128 pp. paper $16.95

To find out more, or for the fastest way to request an examination copy, visit us at www.oup.com/us/he.
For other questions or suggestions, please contact 800.280.0280.
Join the World History Association

Membership information available at thewha.org

The World History Bulletin appears twice a year.

Future Issues

Fall 2014: Indigenous and World Histories
Spring 2015: Empire and The Great War