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:


Overview of grade components:

1. Response/discussion paper and presentation: 20%
2. Presentation of your final paper: 25%
3. Final paper: 35%
4. Participation: 20%
Grading scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100-94</td>
<td>89-77: B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>93-90</td>
<td>86-74: B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>82-80</td>
<td>72-70: C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>89-87</td>
<td>79-77: C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>89-77</td>
<td>69-61: D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>76-73</td>
<td>60-59: D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>79-77</td>
<td>58-55: D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60-59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>69-61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>58-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (though sickness can count as an excused absence). 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 only email (too risky).

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 case of hatred. You can choose a case that lends itself very straightforwardly to the theory, or a case where the fit is less obvious (as long as the case falls broadly under the concerns the author addresses – and these are mostly vast). The latter can be illuminating because it can give a sense of a theory’s potential, and also its limitations.

You can choose any case that interests you. If you like (but this is not required), you can choose a case that is related to your final research project. If so, I ask that you do your best to avoid giving two very similar presentations (as you’ll present on the final project as well) – so, look at a broader or narrower element of the case or issue that you plan to explore in the research paper.

There are three parts to the assignment.

1.1. First, you will provide brief background reading and/or video 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 send these to the class (or to me, if you like) no later than 9 pm on the Sunday before the class when you will present, 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 (but in your own voice), you will write a 6-8-page paper (double spaced) 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. In essence, you will be
answering the question, “how can Author X’s theory be applied to this case, and what does the resulting analysis look like?” As noted above, the fit may be straightforward or it may not; the point is not to manipulate the case to fit the theory, but to explore the range of the theory’s applicability. Finally, make sure to offer your own assessment of the theory’s strengths and weaknesses based on its application to your case (this will also lead into 1.3.b. below).

This paper 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 Friday. 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 the question you addressed in the paper: “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 considered 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 research, analyze, and present an in-depth case study of hatred/destructiveness/malignant aggression of your choice (see paper description below). 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, etc). 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.
Peer review will be an important element of the capstone project. After receiving your proposals, I will divide you into peer review groups based on your topics. One week before you present, you should email your peer review group and me an outline of your presentation. It does not have to be detailed, but it should include your central argument and the basic structure of your presentation.

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

I will respond with comments within a week after the presentation, and I invite you to sign up for a time to meet with me (via a calendar link I will provide) if you have any questions about my comments or want to discuss the paper (you can of course set up a meeting at any point in the semester to discuss anything regarding the course).

3. Paper:

You will write a 20-to-25 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 addressing such hatred (keeping in mind that “solutions” are very hard to come by, and that “addressing” the hatred might entail dealing with a legacy or preventing recurrence), explaining what in your analysis of your case leads you to expect this strategy to be helpful. A brief paper proposal describing your project in a paragraph or so is due February 18, along with an annotated list of five sources (a brief explanation of what each source provides the paper; these should be sources outside the course readings, having to do with your case). A draft ready for peer review is due to your group by April 25; comments are due to those in your group by May 1. The paper is due May 4 by email, with a hard copy delivered to the IS office before 4:00 pm (you can, of course, hand in the paper before this date if you like).

Schedule: (subject to change if necessary)

January 28: Introduction to the course


February 11: 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*

February 18: Zimbardo, continued, chapters 10-16 (chapters 2-9 optional—you might be interested in skimming them) paper proposal due

February 25: Chirot and McCauley, *Why Not Kill Them All? The Logic and Prevention of Mass Political Murder*

March 4: Gaylin, *Hatred: The Psychological Descent into Violence*

March 11: Hinton: *Why Did They Kill? Cambodia in the Shadow of Genocide*

March 14-22: SPRING BREAK!
March 25: presentations; readings provided by students

April 1: presentations; readings provided by students

April 8: presentations; readings provided by students

April 15: presentations; readings provided by students

April 22: presentations; readings provided by students

April 25: draft of paper due to peer review group

April 29: course wrap-up

May 1: peer reviews due to group members

May 4: final paper due by email and a hard copy at the I.S. office (by 4 pm)