

International Studies Senior Seminar: Confronting Global Hatred  
INTL 485-01  
Macalester College, Fall 2011, 4 Credits

Instructor: Nadya Nedelsky

Time: Mondays 7:00-10:00

Room: Markim Hall 303 (except Sept. 19th, Oct. 17th, and Nov. 21<sup>st</sup>; these dates we will meet in Carnegie 404 or another agreed-upon place)

Office: Carnegie 413

Phone: x6479

Office hours: Mondays, 2:30-4:00, and Fridays 10:00-11:00

Hatred, broadly defined as the capacity of human beings for cruel destructiveness toward one another, defies easy understanding and has been a disruptive and galvanizing force since the formation of human societies. Where does it come from? Can its deadly cycles be broken? While hatred is not new, the human potential to harm and destroy has vastly increased over the past century alongside the development of the technologies of weaponry, communication, and travel. With no community immune to its devastations, confronting hatred is more necessary than ever.

Drawing on various fields of study, this course approaches hatred from three interrelated angles. The first is the internal world, the mind, of the hater. We ask, is there something in human nature, our genetic structure, and/or our instincts that predisposes us to hate? Do certain personalities or constellations of passions make some people more prone to hate than others? What motivates the hater, and how does he or she perceive and respond to the external world? This link between the internal and external worlds brings us to the second angle of inquiry: what role do history, culture, ideology, political and social structures, religion, and group psychology play in producing hatred/cruel aggression? What can we learn from psychological experiments, and what can we learn from genocides, ethnic cleansings, mass aggression and terrorism of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries? And finally, from our third angle we seek to apply the knowledge gained from the first two, asking, how might we prevent hatred, or break its deadly cycles?

Texts:

- Daniel Chirot and Clark McCauley, *Why Not Kill Them All? The Logic and Prevention of Mass Political Murder*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Erich Fromm, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*, New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1973.
- Willard Gaylin, *Hatred: The Psychological Descent into Violence*, New York: Public Affairs, 2003.
- Alexander Laban Hinton, *Why Did They Kill? Cambodia in the Shadow of Genocide*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 2005.
- Philip Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil*, New York: Random House, 2007.

Overview of grade components:

1. Response/discussion paper and presentation: 20%
2. Presentation of your final paper: 25%
4. Final paper: 35%, due December 15

## 5. Participation: 20%

### Grading scale:

100-94: A	89-87: B+	79-77: C+	69-61: D+
93-90: A-	86-83: B	76-73: C	60-59: D
	82-80: B-	72-70: C-	58-55: D-

Note: Plagiarized work will not be accepted and will incur significant penalties. If you are using someone else's ideas, words, or research, you MUST cite them properly.

Sustained engagement with the seminar is important. You may have 1 unexcused absence over the course of the semester. After this, absence will result in grade deduction.

Unless you have arranged an extension on a paper before the due date (and I am flexible on this, just ask me), each day late will incur a deduction of one letter grade.

Barring medical or family emergency, incompletes must be negotiated before the end of classes, and the paperwork filled out by the last day of class.

Final papers must be delivered in hard copy – NOT email (just too risky – sometimes, it seems, they vaporize en route).

### Assignments:

#### 1. Case study and discussion leadership:

Beginning in the third week of class and ending in the seventh, students will guide the class in applying the assigned author's analysis to a particular recent case of hatred (in the last 30 years, unless you can offer reasons for choosing a case farther back than that). There are three parts to the assignment.

1.1. First, you will provide brief background reading on your case, such as a thorough/detailed news article, as well as a 2-page (single-spaced) summary of the facts of the case (background information and context, not an analysis) that you write up for us based on your research (you can also include maps, pictures and statistics, if you think they would be helpful). You should get these to me by no later than 5 pm on the Friday before the class when you will present, and I will send them to the class (you can also send them to the class yourself if you prefer, using the course email address: INTL-485-01@lists.macalester.edu). Getting them to the class this far ahead of time is important, because this allows people some time to think about the case in relation to the readings. It makes a big difference for the quality of discussion you will lead (see 1.3, below).

1.2. Second, taking on your author's perspective, you will write a 6 double-spaced-page paper explaining how he would define the nature of the hatred/aggression/destructiveness in your situation and where he would likely locate—or at least look for—its roots. This will be due at class time. Because over the years many people have lamented that after discussing the case with the class, they would have written a somewhat different paper, I offer two options for this paper.

Option A: Just hand in your analysis at class time (or email it to me before 7 pm), and I will respond to it with the knowledge that you wrote it without having discussed the material with the class.

Option B: Hand in the paper at class time (or email it to me before 7 pm – this will be the case either way), but then go back and revise it based on new thoughts/rethinking that grew out of the class

discussion, and get it to me no later than 5 pm on Wednesday. Include a cover sheet explaining, in a brief paragraph, what revisions you did based on the discussion (see 1.3, directly below).

1.3. Finally, in class, you will guide the discussion of your case. You will not present your own analysis, but rather facilitate the group's consideration of the case.

We will begin each class period by exploring the “analytical gear” (to use Zimbardo’s phrase) offered by our reading. The week before the class when you present, I will share a list of the particular “gear” that I will cover during the first part of the class (all will be central to the author’s theoretical framework). Please be able, if called upon, to define these concepts and, if possible, think of examples from your own experience for 2-3 of them, to help bring them to life during this part of the class. I will then turn the class over to each discussion leader in turn. Your mission has two elements.

1.3.a. You will essentially ask us, “How can Author X’s theory be applied to this case, and what does the resulting analysis look like?” In asking us this, you should thus be clear about **what, exactly, we are going to try to explain in your case (thus, not a question about the theory itself)**, and be prepared to guide the class as we consider how the “gear” could work to do this. So, be sure to define the central question(s) raised by your case, and articulate some questions, pointing at particular aspects of the case, that help us analyze it using the theory.

1.3.b. We are also interested evaluating *how strong* the resulting analysis is, the extent to which it adequately explains the case and answers your central questions. The theories almost always run into difficulty or fall short in some way when applied to real cases; they may also have shortcomings in how they are constructed, even before application. You will have already written a paper applying the theory to the case, and will thus have a sense of where at least some of these difficulties arise. Sometimes we too will discover them in the course of our application of the theory to the case, and sometimes not. Be prepared to ask the class **two or three questions** designed to get at the **difficulties/problems in the theory itself** that you find most troubling and/or interesting.

## 2. Presentation of research and analysis:

During the second part of the course, you will choose, research, analyze, and present an in-depth case study of hatred/destructiveness/malignant aggression (see paper description below). In class one week before your presentation, you should provide no more than 15 pages of background information on your case (we can do this via pdfs, links, or photocopies). You may draw on such sources as books chapters, news articles, and journals. The purpose is to give the class the necessary historical and factual information on your case.

Your 20 minute presentation should focus on your argument and analysis, not on the factual details of the case. Assume that the class has read your handout.

## 3. Paper:

You will write a 15-to-20-page paper on your case study. In this paper, you should begin by providing relevant historical context and explaining how you define the nature of the troubling human behavior in your case (for example, malignant aggression, hatred, evil—our theorists will provide a number of concepts that you may draw upon, expand, edit, and/or synthesize). You should then draw on and synthesize the theoretical readings you find helpful to analyze your concrete situation, examining what constellation of internal and external factors you see as fostering “hatred” (or however you conceptualize it) in your case. Finally, you should propose a strategy for overcoming such hatred, explaining what in your analysis of your case leads you to expect this strategy to be helpful. A paper proposal outlining your project is due October 17, along with an annotated list of five sources (a brief paragraph explaining what each source provides the paper). The paper is due by midnight December 14 by email, with a hard copy delivered to the IS office by December 15 before 4:00 pm.

Schedule: (subject to change if necessary)

September 12: Introduction to the course

September 19: Fromm, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*, Terminology, Introduction, and chapters 10, 11 and 12 (skim chapters 8 and 9) **(class in alternative location)**

September 26: Fromm, continued (focus of discussion), and Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect*, Introduction and Chapter 1; during last hour of class, we will watch *Quiet Rage: The Stanford Prison Study*

October 3: Zimbardo, continued, chapters 10-16 (chapters 2-9 optional—you might be interested in skimming them)

October 10: Chirof and McCauley, *Why Not Kill Them All? The Logic and Prevention of Mass Political Murder*

October 17: Gaylin, *Hatred: The Psychological Descent into Violence*; **paper proposal due (class in alternate location)**

October 24: Film: *The Killing Fields*

October 31: Hinton, *Why Did They Kill? Cambodia in the Shadow of Genocide*

November 7: presentations; readings provided by students

November 14: presentations; readings provided by students

November 21: presentations; readings provided by students

November 28: presentations; readings provided by students

December 5: presentations; readings provided by students

December 12: course wrap-up

December 14: final paper due by email, by midnight, and a hard copy at the I.S. office by the following day.