

International Studies Senior Seminar: Confronting Global Hatred
INTL 485-01
Macalester College, Fall 2021, 4 Credits

Instructor: Nadya Nedelsky

Time: Wednesdays 7:00-10:00

Room: Carnegie 411

Office: Carnegie 413

Office hours: Mondays 1:00-2:45, Thursdays 11:30-12:30, and by appointment (please use office hours link below my email signature to sign up)

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. Case study and discussion leadership: 25%
2. Capstone project final paper: 30%
3. Presentation of your capstone project: 25%
4. Participation: 20%

GRADING SCALE:

100-94: A	86-83: B	76-73: C	60-59: D
93-90: A-	82-80: B-	72-70: C-	58-55: D-
89-87: B+	79-77: C+	69-61: 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 one 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 both electronically and in hard copy – NOT only email (too risky), unless we make a specific agreement.

ASSIGNMENTS:

1. CASE STUDY AND DISCUSSION LEADERSHIP

For each of our five texts, two-to-three students will each guide the class in applying the author's analysis to a particular case of hatred (each student picking a separate case). 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). 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, 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 key parts of the assignment: providing background to the class, writing the paper, and leading class discussion.

1. PROVIDING BACKGROUND TO THE CLASS

First, you will research and then provide brief background reading and/or video on your case, such as a thorough/detailed news article, as well as a 1-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 post these to the course Moodle site no later than 8 pm **two days** before the class when you will present. The material should not take longer than 15 minutes to review.

Getting this 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.

2. WRITING THE PAPER

Taking on your author's perspective (but in your own voice), you will write a 6-page paper (double-spaced) explaining how they would define the nature of the hatred/aggression/destructiveness in your situation and where they 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.

Please write this paper so that someone who is an educated reader but not in the class (imagine your roommate, your aunt, etc.) would be able to understand it. Thus, **briefly explain your author's broader project and approach** and **define any concepts** that aren't in common use. This is important for making your writing accessible and also for making clear how you understand the concepts you're employing.

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 email it to me before 7 pm the night you are presenting, and I will respond to it with the knowledge that you wrote it without having discussed the material with the class.
- **Option B:** Email it to me before 7 pm (this will be the case either way), but then go back and revise it based on rethinking that grew out of the class discussion, and get it to me no later than 5 pm two days later. Include a cover sheet explaining, in a brief paragraph, what revisions you did based on the discussion.

3. LEADING DISCUSSION

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**.

During the first part of the class period on the evening of your discussion leadership, we will explore the “analytical gear” (to use Zimbardo’s phrase) offered by our reading. I have posted to Moodle a list of each author’s “gear” (all will be central to the author’s theoretical framework).

The discussion leadership should take 20-25 minutes total.

Your discussion-mission has three elements:

A. HELPING US UNDERSTAND HOW THE THEORY APPLIES TO YOUR CASE

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.

Once you have prompted the class to think about how the theory might be applied, you may share your own analysis, and take questions about it.

B. HELPING US ASSESS THE THEORY’S STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

We are also interested in 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.**

C. HELPING US SEE HOW DIFFERENT THEORIES INTERACT AND COMPARE

Finally, the following week, you should read the next set of presenters' case backgrounds with a view of how your author would view them, and come prepared to ask each presenter one question from your author's standpoint (so the Frommians will challenge Zimbardo, Zimbardoians will challenge Gaylin, and so on. Hintonians (the last to go) will bring a Hintonian perspective to the first set of presentations). This is ungraded and will count toward participation.

On the evening of your discussion leadership:

1. People are usually pretty good about doing the readings, but at the outset of your discussion leadership, please briefly remind us of the situation in your case, and also identify the problem or problems that you want us to address.
2. After you're done introducing the case, people may ask questions clarifying facts, without yet getting into the analysis.
3. Once people have asked their factual questions, lead us through the analysis, asking questions; the class may ask you questions as well. You can also break people up into small groups to discuss your questions before we have a large-group discussion, IF you like (some people do this, others don't).
4. At the end, with this picture in front of us, I'll ask a wrap-up question to assess at the adequacy of the theoretical model as it's applied here, which you and/or the class can answer: To what extent does a [YOUR AUTHOR HERE] analysis explain the case satisfactorily or sufficiently?

2. CAPSTONE PROJECT PAPER

For your capstone paper, you will research, analyze, and present an in-depth case study of hatred/destructiveness/malignant aggression of your choice. The case can be recent or historical, wide-scale or individual. The paper should be 20-25-pages, double-spaced.

As with the shorter paper, write this for someone who has not taken the course and is unfamiliar with your case and with our authors and concepts.

Key elements (include in the order that makes the most sense for your analysis):

- **Context:** What facts (who, when, where, how) do we *need* to know to understand this case? Be concise. We also need to recognize limitations in finding all the facts, so just note where there may be gaps in the evidence. This may then require some level of speculation, which just needs to be forthrightly acknowledged in the paper.
- **Definitions:** What are we talking about here? How do you define the nature of the troubling human behavior in your case? Our theorists provide a number of concepts (for example, malignant aggression, hatred, evil) that you are encouraged to work with:

draw upon, edit, synthesize, expand and redefine them as you see fit -- just note when you do this.

- **Explanation/analysis:** Here's the "why". You should draw on and synthesize the theoretical readings you find helpful to analyze your case, examining what constellation of internal and external factors you see as fostering "hatred" (or however you conceptualize it) in your case. Draw on any and all authors that are helpful, bringing together the various tools/concepts/frameworks you consider applicable and helpful, producing your own framework. You may also draw in other authors/theories you've encountered in other coursework if they are helpful (just be sure to clearly lay out their perspectives and define terms).

Again, you may not be able to find enough evidence to "prove" various factors are at work, and will need to be hypothetical. Instead, you can consider what kind of evidence WOULD indicate certain factors are at work. Be specific on this.

- **Proposed response:** Finally, what should happen? You should propose a strategy for addressing the hatred in your case. Keep in mind that "solutions" are very hard to come by, and that "addressing" the hatred might entail dealing with a long-standing legacy, preventing recurrence, or mitigating harm. Explain what, specifically, 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 Sept 23rd by 5 pm via email. Explain what case you want to take up and, to the extent you can, how you think some of our theories could be applicable.

3. PRESENTATION OF YOUR CAPSTONE PROJECT

Three days before your presentation, you should post the equivalent of about 15 pages of background information on your case, using sources such as news/journal articles, book excerpts, etc. (we can do this via PDFs, videos, links, etc.-- it shouldn't take longer to review than it would to read 15 pages) on the course Moodle site. **You do NOT have to write this yourself.** The purpose is to give the class the necessary historical and factual information on your case.

Peer support will be an important element of the capstone project. After receiving your proposals, I will divide you into small peer groups based on your topics. You should feel free to reach out to them for feedback as you develop your presentation, and likewise offer feedback if asked. I am also happy to consult with you as you develop your presentation and paper.

Your 20-to-30-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. We will then open to Q and A. I also encourage you to bring questions of your own to consult with the class about -- anything you're struggling with.

I will respond with comments within a few days of the presentation, and I invite you to sign up for a time to meet with me 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).

4. PARTICIPATION

As a seminar member, you will be expected to keep up with all readings and participate thoughtfully and respectfully in our discussions.

In addition to this regular participation, there are three further assignments that are individually ungraded but contribute toward the participation grade. These are:

- taking “your” author’s perspective in the subsequent class period (see section “C” on page 5 above)
- choosing 3 concepts from within the analytical gear each week and thinking of a real-world example or illustration from your own experience or observation You should email these to me (they can be very brief—a sentence or two per concept, with short explanation for why the example fits) by **noon** the day we will discuss the text (ideally a bit earlier, though)

SCHEDULE: (subject to change as necessary)

Sept 1: **Introductions and initial inclinations**

Sept 8: **A psychoanalytic perspective**

Fromm, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*, Terminology, Introduction, and chapters 10, 11 and 12 (skip section on pp. 398-405, and briefly skim chapters 8 and 9)

Sept 15: **The psychoanalytic perspective, applied, and a social psychology experiment**

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*

Sept 22: **A social psychology perspective**

Zimbardo, continued, chapters 10 and 12-16 (BRIEFLY SKIM chapter 11; chapters 2-9 optional—you might be interested in skimming them)

Sept 23 (Thursday): **paper proposal due**

Sept 29: **A historical, interdisciplinary perspective**

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

Oct 6: **Another psychological view: “hatred” as something different, and a sociological perspective**

Gaylin, *Hatred: The Psychological Descent into Violence*

Kathleen M. Blee, “Positioning Hate,” in *Understanding Racist Activism: Theory, Methods and Research*, London and New York: Routledge, 2018, pp. 63-71 (on Moodle).

Oct 13: In-class viewing of film: *The Act of Killing*

Oct 20: **An anthropological case study approach**

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

Oct 27: presentations; readings provided by students

Nov 3: presentations; readings provided by students

Nov 10: presentations; readings provided by students

Nov 17: presentations; readings provided by students

Nov 23 (Tuesday): draft of paper due to peer review group

Nov 24: NO CLASS: THANKSGIVING! Enjoy!

Dec 1: peer review session

Dec 8: course wrap-up

Dec 14 (Tuesday): final paper due by email by a hard copy at the I.S. office by 4 pm