

Department of Sociology
University of Toronto
SOC397H1S – New Topics in Sociology
Sociology of Atrocities
Winter 2020
Class time: Thursday, 10am-12pm, SS1073
Professor Ron Levi

email: ron.levi@utoronto.ca

twitter: @ronleviutoronto

Office Hours: Th, 1pm-2pm, Munk School of Global Affairs & Public Policy, Observatory Room 213

TA: Ioana Sendroiu, ioana.sendroiu@mail.utoronto.ca

SCOPE AND AIMS

This course focuses on the sociology of atrocities. We focus on the range of social actors and processes involved when atrocities occur, how we identify, name, and respond to atrocities (such as genocide or crimes against humanity), the behavior of bystanders and intervenors, cultural trauma and the effects of atrocities, and processes of commemoration. We investigate the collective and social dynamics to try and explain the role of individuals, groups, and institutional actors in committing atrocities, including the role of group identities, bureaucracies, collective decision-making, shared repertoires, legacies of hate, and peer networks. We study the role of institutional actors – in particular legal institutions, but also humanitarian bodies, journalists, and others – in identifying, naming and sometimes responding to these atrocities, along with sociological evidence about how they do so and the efficacy of any such response. We include sociological research on bystanders and on those who intervene to save or protect those at risk. Finally, we attend to the lasting effects of atrocities, including health, collective memory, cultural trauma, and commemoration. Throughout the course, we rely on a range of materials and cases, including social science research, legal materials, testimonies, official documents and media accounts.

PREREQUISITES

1.0 SOC FCE at the 200+ level. Students without these prerequisites will be removed at any time discovered and without notice.

READINGS

Readings are listed on the syllabus, and available on Quercus.

EVALUATION

<u>Description</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Date(s) Due</u>	<u>Weight</u>
Discussion Posts	75-100 words, see below	Weekly, First post due January 16, 2020	15%
Stretching and Studying	Connections between readings	Twice during term	5%
Term Test	Short essays with prompted questions	13 February 2020, submitted on Quercus	22%

Reflection Assignment	Short essays in reaction to external readings provided in advance.	19 March 2020, submitted on Quercus	33%
Final Test	At home final timed test during class time on Quercus, short answers.	2 April 2020	25%

Handing in Assignments

Assignments must be submitted on Quercus by 10:10am on the due date specified above. Papers submitted on the due date after 10:10am will be subject to a late penalty as outlined below.

All assignments must be handed in electronically via Quercus. The instructor and TA will not accept electronic copies of assignments via email. Do not submit assignments in hard copy, or put submissions under the office door of the instructor; the instructor is not responsible for student assignments submitted in this way. Students are encouraged to always keep an extra copy of their assignment for their own records.

Discussion Board and Reading Connections (20%)

Traditional forms of communication are changing. While you are encouraged to ask questions in class, we will rely on a discussion board to help stimulate discussion and keep students engaged. The first post will be due on **January 16, 2020**.

How does this work? By midnight on the night before each lecture, students must submit one post on the Quercus discussion board. Your post should raise something you learned from the reading, a question raised by the reading, something you found intriguing or simplistic; or a connection between the reading and a current event. Think of this as an interesting idea, maybe something you would see on Twitter.

Each discussion post is worth 1.5%. Since there are eleven weeks of material available for commentary (weeks 2 through 12 of the course), to get full points you submit comments on 10 weeks of material. Each post should be no more than 100 words. Be concise!

For “reading connections,” the idea is to help you prepare for your assignments by comparing two weeks of readings in each submission, in note form. We will provide you 2.5 points for each of these submissions, for two submissions (total of 5%).

Term Test and Final Test

The term test will be completed at home, and submitted on Quercus. It is due on 13 February. The final test will be completed during class time.

Reflection Assignment

The Reflection Assignment is designed to have you extend what you learn from the course to a new source of information. Rather than asking for new research, I will provide you with material to read, such as human rights reports, and ask you essay questions.

Procedures and Rules

Missed assignments

Students who miss an assignment will receive a mark of zero; UNLESS within 48 hours (two days) of the missed assignment, students give their TA a written request for special consideration which explains why the assignment was missed, accompanied by proper documentation as below.

Make-up tests

Students who miss a test will receive a mark of zero. Students who miss a test for reasons beyond their control may, no later than one week after the missed test, submit to the TA a written request for special consideration) which explains why the test was missed, accompanied by proper documentation as below. A request should be accompanied by contact information (the student's telephone number and email address) so the date, time and place of a make-up test can be communicated to the student. A student who misses a test and the subsequent make-up test for a valid reason will not have a third chance to take the test. Instead, the grade assigned for the missed test will be the same as the grade the student earns for the other test in this course. It is important to note that a student who misses a term test cannot claim that as grounds (i.e. no term work was returned before the drop date) for a successful late withdrawal petition.

Required documentation if you miss a test or assignment deadline:

- In case of illness, you must supply a doctor's note OR a completed Verification of Student Illness or Injury form, available at <https://illnessverification.utoronto.ca>. These should include the start and anticipated end date of the illness.
- If a personal or family crisis prevents you from meeting a deadline, you should contact your college registrar as soon as possible, and we will comply with their recommended accommodations.

Missed Assignments

To request accommodation for a **late assignment** you must present your case to the TA via email.

- In order not to be considered late, assignments must be submitted by the due date on the syllabus via Quercus.
- You are expected to keep a back-up copy of your assignment in case it is lost.
- For lateness *beyond your control*, the documentation must indicate that you were unable to engage in school work *on the due date of the assignment* for a ONE day extension. For a longer extension you must prove that you were unable to engage in school work for a longer period or prove an exceptional, unforeseen circumstance. In the unlikely event that your documentation indicates that you are too ill to make-up an assignment within the term, you must petition the office of the registrar for an extension of time to complete term work.
- Late assignments for reasons that are *within your control* will be penalized **5%** of the assignment marks per day. The penalty will run from the day the assignment was due until the day it is submitted via Quercus. The penalty period does include weekends and holidays. Assignments that are more than 5 days late will not be accepted.

Grade appeals

Instructors and teaching assistants take the marking of assignments very seriously, and will work diligently to be fair, consistent, and accurate. Nonetheless, mistakes and oversights occasionally happen. If you believe that to be the case, you must adhere to the following rules:

- If it is a mathematical error simply alert the TA of the error.

- In the case of more substantive appeals, you must:
 1. Wait at least 24 hours after receiving your mark.
 2. Carefully re-read your assignment, all assignment guidelines and marking schemes and the grader's comments.
 3. You have up to one month from the date of return of the item to inquire about the mark beyond the course instructor. In order to meet this deadline, you must inquire about the mark with your instructor no longer than 15 days after receiving your mark. If you are not satisfied with the instructor's re-evaluation, you may appeal to the Associate Chair, if the term work is worth at least 20% of the course mark. If your work is remarked, you must accept the resulting mark.

If you wish to appeal:

- A. You must submit to the instructor a written explanation of why you think your mark should be altered. Please note statements such as "I need a higher grade to apply to X" are not compelling. Also, please note that upon re-grade your mark may go down, stay the same, or go up.
- B. Attach to your written explanation your original assignment, including all of the original comments.

Electronic communication and electronic learning technology

Email communication is rapid, convenient, and efficient—and you are encouraged to use it to enhance your learning and experience in the course. With that said, it is essential that you follow a few rules:

- Assignments will not be accepted via email. See above for how to submit them.
- All course communication should be conducted through Quercus or your utoronto account.
- All emails must include the course code (e.g., SOC 123) in the subject line.
- All emails should be signed with the student's full name and student number.
- Emails from students will generally be answered within 72 hours of receipt.
- Treat emails as you would any other professional communication.
- Emails that ask questions that are answered in the course syllabus or website (e.g., "how much is assignment X worth") will not receive a response.

Emails that do not follow these guidelines will not receive a response.

Classroom etiquette

- Students are expected to arrive at class on time and to use laptops only for note-taking or in class polls. Other uses (e.g., emailing, web surfing) will result in the student's being required to turn off the laptop, and not to bring it to future sessions of the course.
- Videotaping and recording lectures is strictly forbidden without written permission from the instructor.

Academic integrity

Cheating and misrepresentation will not be tolerated. Students who commit an academic offence face serious penalties. Avoid plagiarism by citing properly: practices acceptable in high school may prove unacceptable in university. Know where you stand by reading the "Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters" in the Calendar of the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Academic integrity is fundamental to learning and scholarship at the University of Toronto. Participating honestly, respectfully, responsibly, and fairly in this academic community ensures that the U of T degree that you earn will be valued as a true indication of your individual academic achievement, and will continue to receive the respect and recognition it deserves.

Familiarize yourself with the University of Toronto's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm>). It is the rule book for academic behaviour at the U of T, and you are expected to know the rules.

Student resources

Accessibility. If you require accommodations or have any accessibility concerns, please visit <http://studentlife.utoronto.ca/accessibility> as soon as possible.

Mental health and well-being. University can be stressful. If you or someone you know is feeling overwhelmed, depressed, and in need of support, services are available. For a listing of mental health resources available on and off campus, see www.studentlife.utoronto.ca/feeling-distressed

The University of Toronto is committed to equity and respect for diversity. All members of the learning environment in this course should strive to create an atmosphere of mutual respect. As a course instructor, I will neither condone nor tolerate behaviour that undermines the dignity or self-esteem of any individual in this course and wish to be alerted to any attempt to create an intimidating or hostile environment. It is our collective responsibility to create a space that is inclusive and welcomes discussion. Discrimination, harassment and hate speech will not be tolerated.

Readings: Subject to change during the semester.

INTRODUCTION (NO DISCUSSION POST)

Week 1, 9 January 2020

1. Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah. 2015. "How Auschwitz is Misunderstood." *The New York Times*. 24 January.
2. The Economist. 2018. "Never again, and again: Can the world stop genocide?" *The Economist*. 8 December.

PART I: ATROCITY CONCEPTS

Week 2, 16 January 2020

JUSTICE AND THE IDEAL OF CIVILIZATION

1. Harris, Whitney 2006. "Tyranny on Trial: The Trial of the Major German War Criminals at Nuremberg, 1945-46, Address to the American Bar Association." *The International Lawyer*: 7-13.
2. Excerpts from opening statements for the prosecution at the Nuremberg Trials:
 - 2.1 Excerpt from Justice Jackson's Opening Statement for the Prosecution, in *Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal*. Volume II. Proceedings: 11/14/1945-11/30/1945. Nuremberg: IMT, 1947. Pages 3-8, 44-46.
 - 2.2 Michael Marrus. 1997. "Crimes against Humanity" (including the addresses of Hartley Shawcross and François de Menthon). Pp.185-193 in *The Nuremberg War Crimes Trial 1945-46: A Documentary History*. Boston: Bedford.
3. Douglas, Lawrence. 2001. "The Idiom of Judgment: Crimes against Humanity." Pp. 38-64 in *The Memory of Judgment: Making Law and History in the Trials of the Holocaust*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Week 3, 23 January 2020

MAKING A CRIME: GENOCIDE

1. Jones, Adam. 2006. *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Pp.8-23. New York: Routledge.
2. "Genocide", and *Prosecutor v. Akayesu* (1998, International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda), as excerpted in Beth Van Schaack and Ronald C. Slye, eds. 2007. *International Criminal Law and Its Enforcement – Cases and Materials*. New York: Foundation. Pp. 410-420.
3. Card, Claudia. 2003. "Genocide and Social Death." *Hypatia* 18:63-79.
4. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. 2015. *Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future: summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* (Ottawa: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015). Excerpt.

PART II: ATROCITY COMMISSION

Week 4, 30 January 2020

GENOCIDAL PROCESSES: PERPETRATORS AND MICRO-LEVEL EXPLANATIONS

1. Browning, Christopher. 1992. "Ordinary Men." Excerpt at Pp. 84-100 in D. Niewyk, ed., *The Holocaust*.
2. Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah. 1996. "Hitler's Willing Executioners." Excerpt at Pp. 91-103 in D. Niewyk, ed., *The Holocaust*, 3rd ed (2003).
3. Hinton, Alexander Laban. 1998. "Why Did You Kill?: The Cambodian Genocide and the Dark Side of Face and Honor." *Journal of Asian Studies* 57: 93-122.
4. Fujii, Lee Ann. 2008. "The Power of Local Ties: Popular Participation in the Rwandan Genocide." *Security Studies* 17:568-597.

Week 5, 6 February 2020

GENOCIDAL PROCESSES: PERPETRATORS AND MICRO-LEVEL EXPLANATIONS II: IDENTITIES AND CLAIMS, FROM ORDERS AND SOLDIERS TO DESK PERPETRATORS

1. *Prosecutor v. Erdemovic*. 1997. Excerpt. International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.
2. Arendt, Hannah. 1963. Excerpt from *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*.
3. Bryant, Emily, Emily Brooke Schimke, Hollie Nyseth Brehm and Christopher Uggen. 2018. "Techniques of Neutralization and Identity Work Among Accused Genocide Perpetrators." *Social Problems* 65:584–602.

Week 6, 13 February 2020

GENOCIDAL PROCESSES: INSTITUTIONS AND MESO AND MACRO-LEVEL EXPLANATIONS

1. Hilberg, Raul. 1989. "The Bureaucracy of Annihilation." In *Unanswered Questions: Nazi Germany and the Genocide of the Jews*. 119-133.
2. Hagan, John and Wenona Rymond-Richmond. 2008. "The Collective Dynamics of Racial Dehumanization and Genocidal Victimization in Darfur." *American Sociological Review* 73: 875-902.
3. Misser, François & Ives Jaumain. 1994. "Rwanda: Death by Radio." *Index on Censorship* 23:4-5, 72-74.
4. Broch, Ludivine. 2014. "Professionalism in the final solution: French railway workers and the Jewish deportations, 1942-4." *Contemporary European History* 23:359-380.

Optional:

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1989. "The Uniqueness and Normality of the Holocaust." Excerpt at Pp. 82-88 in Neil Levi and Michael Rothberg, eds., *The Holocaust: Theoretical Readings*. Rutgers University Press, 2003.

Straus, Scott. 2007. "What Is the Relationship between Hate Radio and Violence? Rethinking Rwanda's "Radio Machete." *Politics & Society* 35: 609-637.

Luft, Aliza. 2019. "Dehumanization and the Normalization of Violence: It's Not What You Think." *Social Science Research Council, Items Digital Forum*. 21 May.

20 February 2020

READING WEEK, NO CLASS

Week 7, 27 February 2020

GENOCIDAL PROCESSES: RESCUE, CONTESTATION, AND SAVIORS

1. Ignatieff, Michael. 2013. "One Country Saved Its Jews. Were They Just Better People?" *New Republic*.
2. Braun, Robert. 2018. "Minorities and the Clandestine Collective Action Dilemma: The Secret Protection of Jews during the Holocaust." *American Journal of Sociology* 124: 263-308.
3. Fox, Nicole, and Hollie Nyseth Brehm. 2018. "'I Decided to Save Them': Factors That Shaped Participation in Rescue Efforts during Genocide in Rwanda." *Social Forces* 96: 1625-1648.

PART III: SOCIAL CHANGE, CULTURE, AND RECOGNIZING ATROCITIES IN WAR

Week 8, 5 March 2020

ATROCITIES, CODES AND TABOOS IN WAR

1. Jefferson, Catherine. 2014. "Origins of the norm against chemical weapons." *International Affairs* 90: 647-661.
2. Finnemore, Martha. 1999. "Rules of War and Wars of Rules: The International Red Cross and the Restraint of State Violence." Pp. 149-165 in John Boli and George M. Thomas, eds., *Constructing World Culture: International Nongovernmental Organizations Since 1875*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

3. Carpenter, Charli. 2013. "Beware the Killer Robots: Inside the Debate over Autonomous Weapons." *Foreign Affairs*. 3 July.

Week 9, 12 March 2020

THE RECOGNITION OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE ATROCITIES

1. Mackinnon, Catherine. 1994. "Rape, Genocide, and Women's Human Rights." *Harvard Women's Law Journal* 17:5-16.
2. *Prosecutor v. Akayesu* (1998, International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda), as excerpted in Beth Van Schaack and Ronald C. Slye, eds. 2007. *International Criminal Law and Its Enforcement – Cases and Materials*. New York: Foundation. Pp. 470-480.
3. Crawford, Kerry. 2013. "From spoils to weapons: Framing wartime sexual violence." *Gender & Development* 21: 505-517.

Week 10, 19 March 2020

LEGAL INSTITUTIONS AND REAL-TIME JUSTICE?

1. Rubin, Elizabeth. 2006. "If not Peace, then Justice." *New York Times Magazine*. 2 April.
2. Glasius, Marlies. 2009. "'We ourselves, we are part of the functioning': The ICC, victims, and civil society in the Central African Republic." *African Affairs* 108 (430): 49-67.
3. Posner, Eric. 2013. "Assad and the Death of the International Criminal Court." *Slate*. 19 September.
4. Savelsberg, Joachim. 2017. "International Criminal Law as One Response to World Suffering: General Observations and the Case of Darfur." Pp. 361-373 in R. Anderson, ed., *Alleviating World Suffering*. Springer.

Part IV: Reconciliation, Remembrance

Week 11, 26 March 2020

TRUTH AND MEMORY

1. Ignatieff, Michael. 1997. "Digging up the Dead." *New Yorker* 73(34), 84.
2. King, Elisabeth. 2010. "Memory controversies in post-genocide Rwanda: Implications for peacebuilding." *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 5: 293-309.
3. Wojcik, Adrian et al. 2010. "Living on the ashes: Collective representations of Polish-Jewish history among people living in the former Warsaw Ghetto area." *Cities* 27:195-203.
4. Eyerman, Ron. 2019. "Perpetrator Trauma and Collective Guilt: The My Lai Massacre." Pp.167-194 in *Memory, Trauma, and Identity*. Palgrave.

Week 12, 2 April 2020, Final Test