Santa Clara University
Scholar Commons

History | College of Arts & Sciences

2015

Introduction: Gendering Genocide Studies, 1st Edition

Amy E. Randall
Santa Clara University, arandall@scu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/history

Part of the Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons, and the History Commons

Recommended Citation
Randall, A.E. "Introduction: Gendering Genocide Studies" in Genocide and Gender in the Twentieth Century: A Comparative Perspective, 1st Edition, ed. Amy E. Randall (Bloomsbury Publishers, 2015), 1-34.

Copyright © 2015 Bloomsbury Publishing. Reprinted with permission.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts & Sciences at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in History by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact rscroggin@scu.edu.

Introduction: Gendering genocide studies

Amy E. Randall

When it comes to understanding genocide, gender matters. This has not always been evident, and even today there are critics and skeptics. Indeed, when feminist scholars in Holocaust studies first began examining women's experiences and gender questions, their scholarship was ignored or met with hostility by many academics and others, including some survivors. Opponents expressed various concerns, including the idea that gender research and analysis would "trivialize" or "politicize" the Holocaust, de-emphasize the centrality of anti-Semitism and racism to Nazi persecution,[1] and promote "comparative victimhood or creat[e] unequal victims."[2]

Studying the gendered dimensions of genocide, however, does not trivialize the enormity of the crime. Nor does it minimize the importance of real and imagined ideas about ethnic, national, racial, and religious difference in explaining the victimization, destruction, and mass killing of certain groups. The fear that gender analysis will lead to a hierarchy of victims is also misplaced. Gender scholarship does not argue that women had it better or worse than men; rather, it acknowledges differences in women's and men's experiences and examines how the unfolding of genocide has involved "events that specifically affect men as men and women as women."[3] More generally, the purpose of this scholarship is to use gender as a lens for better comprehending the seemingly incomprehensible crime of genocide.

As this volume makes clear, an examination of gender and genocide allows us to hear the voices and stories of women that are often overlooked and to read men's voices and stories in a more nuanced way. By considering both women and men as gendered subjects, this research sheds light on how discourses of femininity and masculinity, gender norms, and understandings of female and male identities contribute to victims' experiences and responses. Such analysis highlights, for example, how Jewish men became demoralized in Nazi Germany, not merely because of the marginalization and increasingly alarming situation of Jews, but also because they could

01 Introduction.indd 1 4/7/2015 2:24:56 PM

not fulfil their traditional male gender roles as providers for and protectors of their families. Moreover, this feeling of manly "failure" was then compounded by the utter inability of Jewish husbands, fathers, and brothers in concentration/death camps to protect their loved ones.[4]

Historically, the leaders and perpetrators of genocide have promoted deliberately gendered genocidal strategies and processes, which, not surprisingly, have then produced gender-specific traumas or "gendered harms." Investigating these strategies and processes provides a window not only on victims' experiences, but also on genocidal ideologies and discourses, the intentions of perpetrator regimes, the motivations of perpetrators, and the significance of genocidal propaganda. Gender analysis demonstrates, for example, how by raping women *en masse*, often in front of their families and communities, or by forcing family and community members to rape their own, perpetrators intend not merely to devastate the victims and their families but to destroy the targeted group by tearing family and community ties asunder.[5]

The study of sexual violence in the context of genocide shows how it can be used as a genocidal weapon, and scholarship that employs this framework has usefully complicated older narratives about women, war, and rape, in which rape was depicted as a by-product of war, as something incidental.[6] An investigation of genocidal sexual violence also discloses how constructions of ethnic, national, racial, or religious identity are gendered. This research reveals, for example, how certain beliefs about gender, gender roles, and ethnic, national, or racial identity can inspire the leaders and perpetrators of genocide to promote campaigns of mass rape and forced impregnation or, alternatively, to promote forced abortion and forced sterilization.[7] In addition, this research shows how pregenocidal gender dynamics, cultural practices, and political economies can inform the motivations for and forms of genocidal sexual violence. For instance, an analysis of women and gender in pregenocidal Rwanda highlights how rape during the Rwandan genocide was used not only as a symbolic and psychosocial weapon but also as an economic weapon; men claimed the women and girls they raped as war booty so that they could acquire their land and property in forced "marriages."[8] By shedding light on forms of sexual violence, such as forced marriages, and on "invisible" victims who do not fit into existing categories of victimhood, such as male victims or others, the study of genocidal sexual violence can also call attention to issues that have been largely ignored by policymakers and others.[9]

Gender analysis is valuable too in helping us to understand the complexity of human behavior in genocidal circumstances. Why do perpetrators commit atrocities? How do ordinary people become mass murderers, or at least complicit in the processes of genocide? Why do so many people remain bystanders in the face of terrible crimes? How is it that some people decide to resist and undermine genocidal tactics, and sometimes actively aid victims? What role does gender play in shaping individual and group

attitudes and conduct during genocide? While gender is only one variable among many in explaining human behavior, it is nonetheless important. As chapters in this volume demonstrate, for instance, discourses of masculinity have contributed to the transformation of ordinary boys and men into active killers.[10]

Using gender as a lens to examine the aftermaths of genocide can also be useful, for even after mass atrocities and mass killings stop, and genocide has officially "ended," the effects of genocide persist in the lives of victims and their communities. How do the targeted groups transition to a postgenocidal society? How do international bodies (including nongovernmental organizations), domestic institutions, and local groups negotiate postgenocidal problems, such as the emotional and physical trauma, and the pragmatic needs, of victims or encourage the reconciliation and the rebuilding of societies? Scholarship suggests that gendered norms and beliefs—as well as the interconnectedness of gender, race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, and sexuality—can inform perceptions of, and responses to, postgenocidal issues. For example, after the Armenian genocide ended, local Armenian organizations temporarily suspended long-established ideas about paternal lineage and women's sexual purity and honor to promote the reintegration of "dishonored" women and of children fathered by the "enemy."[11] In postgenocidal Bosnia and Herzegovina, by contrast, the persistence of the belief that a child's ethnic identity was determined by his or her father's identity, beyond the mother's biological contribution or the child's socialization in the mother's ethnic community, led to the marginalization and abuse of "children born of rape."[12] Considering the gendered effects of trauma underscores how female survivors of sexual violence are often subject to additional violence, such as sexual exploitation or HIV, and male survivors are denied important resources. Looking into and "seeing" the continuation of gendered harms after genocide can result in new and more effective efforts to help survivors.

Analyzing the gendered dimensions of genocide "justice" in its various forms raises questions about the value and limits of such justice. How have international criminal courts, for example, recognized and obscured gendered forms of genocidal violence? In recognizing rape as an instrument of genocide, the Rwanda and Yugoslavia tribunals have enabled violence against women to be foregrounded and taken seriously, including in efforts to punish perpetrators. Yet, as groundbreaking as this has been, the conceptualization of rape as genocide has simultaneously had limiting effects; in focusing on mass rape, for example, international criminal prosecutions have downplayed or ignored other acts of violence, such as "forced marriages."[13] Research on women's testimonies in international criminal prosecutions has also shown how court proceedings have both valorized *and* silenced women, leading to distortions in their narratives in the courtroom and in their later recounts of experiences.[14]

Another topic worth considering is how gender plays a role in memory and commemoration. Memorial culture, which produces official representations of genocidal events, is not gender-neutral. How does gender inform the construction of collective memories, historical spaces, and ritual or national remembrance? In what ways are the motifs and tropes of traumatic memorialization gendered? How can the public imagery of gender-specific atrocities—such as the sexual abuse of women—contribute to voyeurism and the sexual objectification of female victims? How do representations of genocidal violence reinforce gender stereotypes and, in the process, render invisible the complexity of men's and women's unofficial memories and trauma?[15]

A gender perspective can also contribute to genocide prevention. As scholars, human-rights activists, and policymakers grapple with the challenges of how to stop genocidal violence before it starts or when it is happening, and how to discern if genocide is unfolding in the midst of violent conflict, a focus on gender-specific actions and patterns might yield insights. Scholars have pointed out how there is a high correlation between certain types of gendered violence and genocide. For instance, in many genocides, mass violence has been directed first at "battle-aged" boys and men, followed by "root-and-branch" killings that aim for the wholesale annihilation of the targeted group. This insight is just one example of how analyzing the gendered harms in violent conflict could contribute to the identification of genocide as well as preventative efforts.[16] In present-day conflicts if the gender-selective slaughter of male civilians occurs, it could be a warning that the more generalized destruction and mass murder of a specific population might soon follow.

As this short discussion has suggested, gender analysis can complicate and enrich our understanding of genocide and its processes, effects, and aftermaths. It is also the case that the study of genocide can complicate and enrich our understanding of gender. Scholarship on genocide and gender underscores the lack of fixity to gender; it shows how genocide, like other historically and culturally specific phenomena, can destabilize and redefine gender norms and identities. In addition, this scholarship highlights how social constructions of gender intersect with constructions of ethnicity, nationality, race, religion, and sexuality.

Although scholarship on gender and genocide is still relatively new, debates about the definition of genocide are not. The first part of this introduction examines the invention of the word "genocide" and the problematic definition of genocide adopted by the international community when it decided to criminalize the practice. The introduction then turns to the emergence and evolution of genocide studies. The third section focuses on the development of scholarship on gender and genocide. The last part of the introduction, which discusses the framework for this book and how I came to this project, also summarizes the individual chapters' scholarly contributions.

01 Introduction.indd 4 4/7/2015 2:24:56 PM

Gender and the definition of genocide

As many scholars have pointed out, although the term "genocide" is relatively new, the practices and events associated with genocide are age-old phenomena. There is no shortage of historical examples of the widespread destruction and mass murder of particular groups of people. Moreover, many of the violent practices from earlier cases have been deployed in more recent episodes. Despite some continuity between older and more recent genocides, however, some scholars have argued that there is "something very new" about twentieth-century genocides.[17] According to this perspective, these genocides are distinct because they are a product of "modernity's defining features, the combined force of new technologies of warfare, new administrative techniques that [have] enhanced state powers of surveillance, and new ideologies that [have] made populations the choice objects of state policies and that [have] categorized people along strict lines of nation and race."[18] Moreover, these "modern" genocides have been marked by (1) "the seizure of state power by revolutionary movements"[19] that seek to create a "better, and radically, different society," a society shorn of human "weeds" who are considered "irrelevant" and/or a "danger" to this end goal[20]; and (2) the mass mobilization and participation of ordinary civilians in the brutalities against and killing of targeted groups.[21]

One of the modern manifestations of twentieth-century genocides, I would add, is the mass targeting of women as victims as well as the mass mobilization of women as indirect and direct participants. In earlier examples of genocide, of course, women have not been immune from great violence, including rape, and undoubtedly some women have acted as indirect participants as well as more violent aggressors. But in the context of the twentieth century, which was marked by mass politics, mass culture, and total war, women began to be recognized as fuller members of polities and, as such, were expected to aid in nation-building as well as the defense of the nation. One way that women were encouraged to contribute to nation-building and national defense was by becoming mothers: pre-First World War fears about population decline, in conjunction with First World War loss of life, transformed motherhood from one of a gendered expectation for individual women to that of a national duty, a civic obligation. In this framework, women were not only "mothers" of their individual children, but also mothers of the nation. Another hallmark of modernity—the biologization of ethnicity, nationality, and race—combined with the construction of women as mothers of the nation, of women as mothers of a national/ethnic/racial collectivity, to make them more vulnerable to genocidal violence.[22]

Whatever scholarly debates there are about the continuities and discontinuities between older and more recent "modern" genocides, academics can easily agree that the term "genocide" is a twentieth-century modern invention. Raphael Lemkin, a Polish-Jewish lawyer and scholar,

conceived of the word genocide in 1943, in the context of Second World War and Nazi efforts to annihilate the Jews and other racially undesirable groups in Western and Eastern Europe. Even before the Holocaust, however, Lemkin was concerned about mass atrocities committed against groups *as groups*—particularly the mass murder of Armenians under the Ottoman Empire during the First World War. Indeed, in 1933, he had appealed to his colleagues at the Fifth International Conference for the Unification of Criminal Law (sponsored by the League of Nations) to criminalize "Acts of Barbarity," the brutalities and acts of extermination against "national, racial, religious and social collectivities," and "Acts of Vandalism," the "destruction of works of art and culture" of such targeted groups.[23] After continuing in the 1930s to push for the criminalization of these acts, and then fleeing Nazi-occupied Poland in 1939, Lemkin combined his earlier concepts in the neologism "genocide," which he produced from the Greek "genos" (race or tribe) and the Latin "cide" (killing).[24] Lemkin sought a word that could describe the Nazi methods of destruction and mass murder, a word that "could not be used in other contexts (as 'barbarity' and 'vandalism' could)," a word that would connote moral judgment.[25]

Lemkin formally introduced the term genocide in his 1944 book, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government—Proposals for Redress*. Although the text focused largely on specific German and Axis practices, laws, and decrees in "incorporated" and occupied territories, it contained a short chapter on "The Legal Status of Jews" that highlighted the "special status" accorded to Jews in every occupied country and a chapter on "Genocide," which detailed a range of German techniques—political, social, economic, biological, physical, religious, and moral—that were being used to destroy "national groups" throughout occupied Europe. Although Lemkin acknowledged that the Germans targeted Jews and other racially "undesired" groups in particular, including Poles and Russians, his chapter made it clear that German occupation was accompanied by genocidal processes that affected a wide array of peoples.[26]

Significantly, Lemkin produced a broad definition of genocide—one that could include but was not reduced to mass murder. He explained:

> Generally speaking, genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation, except when accomplished by mass killings of all members of a nation. It is intended rather to signify a coordinated plan of different actions *aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves* [my emphasis]. The objectives of such a plan would be disintegration of the political and social institutions, of culture, language, national feelings, religion, and the economic existence of national groups, and the destruction of the personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups. Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved

> are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity, but as members of the national group.[27]

In Lemkin's view, nonlethal techniques of destruction, such as culturally destructive acts, could be genocidal, insofar as they were part of a broader "coordinated plan" aimed at eradicating a national group.[28] The distinction that Lemkin drew between mass murder and genocide was conceptually significant. Moreover, this distinction, and Lemkin's emphasis on genocide as the "*destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups*," suggests the importance of gender analysis in examining genocidal processes. To take one example, consider the role that sexual violence plays in destroying the "essential foundations of the life" of groups. Because women are seen as contributing not only to the biological but also to the cultural reproduction of ethnic, national, racial, and religious groups, sexual violence against women—in its myriad forms—can be an effective strategy for devastating not only individual female members of a group but also group reproduction (in part by having damaging effects on families and communities). The rape and sexual torture of men can similarly impede their ability to promote the biological and social continuance of groups.

Although Lemkin did not explicitly make the case that gendered strategies were used to advance genocide, he repeatedly argued that genocide needed to be recognized as an international crime, and his unflagging efforts to convince others ultimately resulted in action. In 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations (UN) officially declared genocide an international crime, and in 1948, it adopted the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. The UN Convention not only defined genocide but also mandated that contracting parties "undertake to prevent and punish" it.[29]

The UN definition of genocide was fraught from the outset. According to the UN, "acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group" constituted genocide. These genocidal acts included: "(a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; and (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group."[30] To the dismay of many at the time (and since), acts aimed at the physical, biological, and reproductive destruction of a group were specified, whereas cultural techniques of destruction, which Lemkin had included in his broader formulation of genocide, were excluded, although "vestiges" of the cultural remained.[31] The subjective and elusive nature of "intent" was also of concern; what was evidence of "acts committed with intent to destroy?" Interpretive difficulties existed as well in connection with the clause "in whole, or in part"; how was "in part" to be determined? What yardstick should be used?

One of the major problems with the legal definition adopted by the United Nations Communications Group (UNCG) in 1948 was its omission of political and social groups. Although these groups had been acknowledged as potential targets of genocide in the UN resolution of 1946 and in earlier drafts of the UN definition of genocide to be used in the Convention, they were ultimately excluded for two main reasons: (1) behind-the-scenes political maneuvering and (2) the idea that membership in political and social groups was "transient and unstable" and, moreover, often voluntary, and hence different from other groups for which membership was inevitable or virtually so.[32] Significantly, given the topic of this book, the destruction of groups defined by gender or sexuality was excluded as well. Moreover, sexual violence was not recognized as an act of genocide. As some of the chapters in this volume note, international criminal tribunals in the 1990s addressed the initial failure to include rape and sexual violence as genocidal acts by arguing that they could be used to cause "serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group" and by convicting *génocidaires* of this type of genocidal violence.[33] Under international law today, rape and sexual violence can constitute genocide if they are "committed with the specific intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group."[34]

The limits of the UNCG's definition of genocide contributed to limits on the UNCG's promise to prevent and punish genocide. When, after all, was murderous violence not merely a terrible by-product of war but a result of an intentional plan to exterminate members of a populace? What counted as evidence of an intentional plan? Again and again, the UN and contracting parties turned a blind eye to mass brutalities and genocides in the post-Second World War Cold War era. To be sure, various factors other than definitional challenges, such as the Convention's ineffective procedures for activating "prevention," contributed to this lack of international response. One of the main problems, however, was governments' pursuit of *realpolitik* in international relations in the context of the Cold War.[35]

Silence and the emergence and evolution of genocide studies

Although the term "genocide" was adopted by the UN and publicized in the media in the 1940s, the academic field of genocide studies developed only in the late 1970s and 1980s, after "Holocaust studies" emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. Indeed, this new field was "part offspring of, part uneasy junior partner to" Holocaust studies.[36]

Academic examination of the Nazi extermination of the Jews began in the wake of the Second World War but did not generate much scholarship until the

1960s.[37] Moreover, although in the late 1940s and 1950s presses published some memoirs and institutions began to collect valuable materials about the destruction of the Jews, public discussion about, and commemoration of, the great crimes that had been committed was very limited, in Israel as well as in the United States and Eastern and Western Europe.[38] In the face of this relative silence, prominent Israelis became concerned that the "Holocaust was being forgotten" and decided to use the Israeli capture, and 1961 trial of, Adolf Eichmann—the Nazi leader responsible for organizing the mass deportation of Jews to their deaths—to publicize this tragic history to "Israeli youngsters" and the world.[39] Given that Israel was surrounded by a sea of hostility from its Middle Eastern neighbors, reminding the world of the Holocaust was also useful for legitimizing the nation's right to exist.

The Eichmann trial played a huge role in the development of Holocaust studies, as did other factors, especially the publication in the early 1960s of historian Raul Hilberg's seminal work, *The Destruction of the Jews*, which was a masterful accounting of the crimes committed against Jews; Hannah Arendt's controversial analysis, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*, and the Frankfurt-Auschwitz trials from 1963 to 1965.[40] In addition to new scholarship and new trials, the broader political context of the 1960s was significant. A "new political consciousness" emerged in West Germany, which resulted in calls for greater openness about the country's Nazi past.[41] Meanwhile, the rise of the "New Left" in West Germany, France, the United States, and elsewhere; the ongoing civil rights movement in the United States; American violence in the Vietnam War (including massacres of innocent civilians); and the end of European colonial empires that had been justified through ideas of racial and civilizational superiority fostered academic and nonacademic discussions about and comparisons between historical and present-day examples of what some saw as the "mass cruelty and mass human destruction perpetrated by state authorities," including the Nazi brutalization and extermination of the Jews.[42]

Growing popular interest in the Holocaust also provided support for academic studies. As Holocaust memorialization expanded in the 1970s and 1980s, memorial sites, museums, and commemorative plaques in the West began to proliferate.[43] The introduction of educational initiatives in schools as well as artistic productions about the Holocaust—such as television series and films that focused on the Nazi annihilation of the Jews—also raised public awareness about the Holocaust.[44] Not surprisingly, the institutionalization of Holocaust memory fueled the growth of "Holocaust studies" in many colleges and universities.

As was the case with the Holocaust, academic interest in the Armenian genocide developed after a period of relative silence. Despite widespread media coverage of, and popular uproar during, the First World War over the "Armenian massacres" in the Ottoman Empire; short-lived Turkish and international efforts in the immediate postwar period to punish some of the main perpetrators; and the publication of various memoirs and document

AQ: Please note that the commas had been changed to semi-colons for clarity in the long sentence as the sentence contains other commas.

collections in the years thereafter, international and public attention to the "Armenian question" subsided during the interwar era and the following decades. The Turkish government's downplaying of wartime events and its denial of charges of genocide converged with Western geopolitical interests to foster silence or misinformation about the mass crime carried out against Armenians.[45] This silence was largely reproduced in the Western academic world, where there was little scholarship on the Armenian genocide until the 1970s and 1980s.[46]

In the face of this continued silence, Armenian activists organized a day of commemoration on the fiftieth anniversary of the genocide in 1965, and this activism contributed to the development of Armenian genocide studies. In Yerevan, Soviet Armenia, and in many other cities and countries, Armenians "took to the streets" and called attention to the deportations and mass killings of the Armenians during the First World War in the Ottoman Empire. Activists not only demanded that the Turkish government admit "the wrongs of its Ottoman and Young Turk predecessors," but also pressed for "an end to world indifference." Some Armenians also insisted upon "the return of Armenian lands under Turkish occupation."[47] Nonviolent calls for the recognition of the mass violence carried out against the Ottoman Armenians were accompanied in the 1970s and 1980s by more violent calls that led to the assassination of dozens of Turkish diplomats and the death of many others.[48] As public awareness about the annihilation of the Armenians grew, and the Turkish government countered by promoting a vociferous "campaign of denial," scholarly attention to the genocide increased.[49] Richard Hovannisian, one of the pioneers in Armenian genocide studies, explains, "It was the reprehensible action of a government to wipe clean the slate of history, just as its predecessor had wiped clean an entire people, that aroused in me a sense of moral indignation and a commitment to engage in the struggle of memory against forgetting despite the unfavorable odds."[50] International recognition in the 1980s of the Ottoman crimes committed against Armenians during the First World War as genocide lent further support to Armenian genocide studies.[51]

Holocaust studies also played a role in the development of Armenian genocide studies. Some scholars who initially examined the Holocaust later turned to the study of the Armenian genocide.[52] Meanwhile, some academics who examined the mass destruction of Armenians under the Ottoman Empire became interested in comparing this tragedy with the Nazi destruction of Jews, to uncover similarities and differences, and to demonstrate that what happened to the Armenians was indeed genocide. The idea that the Armenian genocide was the prototype of modern genocides emerged in this context.[53]

As Holocaust studies and Armenian genocide studies emerged, contemporaneous examples of mass atrocities and acts of extermination against specific groups of people occurred in a variety of different countries and contexts. In 1971, for example, the West Pakistani regime committed

what is now considered genocide in East Pakistan/Bangladesh during the Bangladesh war of independence. The Pakistani army and militias engaged in mass rape and murdered over one million Hindus and Bengalis, if not more (some scholars estimate the number of deaths was close to three million).[54] From 1975 to 1979, one-and-a-half to three million people in Cambodia died under the communist Khmer Rouge regime. Genocide was the result of the regime's radical efforts to pursue a total reorganization of society and the economy—via forced de-urbanization, forced collectivization of agriculture, forced labor, torture, mass executions, and other policies. Although the vast majority of victims were ethnic Khmer, many of whom were murdered for being "oppositionists" (including intellectuals, professionals, religious leaders and enthusiasts, and others), minority groups such as the ethnic Vietnamese and ethnic Chinese were also targeted.[55]

Genocide studies began to cohere as ongoing instances of genocidal violence—along with the growing scholarly literature on particular genocides—began to foster greater academic interest in other cases of genocide as well as the processes of genocide more broadly. For some scholars, the current examples of mass destruction and murder in the world demanded activism in the form of research and teaching about genocide. An expert on the Armenian genocide, Robert Melson, discusses the connection between the terrible violence perpetrated against the Igbo ethnic group in the second half of the 1960s and his growing interest in genocide studies:

> As a child I survived the Holocaust, and as a young adult I witnessed the beginnings of the Biafran war that led to mass death in Nigeria. Both of these events, in different ways, started me on the intellectual and emotional journey to study genocide with the hope of understanding and preventing it.[56]

Henry Huttenbach, another early genocide studies scholar, explains that his existing commitment to contextualize the Holocaust in his teaching in the 1970s was boosted in part by the massive bloodshed in Cambodia, leading to a new course on twentieth-century genocide (and not just the Holocaust) and new comparative scholarship on the Holocaust.[57]

Early genocide scholarship included not only individual case studies, but also comparative analysis. Leo Kuper's foundational text for genocide studies in 1981 is a good example of this; although it contained a more detailed analysis of the "Turkish genocide against Armenians" and "German genocide against the Jews," it nonetheless discussed genocides and "genocidal massacres" elsewhere—those linked to colonization, decolonization, and ethnic and religious conflicts in postcolonial successor states.[58] In his preface, Kuper acknowledged the criticism that could be leveled against his approach. He noted: "The very act of comparison is an affront. Should not 'each human evil be understood in its own terms'?" Nonetheless, Kuper asserted, "even in the particular case," understanding was difficult, for "genocide seems to defy

understanding." Moreover, because genocides were "all too common in our day," comparative study was necessary; identifying commonalities among genocides (as well as their particularities) would aid in the prevention of genocide.[59] Scholars offering a comparative perspective during early genocide studies asked such questions as "which forms of social organization" make it more or "less likely for a massive genocide to occur?"[60] They also sought to provide a conceptual framework for better understanding the crime by focusing on definitions, classifications, and typologies of genocide, raising questions, for example, about the problems and consequences of the UN definition and classifying genocides—for example, ideological, retributive, utilitarian—to distinguish different historical examples. Whereas many of these comparative scholars examined the types of leaders, ideologies, political structures, and social institutions that could make mass atrocities and murder possible, others investigated the importance of social group dynamics and individual human behavior. One of the founding texts along these lines is Israel Charny's book, *How Can We Commit the Unthinkable? Genocide: The Human Cancer*. As Charny explained,

> This book is not about the holocaust of the Jewish people, nor is it about any one or another specific instance of genocide. Rather, it is a search for the underlying rhythms, patterns, and meanings within the human mind, individually and collectively, that make it possible for us human beings to be drawn to the worst possible side of ourselves.[61]

Some of the earliest advocates of comparative genocide studies were scholars and teachers who had previously focused on the Holocaust, as well as Jewish survivors or escapees from the Nazi genocide who became academics. Moreover, many Holocaust studies scholars welcomed the development of this new approach.[62] (As already mentioned, some of this early work focused on the Holocaust and the Armenian genocide). Enthusiasm for comparative analysis, however, was countered by significant opposition to it from those who argued that the Holocaust was a singular event in history, a horror so different from other historical examples of mass murder that it could not be compared to them. In Stephen Katz's view: "The Holocaust, that is, the intentional murder of European Jewry during World War II, is historically and phenomenologically unique." For many critics, the inclusion of the Holocaust in comparative analyses of genocide was intellectually and morally wrong; it would diminish the enormity of the Nazi crime against Jews, and it would lead to a de-emphasis on the anti-Jewish essence and totalizing nature of the Holocaust, in which the Nazi state intended to annihilate all Jews throughout Europe.[63] For those who favored comparative analysis, the point was not to downplay the specific features of the Holocaust—such as the Nazi regime's anti-Semitic ideology, domestic political structures, and social processes—or the scope and methods of mass murder.[64] Instead, the point was to better comprehend the Holocaust and other genocides by

01 Introduction.indd 12 4/7/2015 2:24:56 PM

examining commonalities as well as differences, discerning patterns (e.g., of dehumanization and humiliation), and contextualizing genocides in broader world processes (e.g., world war or colonialism). For some proponents of comparative studies, this approach was a moral issue. In the face of "more and more examples [of genocide] tragically and contemporarily coming to the fore," one scholar explained, "The 'success' of Holocaust studies in increasing our awareness of that which humanity is capable of doing to itself ethically mandate[d] a broader understanding of its repetitive, if not paralleling, behavior."[65] Comparative analysis was also a moral issue because it was linked to prevention. Was it possible to identify regimes, factors, or conditions that enhanced the likelihood of genocide? Could genocide be anticipated? And if so, could it be prevented?

The interdisciplinary field of genocide studies has developed significantly in the last twenty to twenty-five years. The mass atrocities and mass slaughter that occurred in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s and in Rwanda in 1994 shocked the world and demonstrated not only that "genocide was not a thing of the past" but also that "the West could still host the crime."[66] These cases of immense violence increased academic and public interest in the origins and mechanisms of genocide and fueled new scholarship in genocide studies, both in the area of individual genocides and in comparative analysis.[67] Another major geopolitical event, the end of the Cold War and the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, played a role too in the growth of genocide studies. As Dan Stone notes, "Since the end of the Cold War far more documents have been discovered than historians would have believed possible at the end of the Nuremberg Trial."[68] The availability of new research materials has resulted in many new studies—for example, on the local dimensions and microprocesses of the Holocaust in formerly communist Eastern Europe countries, the complicity of ordinary civilians in genocidal events, and religious leaders' and institutions' collaboration with the Nazis—that have contributed to broader and comparative interest in topics such as civilian complicity.[69] The end of the bipolar division of the world, combined with the murderous violence in Bosnia and Herzegovina, also fostered a new moral context for trying to prevent genocides, intervening actively once they had begun, punishing perpetrators, and assisting survivors with their trauma and needs in the aftermath of genocide. The focus on these goals by policymakers, human rights activists, international and local nongovernmental organizations, women's groups, legal bodies, and other individuals and institutions has contributed to new scholarly works on genocide.

As the field has developed, the disciplinary boundaries of genocide studies have broadened. Whereas much of the early genocide scholarship was produced by historians and social scientists, more recent scholarship has emerged from scholars in cultural studies, legal studies, indigenous studies, gender studies, and many other disciplines and fields. This work has raised important new questions and issues in genocide studies, such as whether or not the forced removal of indigenous children from their

families, communities, and culture constitutes genocide, or how states and nonstates can perpetrate genocide "by attrition" by denying human rights, such as health care and/or food, to members of groups.[70] Since the 1990s, the geographic and temporal range of genocide studies has also expanded, and academic inquiries into premodern and colonial genocides and lesser-known instances (such as those in Guatemala in the 1980s or in German South West Africa in 1904) increasingly accompany genocide scholarship on what some call the "twentieth-century" core.[71]

Gender and genocide

Scholarship on gender and genocide is a relatively new phenomenon. Although it began to gain momentum in the mid to late 1990s, partly because of the widespread sexual humiliation and mass rape of women in the Rwandan and Bosnian genocides, it started with the study of women and the Holocaust, which feminist scholars initiated in the early 1980s. As was the case with Holocaust studies and Armenian genocide studies, concerns about the silencing of victims' and survivors' voices and experiences—in this case, female victims and survivors—played a critical role in the development of this scholarly focus. According to Joan Ringelheim, one of the pioneers of women's Holocaust studies, the impetus for studying women and the Holocaust was twofold: "the experiences and perceptions of Jewish women ha[d] been obscured or absorbed into descriptions of men's lives," and studying women and the Holocaust would presumably "yield new questions and data."[72] Sybil Milton, another pioneer of the study of women and the Holocaust, noted that it was not merely that women's "gender-specific experiences" had been left out of the scholarly record, but that "recent literature, based mostly on the experiences of male perpetrators, male victims, and male survivors," had promulgated inaccurate and "misleading" information about women's experiences.[73] In Lisa Pine's view, this new field of study was a product of three developments in the 1970s: increased scholarship on the Holocaust more generally; the emergence of a "second wave of feminism" and women's studies (which, among other things, aimed to end the silencing of women's stories); and the vast expansion of published Holocaust memoirs and testimonies.[74]

Despite resistance to the study of women and the Holocaust (noted earlier), the study of this topic began to grow. In 1983 the Institute for Research in History sponsored the conference, "Women Surviving the Holocaust," at Stern College. Although proceedings from the first conference ever to focus on women and the Holocaust were subsequently published, and then followed by some related scholarly articles, chapters, and books, it was only in the 1990s that scholarship on women and the Holocaust has started to expand significantly.[75] Importantly, this work did not merely "add women" into narratives of the Holocaust (although this was valuable), it

also discussed the importance of gender—that is, the cultural ideas and social prescriptions about femininity and masculinity assigned to "female" and "male" sexed bodies. The increased scholarship was reflective of the growing legitimacy of gender studies and was accompanied by the wider study of women and Nazism as well as women and fascism more broadly. New academic studies on women and the Holocaust also appear to have been partly inspired by the institutionalization of Holocaust memory and its limitations. As Joan Ringelheim has suggested, the failure of the four-day opening conference of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in 1993 to have any panels on women or gender, and the initial failure of the museum to have any conceptualization of gender, underscored the need for greater attention to gender and the Holocaust, including on survivor memories and the "construction of collective memory in both national and community settings."[76] Reports in the 1990s about the widespread sexual violence perpetrated against non-Serbian women in the Balkans and Tutsi women in Rwanda fueled greater interest in the study of sexual violence during the Holocaust, perpetrated by both Germans and non-Germans against Jewish as well as non-Jewish women, which has resulted in a prodigious amount of new scholarship on this topic in the last ten to fifteen years.[77]

The study of gender and the Armenian genocide emerged even later than the study of gender and the Holocaust. Although some women's memoirs and autobiographies—and biographies about Armenian female victims—were published in the 1980s and 1990s, most gender analyses emerged after 2000. The turn to gender was a product of several factors, including the mass rape of women in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda in the 1990s, which confirmed the legitimacy of examining gender-based distinctions in mass violence and increased scholarly interest in analyzing gender and genocide comparatively. Recently, greater openness in Turkey about discussing the fate of Islamized Armenian women in Turkish families and their descendants and "the keen interest of third-generation Armenians in the experience of their grandmothers" (and, I would add, interest on the part of Turks who "discovered" their grandmothers' past) has also fostered new scholarship.[78]

Gender analyses of the Rwandan and Bosnian genocides began to appear as the atrocities and destruction unfolded, and stories about the sexual violence perpetrated against women began to be publicized. As the feminist Slavenka Drakulic notes about the carnage in the former Yugoslavia: "It was all there, on the television screens"—"shells, bombs, slaughter, rape, blood, destruction—the entire war unfolded in front of [Europeans'] eyes. Everybody knew what was going on."[79] In the view of many, the media accounts of Serbian policies of mass rape, including the use of rape camps, and the news about the mass rape of Tutsi women, often accompanied by sexual mutilation and then followed by killing, demanded scholarly, legal, and humanitarian attention as well as international intervention.

Inclusions and exclusions in the volume

In addition to being a gender studies scholar, I am a historian of the Soviet Union, and, as such, it might seem surprising that this volume does not include a chapter on gender and the terrible mass crimes that Stalin spearheaded, which resulted in the imprisonment, deportation, and death of millions.[80] As Nicholas Werth and others have argued, the mass crimes perpetrated against the Soviet people were not discrete events; they were part of a larger project, a "radical, murderous form of *social* engineering" on behalf of a "transformative vision of Utopia"—the utopia of Soviet socialism.[81] Moreover, some scholars claim that the mass crimes are evidence of the "genocidal character" of the Stalinist regime, which "killed systematically rather than episodically."[82] Although there is scholarly consensus that the great violence perpetrated under Stalin's rule was horrific and destroyed countless lives, there is no scholarly consensus on how to conceptualize this violence.

Whether or not these mass crimes should be understood as genocidal or as evidence of "Stalin's genocides," they are not included in this volume for three main reasons. First, as I conceptualized this book, I decided it should concentrate on just a few examples of genocide in the twentieth century, so that it could offer a more detailed examination of these cases. That is, I opted for depth and not breadth. As a result, the book focuses primarily on the Armenian genocide and Holocaust in the first half of the twentieth century and the genocides in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the second half. The chapters by Adam Jones and Elisa von Joeden-Forgey are the exceptions, in that they consider not only one or more of these four core cases but other examples of genocide as well. (Jones examines genocide in Rwanda *and* the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), and Joeden-Forgey's analysis includes discussion of Argentina and Darfur.) It should be noted, as well, that this volume focuses on Nazi efforts to exterminate the Jews of Europe and not on the victims of the Holocaust more broadly, even though the Nazis also attempted to annihilate groups other than the Jews for racial reasons, especially "Gypsies" (Roma and Sinti), gay men, and mentally and physically "handicapped" people. This focus on the Jewish victims of the Nazis has to do with the content of individual contributions to the volume and not with any belief on my part that these other groups are somehow less important victims of the Nazi regime's murderous actions.[83]

One reason for the book's focus on these four cases is that they more or less fit the legal definition of genocide adopted by the UN Convention, which provides a useful framework for comparison, despite the limits of the definition. Like many others, I consider the definition problematic, not least of all because it excludes cases of genocide in which groups of people have been (or could be) targeted because of real and imagined gender, sexual, social, political, and other differences. An additional reason for focusing on these four cases is the growing scholarship on *gender* and these particular

01 Introduction.indd 16 4/7/2015 2:24:56 PM

genocides. Although some academic attention has been paid to the plight of women in the Bangladesh genocide of 1971 and in the more recent Darfur genocide, gender scholarship on most other examples of twentieth-century genocidal violence is limited.[84]

Contributions to this volume

In Part I of this volume, both authors demonstrate the importance of examining not only women but also men as gendered victims of genocide. After reviewing some of the main scholarly developments and issues in the study of gender and the Holocaust, Lisa Pine's chapter examines Jewish men's and women's responses not only to Nazi persecution in the 1930s but also to Auschwitz-Birkenau, the largest of the Nazi death camps. Pine's analysis provides insight into how gender norms and social constructions of male and female identities informed victims' experiences as well as their testimonies and memories about this past. Pine also explores a subject that is often glossed over—how some men and women "deviated" from expected gender and sexual norms in the context of the camps. Pine focuses in particular on women's "deviation" and describes, for example, how many women traded sexual favors for food and other items. Pine's discussion provides a window on how women and men at Auschwitz-Birkenau faced difficult moral choices and physical situations that challenged their previous sense of self.

In Chapter 2, Adam Jones examines masculine vulnerabilities in the Rwandan and Congolese genocides, upsetting the standard framing in studies of mass violence of men as perpetrators and women as victims. He details how in both the Rwandan and Congolese cases (and in the ongoing violence in the DRC), men and boys—particularly those of "battle age"—were specifically targeted for direct killings and sexual violence because they were male. In addition, Jones explores how "gendercidal" military conscription and forced (*corvée*) labor have historically resulted in the victimization of men, including in the unfolding of tragic events in Rwanda and the DRC. Jones's argues that it is imperative "from a humanitarian-intervention viewpoint" to recognize and address the forced mobilization of and gender-selective atrocities against males.

Although sexual violence was addressed briefly in Pine's and Jones's chapters on the gendered experiences and gendered harms that men and women have faced in different genocidal contexts, Part II provides an in-depth exploration of sexual violence against girls and women in the four cases of genocide that are the focus of this volume. The chapters analyze a wide variety of forms of sexual violence, including forced concubinage, marriage, and enslavement of women and children; forced assimilation; rape; sexual torture; and "degenderization" (the destruction of genitals and secondary sex characteristics). Together, they provide an important

comparative perspective on sexual atrocities during genocide and underscore how different ideologies and different historical and cultural contexts shape this type of violence.

Anthonie Holslag, in Chapter 3, utilizes ideas from anthropologist Gerd Baumann about the dialectic process of "Othering" and "Selfing" in identity formation to explore the unfolding of violence, particularly sexual violence, during the Armenian genocide. He argues that sexual violence played a key role in the Ottoman Empire's leaders' efforts to construct a new Ottoman Self based on Turkishness, which, in the context of the First World War, came to rely not merely on the marginalization but also on the elimination of Armenians, who had been constructed as the "Other." Holslag explores how perpetrators sought to destroy the very essence and reproduction of Armenian identity by committing acts of "gendercide" and rape, sexual torture, and "degenderization," and by exposing the intimate parts of the bodies of the dead. Holslag also examines how the forced assimilation and enslavement of women and young boys served not only to subordinate but also to eliminate Armenianness.

In Chapter 4, Zoë Waxman analyzes sexual violence against Jewish women in the Holocaust. Waxman acknowledges that the Nazi persecution of Jews included various forms of sexual violence, such as forced abortion and sterilization as well as the sexual humiliation and violation of women upon first examination and registration at camps. In comparing these forms of sexual violence to similar sexual aggression in more recent cases of mass destruction and murder, she argues that the Holocaust was distinctive. Whereas rape was an integral and widespread instrument of genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the rape of Jewish women was not a systematic or organized part of Nazi genocidal policy because of Nazi racial ideology.

Patricia Weitsman's chapter examines the Serbian policies of mass rape, forced impregnation, and forced maternity against Bosniak women in the Bosnian War. In the process, she illuminates how particular conceptions of gender in the former Yugoslavia informed constructions of ethnic identity to produce these specific forms of sexual violence. The popular perception that women were mere vessels for paternal identity, and that their maternal biological connection and role in a child's upbringing did not contribute to a child's ethnic identity, allowed the Serbs to claim that forced impregnation would result in more "Serbian" babies. Weitsman also discusses how this gendered notion of ethnic identity resulted in tragic consequences for the children born of rape.

In Chapter 6, Burnet explores the mass rape of women during the Rwandan genocide. Her chapter adds to the existing scholarship on this subject by examining in particular how the political economy of everyday gender violence and notions of sexual consent and gender roles in pregenocidal Rwanda—all of which subordinated women to men—heightened "women and girls' vulnerability to sexual violence" during the genocide, affected the ways this mass violence unfolded, and shaped the postgenocidal

repercussions of this aggression on survivors, their families, and local communities (e.g., reactions to children born of rape). By discussing the perpetrators and survivors who did not fit into the "Hutu-perpetrator/Tutsi-victim dyad," and by raising the question of women's "sexual agency" and militarized sex, Burnet complicates traditional narratives of sexual violence in Rwanda and sheds light on the silenced victims of this violence.

Part III of this volume contains two chapters that use gender as a lens for better understanding complicity and participation in genocidal violence.[85] Although in the 1980s and 1990s important scholarship raised the question of German women's relationship to and support for the Nazi regime and its anti-Semitic and racist policies, and in the last decade there has been greater attention paid to women perpetrators in the Holocaust, there has been relatively little work on masculinity and male perpetrators.[86] Stephen Haynes's chapter, which was first published in 2002 in the *Journal of Men's Studies*, thus remains groundbreaking. The introduction to this chapter is a bit dated because, as Haynes notes, there was virtually no scholarly interest in applying gender analysis to the study of men in the Holocaust at the time of his writing. Since then, the field of masculinity studies has burgeoned, and there has been increased—albeit still limited—academic inquiry into male experiences and discourses of masculinity in the Holocaust.[87] Haynes explores how discourses of masculinity contributed to male Holocaust perpetrators' genocidal conduct and "verbal self-justifications" for their behavior. In addition to analyzing the experiences and testimonies of more elite and Nazified men—death camp commandants, SS men, and *Einsatzgruppe* officers—Haynes investigates "ordinary men/ordinary Germans," that is, the reserve police forces that have been the subject of so much scholarly debate. His analysis of both groups underscores the need for genocide scholarship to investigate men as gendered beings and sheds light on how notions of ideal German masculinity played a part in shaping men's actions.

Nicole Hogg and Mark Drumbl's chapter examines the mass participation of "ordinary" women and female leaders in the Rwandan genocide. Although the vast majority of those engaged directly in killings were male, many women did kill Tutsis. Moreover, they actively contributed to genocidal processes by exposing victims to the killers and engaging in the looting of victims' property. Some ordinary women, however, tried to save Tutsis. Hogg and Drumbl explore the importance of gender roles and gender dynamics in determining ordinary women's actions as bystanders, active participants, and rescuers. They also investigate the gendered discourses that were deployed against and by women perpetrators in leadership positions who faced prosecution after the genocide.[88]

The chapters in Part IV focus on postgenocidal trauma and memory. How do the victims of genocide recover after the violence has ended? How do communities try to rebuild? How do ideas about gender affect recovery efforts and survivor resources? How does memory operate? What are the

effects of particular gendered narratives and collective memories about genocidal violence?

Lerna Ekmekcioglu's chapter examines the complexities of Armenians' postgenocidal and post-First World War rescue efforts to track down, "emancipate," and reintegrate into their own communities the children and women who had been taken into Muslim households and orphanages during the wartime genocide. Ekmekcioglu explores how differences between Ottoman and Armenian authorities about how to deal with married female abductees, resistance to reintegration among some Armenian children and women, Ottoman fears that "true Muslim" children were being taken in Armenian rescue efforts, and a broader Turkish-Armenian dispute over territory in Eastern Turkey (which was connected to demographics) led to a fierce battle about ethnoreligious identity and "who belonged to whom." In order to repopulate the Armenian community and strengthen Armenian land claims, Armenian leaders promoted a pronatalist campaign and temporarily altered lineage rules as well as gender and sexual norms. In the process, maternity trumped paternity in determining a baby's identity, and women who had been forcibly married or had served as sexual concubines, and children of Muslim fatherhood, could be reclaimed as "Armenian."

In Chapter 10, Olivera Simić investigates the sexual violence experienced by men during the Bosnian War, the silence surrounding these male victims, and the consequences of this silencing for male survivors. During the war, hundreds of men were subjected to various forms of sexual abuse: rape, sexual torture, genital mutilation (including castrations), and forced incest. These male victims have been virtually ignored, by both the international community and local bodies, partly because of their shame and reluctance to speak out about their experiences and partly because of a gendered narrative about the Bosnian War, which has underscored the great sexual violence that Bosniak women were subjected to but has rendered male victims invisible. Moreover, gender norms and stereotypes have made it difficult for men to be seen as victims of sexual violence. The result, Simić argues, is that male survivors of sexual violence have not received counseling or other forms of assistance, nor have they seen the prosecution of their perpetrators, all of which could have helped with healing from their great trauma. Moreover, the lack of scholarly attention to these male victims has hindered understandings of wartime and genocidal violence. As Simić explicates, male perpetrators who sexually abuse "enemy" men not only disempower and feminize them, but also humiliate these men's ethnic group and assert their own dominant masculinity.[89]

Selma Leydesdorff, in Chapter 11, considers the great difficulty women survivors of Srebrenica have in conveying what happened to themselves and others during the genocide. She also examines how the lack of recognition afforded to these women in the international arena of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), and the failure of the courts to really listen to these female survivors, has led to the distortion

of their narratives. In the ICTY and other legal proceedings, women's complex stories of great sadness and pain and incomprehension have been transformed by juridical language into simpler testimonies of denunciation and self-defense. This has not only resulted in a new kind of violence against survivors, Leydesdorff suggests, but it has also undermined an opportunity to better comprehend how deeply Bosniak women's lives were disrupted by the Bosnian tragedy.

The last part of the volume considers how international law has shaped understandings of genocide and how the study of gender and genocide is central to realizing genuine genocide prevention. Doris Buss's chapter examines the role of international law in recognizing gendered forms of genocidal violence. In particular, she contextualizes how the international tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia came to see rape as a crime of genocide, worthy of prosecution and punishment. The courts' framing of rape and sexual violence as a product of elite-orchestrated ethnic conflict, she argues, was linked to a broader effort to make sense of violence in Rwanda and Yugoslavia by reframing these conflicts as a product of elite manipulation of ethnic identities, rather than as a product of old tribal hatreds and "atavistic animosities." Although this narrative of sexual violence can be seen as an improvement over older narratives about war and its effects, in which the sexual victimization of women was ignored or considered incidental, Buss points out how this legal framework has nonetheless been limiting. Similarly to Leydesdorff, Buss maintains that particular types of juridical framing have discouraged a more complex analysis of sexual violence and have obscured other forms of gendered harms that accompany genocide as well as victims and perpetrators of sexual violence who do not "fit" into this framework.

The last chapter in the volume argues that gender research can aid in the determination of mass violence as genocidal and in efforts to prevent it. In Joeden-Forgey's view, when gendered violence and "life force atrocities" accompany violent conflict, they are a strong indicator of genocidal intent. This is because "ritualized atrocities that target the life force of a group" by destroying familial and community bonds, ties to the land, symbols of group cohesion, and the social and biological reproduction of a group are common to genocides, despite local and cultural variations. Instead of reading the crime of genocide in the numbers of bodies and massacres, genocide can thus be read from the "bottom up"—through examples of gendered and life-force atrocities. If in monitoring violent conflict, human rights organizations, government agencies or other groups identified the existence of these types of crimes, this information could then potentially serve as a red flag for the unfolding of genocidal violence.

* * *

As a historian of the Soviet Union, I never expected to edit a book or write on the topic of genocide. Before 2008, I also never expected to teach a course on

twentieth-century genocides. So how did I get here? As with many scholars and teachers of genocide studies, I came to this project through intellectual and personal avenues. My intellectual journey is connected to my pursuit of gender and sexuality studies in graduate school at Princeton as well as my teaching of the Holocaust and gender history in my first academic job and ever since. Indeed, it was in these early years that I discovered Olga Lengyel's memoir, *Five Chimneys: A Woman Survivor's True Story of Auschwitz*, in my search for a text that undergraduates were unlikely to have read in other college-level classes, high school, or on their own. This memoir fueled my interest in gender and genocide. Lengyel's description of complicity and resistance in Auschwitz, including among women, and the gendered dimensions of her and other women's experience of the camp, raised important questions for me about gender and the Holocaust. My interest in this topic was not merely intellectual, however. As a child I became interested in the unequal status, discriminatory treatment, and abuse of girls and women in our society; one of my stronger middle school memories is being chased by boys who mocked me for being a "women's libber" and for getting in trouble by fighting back (in a very unladylike way). As a young woman, I became increasingly aware of how I and other women in our society were subjected to disdain, mistreatment, marginalization, and violence because of sexism, gendered beliefs, gender norms, and, in some cases, misogyny. And yet, I was also aware of how fortunate I was to be female in the United States, because despite significant similarities in the abuse that females suffer the world over—such as domestic violence and rape—it was clear to me that in some other countries, girls and women suffered from additional forms of abuse and aggression, such as honor killings and genital mutilation. Anti-Semitism too was personal; although I grew up in a community with a significant Jewish population and few overt expressions of anti-Semitism, I was to some extent aware as a ten-year-old in the 1970s that my stepfather's Jewish identity was part of the reason why he was so disliked by the Boston political establishment. It was only years later that I came to fully understand how central anti-Semitism was to the unfolding of his fate as Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Massachusetts and to the personal history of our family.[90] This experience of anti-Semitism contributed to my interest in historical cases of anti-Semitism, which was reinforced by my Hebrew Sunday school discussions of pogroms against Jews in Imperial Russia and two units in my K-8 school about the Holocaust. As a teenager and young adult, I also began to learn and think more about the history and persistence of racism (both in our society and elsewhere) as well as the marginalization and hatred of the "Other"—including the racial, religious, female, and sexual Other. This knowledge, along with my activism as an undergraduate in the antiapartheid divestment movement and in efforts to raise awareness about sexual violence against women, contributed to my intellectual and moral development and has led to a lifelong concern about the violation of people's rights and dignity and

the violence—economic, political, psychological, sexual, and physical—that frequently accompanies it. As a professor, I have tried to be an activist by teaching about these issues. Indeed, this edited collection on genocide and gender is a result of my decision to teach a course on genocide and ethnic cleansing in the twentieth century at Santa Clara University.

Notes

1 Joan Ringelheim, "Thoughts about Women and the Holocaust," and Myrna Goldenberg, "Different Horrors, Same Hell: Women Remembering the Holocaust," in *Thinking the Unthinkable*: *Meanings of the Holocaust*, ed. R. Gottlieb (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1990), pp. 144–5, and 152, respectively.

2 Helene Sinnriech, "Women and the Holocaust," in *Plight and Fate of Women during and Following Genocide*, ed. Samuel Totten (London, UK and New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2009), p. 27.

3 Raul Hilberg, *Perpetrators Victims Bystanders: The Jewish Catastrophe, 1933–1945* (London, UK: Secker and Warburg), p. 126.

4 See Lisa Pine's chapter in this volume.

5 See Elisa von Joeden-Forgey's chapter in this volume.

6 See Doris Buss's chapter in this volume.

7 See Patricia Weitsman's chapter in this volume.

8 See Jennie Burnet's chapter in this volume.

9 See the chapters in this volume by Anthonie Holslag, Adam Jones, Jennie Burnet, and Olivera Simić.

10 See the chapters by Adam Jones and Stephen Haynes in this volume.

11 See Lerna Ekmekcioglu's chapter in this volume.

12 See Patricia Weitsman's chapter in this volume.

13 See Doris Buss's chapter in this volume.

14 See Selma Leydesdorff's chapter in this volume.

15 Janet Jacobs, *Memorializing the Holocaust: Gender, Genocide, and Collective Memory* (London, UK and New York, NY: I. B. Tauris, 2010).

16 See Elisa von Joeden-Forgey's chapter in this volume.

17 Robert Gellately and Ben Kiernan, "The Study of Mass Murder and Genocide," in *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective*, ed. Robert Gellately and Ben Kiernan (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 9. For an early example of this scholarship, see Roger Smith, "Human Destructiveness and Politics: The Twentieth Century in an Age of Genocide," in *Genocide and the Modern Age: Etiology and Case Studies of Mass Death*, ed. Isidor Wallimann and Michael N. Dobkowski (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1987), pp. 21–39.

18 Eric Weitz, "The Modernity of Genocides: War, Race, and Revolution in the Twentieth Century," in *The Specter of Genocide*, p. 54.

19 Weitz, p. 56.

20 Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1989), pp. 91–3.

21 Marie Fleming, "Genocide and the Body Politic in the Time of Modernity," in *The Specter of Genocide*, p. 98. Some scholars criticize this emphasis on the distinctiveness of twentieth-century genocides, because they argue that it underplays or ignores the "colonial essence of modernity." Or to put it another way, the "revolutionary social logic" of modern genocides in the twentieth century "was inherently colonial." For more on this critique, see Dirk Moses, "Genocide and Modernity," in *The Historiography of Genocide*, ed. Dirk Moses (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 179; and Richard King and Dan Stone, ed. *Hannah Arendt and the Uses of History: Imperialism, Nation, Race, and Empire* (New York, NY and London, UK: Berghan Books, 2007). Hannah Arendt argued that there were important continuities between the colonialism/imperialism of the nineteenth century and Nazi totalitarianism and the Holocaust; the former promoted ways of thinking (about race) and practices for domination and exploitation (bureaucracy) that helped to foster the possibility "for a totalitarian government on the basis of racism." See Hannah Arendt, *Origins of Totalitarianism* (Cleveland, OH: World Publishing Company, 1958), part II, here p. 185.

22 Although scientific racism and negative eugenics largely ceased to have scholarly credibility in the second half of the twentieth century, after their murderous use by the Nazis, the biologization of race still has popular currency, and science is still mobilized to propagate racist ideas.

23 Ana Filipa Vrdoljak, "Human Rights and Genocide: The Work of Lauterpacht and Lemkin in Modern International Law," *The European Journal of International Law* 20:4 (2010), p. 1176; Samantha Power, "*A Problem from Hell:*" *America and the Age of Genocide* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 2002), p. 21.

24 For more on Lemkin's efforts to convince the international community that certain acts violated international law and were therefore international crimes, see Vrdoljak, "Human Rights and Genocide," pp. 1163–93.

25 Power, "*A Problem from Hell*," p. 42.

26 Raphael Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government—Proposals for Redress* (New York, NY: Howard Fertig, 1973 [1944]), chapters 8 and 9.

27 Ibid., p. 79.

28 For more on Lemkin's book and his understanding of genocide, see Dirk Moses, "The Holocaust and Genocide," in *The Historiography of the Holocaust*, pp. 537–40.

29 "The United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide," in *The Genocide Studies Reader*, ed. Samuel Totten and Paul Bartrop (London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2009), p. 31.

30 Ibid.

31 Kuper argued that "vestiges" of cultural genocide remained in two main ways; ethnical groups (that is, "groups with distinctive culture of language") were

01 Introduction.indd 24 4/7/2015 2:24:57 PM

included as groups to be protected against genocide, and "forcibly transferring children of the group to another group" constituted an act of genocide. Leo Kuper, *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), p. 31.

32 Kuper addresses these complexities and controversies regarding the UN definition in pp. 22–35, here 26. Also see Samuel Totten, ed., *Teaching about Genocide: Issues, Approaches, and Resources* (Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 2004), especially chapters 3 and 4. In addition to already mentioned concerns about the definition—for example, about how it excludes political and social groups as targets of and hence deserving protection from genocide—there is another problem; as Alexander Hinton notes, this legal definition reifies the idea of race as "immutable," which belies the fact that race itself is a social construction that historically has been highly mutable. Alexander Hinton, "Critical Genocide Studies," in *Genocide Matters: Ongoing Issues and Emerging Perspectives*, ed. Joyce Apsel and Ernesto Verdeja (Oxon, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 2013), p. 50.

33 For more on the prosecution of sexual violence as an act of genocide, including significant limitations regarding what is viewed as sexual violence, see Anne-Marie de Brouwer, *Sexual Violence as an Act of Genocide: Supranational Criminal Prosecution of Sexual Violence: The ICC and the Practice of the ICTY and the ICTR* (Antwerp, Belgium and Oxford, UK: Intersentia, 2005). Helen Fein has argued that sexual violence could also be considered an act of genocide because it falls "within several of the five acts defined by the UNCG as genocide"—that is, acts C and D (and not only B). For more on her view, see Roger Smith, "Genocide and the Politics of Rape: Historical and Psychological Perspectives," in *Genocide Matters*, p. 98.

34 Smith, "Genocide and the Politics of Rape," in *Genocide Matters*, p. 99.

35 Paul Bartrop and Samuel Totten, "The History of Genocide: An Overview," in *Teaching about Genocide*, pp. 45–6. For a more detailed discussion of the failures of the international community, see Power, "*A Problem from Hell*," and Karen E. Smith, *Genocide and the Europeans* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010). For problems with prevention, see Samuel Totten, *Impediments to the Prevention and Intervention of Genocide* (New Brunswick, NJ and London, UK: Transaction Publishers, 2013).

36 Donald Bloxham and A. Dirk Moses, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 3.

37 As Michael Marrus notes, up until the Eichmann trial in 1961, there was "relatively little discussion of the massacre of European Jewry" in academic circles and the wider public, and when academics did mention it, they usually "did so in passing as one more atrocity in a particularly cruel war." Michael Marrus, *The Holocaust in History* (Hanover, NH and London, UK: University Press of New England, 1987), pp. 4–5. For some of the earliest academic literature on the Holocaust, see Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York, NY: Holmes & Meier, 1961); Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (New York, NY: The Viking Press, 1965); Lucy Dawidowicz, *The War against the Jews, 1939-1945* (New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1975); Helen Fein, *Accounting*

for Genocide: National Responses and Jewish Victimization during the Holocaust (New York, NY: Free Press, 1979); Henry Friedlander and Sybil Milton, eds., *The Holocaust: Ideology, Bureaucracy, and Genocide* (Millwood and New York, NY: Kraus International Publications, 1980); Yehuda Bauer, *A History of the Holocaust* (New York, NY: Franklin Watts, 1982).

38 For more on why awareness about and commemoration of the Holocaust was initially so limited and then began to expand, see Dan Stone, "Memory, Memorials, and Museums," in *The Historiography of the Holocaust*, pp. 512–15; Jacobs, *Memorializing the Holocaust*, pp. xvii–xviii; Eliezer Don-Yehiya, "Memory and Political Culture: Israeli Society and the Holocaust," *Studies in Contemporary Jewry* 9 (1993), pp. 139–61; Idith Zertal, *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company: 1999); Alan Mintz, *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2001).

39 Marrus, *The Holocaust in History*, pp. 4–5.

40 Ian Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives of Interpretation* (London, UK: Edward Arnold, 1985), pp. 83–4.

41 This new political consciousness, which resulted in calls for greater openness about the country's past and its perpetration of terrible crimes against Jews in the Second World War, was particularly prominent among younger West Germans. See Jacobs, *Memorializing the Holocaust*, p. xvii.

42 Henry R. Huttenbach, "Vita Felix, Via Dolorosa: An Academic Journey towards Genocide," in *Pioneers of Genocide Studies*, ed. Samuel Totten and Steven Leonard Jacobs (London, UK and New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002), p. 51. For more on the links between politics of the 1960s and the Nazi past, including the historical rhetoric used by critics to delegitimize various state actions, see Harold Marcuse, "The Revival of Holocaust Awareness in West Germany, Israel, and the United States," in *1968: The World Transformed*, ed. Carole Fink, Philipp Gassert, and Detlev Junker (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 421–38.

43 Stone, "Memory, Memorials, and Museums," pp. 512–15; Gellately and Kiernan, "The Study of Mass Murder and Genocide," p. 6; Jacobs, *Memorializing the Holocaust*, p. xvii. For an interesting discussion of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, which President Carter commissioned in 1979 and which finally opened in 1993, see Alison Landsberg, "America, the Holocaust, and the Mass Culture of Memory: Toward a Radical Politics of Empathy," *New German Critique* 71 (1997), pp. 63–86.

44 Kershaw argues that German "popular consciousness was reached only through the showing of the American filmed 'soap-opera' dramatization of the Holocaust on Western German television in 1979." Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship*, 83.

45 For Turkish narratives, including scholarship, on the Armenian deaths and massacres, see Donald Bloxham and Fatma Müge Göçeck, "The Armenian Genocide," in *The Historiography of Genocide*, pp. 346–52. For geopolitical reasons, the West legitimized the new state, the Republic of Turkey, which

succeeded the Ottoman Empire after its collapse in 1918. This included "Western abandonment of the Armenians" in the final postwar peace treaties and Western complicity in the cover-up in subsequent decades. As Richard Hovannisian notes, Turkish leaders secured this complicity by "playing upon" Turkey's importance as "a bulwark against communism" and an international trade and commerce partner. See Hovannisian, "The Armenian Genocide," in *Genocide: A Critical Bibliographic Review*, ed. Israel Charny (New York, NY: Facts on File Publications, 1988), pp. 97–8; "Confronting the Armenian Genocide," in *Pioneers of Genocide Studies*, p. 32, respectively.

46 Some of the early work includes: Richard Hovannisian, *The Armenian Holocaust (A Bibliography Relating to the Deportation, Massacres, and Dispersion of the Armenian People, 1915-1923)* (Cambridge, MA: Armenian Heritage Press, 1980); Richard Hovannisian, ed., *The Armenian Genocide in Perspective* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1986); Yves Ternon, *Les Arméniens, histoire d'un génocide* (Paris, France: 1977); Gerard Chaliand and Yves Ternon, *The Armenians; From Genocide to Resistance*, trans. Tony Berret (London, UK: Zed Press, 1983); Vahakn Dadrian, "The Role of the Turkish Physicians in the World War I Genocide of the Armenians," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 1:2 (1986), pp. 169–92.

47 Rubina Peroomian, "Historical Memory: Threading the Contemporary Literature of Armenia," in *The Armenian Genocide: Cultural and Ethical Legacies*, ed. Richard Hovannisian (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2007), p. 107; Richard Hovannisian, "The Armenian Genocide and Patterns of Denial," in *The Armenian Genocide in Perspective*, pp. 121–2.

48 Radical international groups, such as the Justice Commandos of the Armenian Genocide and the Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia, used violent attacks and assassinations to spread the same message and to demand apologies and reparations from the Turkish government.

49 In 1982, this growing academic interest in the Armenian genocide was reflected in the founding of the Zoryan Institute for Contemporary Armenian Research and Documentation, which explicitly promoted genocide research and documentation. In addition to serving as an international scholarly center, the institute has organized international conferences as well hundreds of seminars and lectures in conjunction with academic institutions. By launching an oral history project in 1983, which recorded 700 survivors' testimonies, and collecting a vast array of archival materials, the institute has also become an important research repository. K. M. (Greg) Sarkissian, *The Making of a National Research Centre: The Zoryan Institute* (The Zoryan Institute, 2004).

50 Hovannisian, "Confronting the Armenian Genocide," in *Pioneers of Genocide Studies*, p. 33. Among other things, the Turkish government produced a flood of denial literature that it then sent to Western libraries and schools. It also pressured NATO allies to collude in the silencing of what really happened—for example, by not lending support to commemorations or conferences about the Armenian genocide. For more on this topic, see Hovannisian, "The Armenian Genocide," in *Genocide: A Bibliographic Review,* pp. 100–1 and "Genocide and Denial: The Armenian Case," in *Toward the Understanding and Prevention of Genocide: Proceedings of the Proceedings of the International Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide* (Boulder, CO; Westview Press, 1984).

51 People's Tribunal at Sorbonne, 1985, United Nations Commission on Human Rights, 1985, European Parliament after that (see Dadrian, *History of the Armenian Genocide*, p. xix).

52 Irving Louis Horowitz, "Gauging Genocide: Social Sciences Dimensions," in *Pioneers of Genocide Studies*, p. 263.

53 Some of the comparative scholarship includes: Vahakn Dadrian, "The Convergent Aspects of the Armenian and Jewish cases of Genocide," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 3:2 (1988), pp. 151–69; Robert Melson, *Revolution and Genocide: On the Origins of the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1996); Robert Melson, "Revolution, War, and Genocide: The Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust Compared," in *Encyclopedia of Genocide*, vol. 2, ed. Israel W. Charny (Denver, CO: ABC Clio, 1999).

54 For some early academic work on Bangladesh, see Kalyn Chaudhuri, *Genocide in Bangladesh* (Telangana, India: Orient Longman, 1972); Abul Hasanat, *Bangladesh, Sufferings, Survival: Let Humanity Not Forget the Ugliest Genocide in History* (New York, NY: Muktadhara, 1978). Although there was some Western media coverage of and some early non-Western scholarship on the genocide in Bangladesh, most academics in the West paid little attention to it in the following two decades. Donald W. Beachler, "The Politics of Genocide Scholarship: The Case of Bangladesh," *Patterns of Prejudice* 41:5 (December 2007), pp. 467–92. One of the earlier Western academics to focus on the Cambodian genocide, Ben Kiernan, provides an excellent overview of it in *The Pol Pot Regime: Race, Power and Genocide in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge, 1975–1979* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996).

55 Although there was Western media coverage in the late 1970s and early 1980s about the mass atrocities and deaths in Cambodia, geopolitical factors played a role how these events were explained. Because of the US alliance with China against the Soviet Union and the Vietnamese, for example, most American politicians did not acknowledge the Khmer Rouge's murderous policies and mass killings—both during the height of the carnage and in the 1980s. Moreover, some explained the mass deaths by promoting the narrative that the Vietnamese invasion in 1979 had led to "genocide by starvation." US diplomatic support for the Khmer Rouge continued until 1991. For more on how politics shaped recognition of and attention to the genocides in Bangladesh and Cambodia, see Donald W. Beachler, *The Genocide Debate: Politicians, Academics, and Victims* (Basingstoke, UK and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

56 Robert Melson, "My Journey in the Study of Genocide," in *Pioneers of Genocide Studies*, p. 139.

57 Huttenbach, "Vita Felix, Via Dolorosa," p. 54.

58 Kuper, *Genocide*. Other examples of early scholarship in genocide studies include: Richard Arens, ed., *Genocide in Paraguay* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1976); Irving Louis Horowitz, *Taking Lives: Genocide and State Power* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transactions Books, 1976); Leo Kuper, *The Prevention of Genocide* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985); Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, *The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses*

and Case Studies (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990). In their book, Chalk and Jonassohn explicitly adopted a comparative approach to "attempt to identify the social conditions and situations in which genocide [was] likely to occur" (p. 4). This book discusses genocides in many different historical contexts and places, including ancient Carthage, New England in the 1630s (Puritans' destruction of the Pequots), twentieth-century Bangladesh, Burundi, Indonesia, Cambodia, and so on.

59 Kuper, *Genocide*, pp. 9–10.

60 Isidor Wallimann and Michael N. Dobrowski, eds., "Introduction," in *Genocide and the Modern Age*, pp. xxiii.

61 Israel Charny, *How Can We Commit the Unthinkable? Genocide: The Human Cancer* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1982), p. 4.

62 This openness and interest of some Holocaust studies scholars led to the first international conference on the Holocaust and genocide in 1982 in Israel. See Israel Charny, ed., *Toward the Understanding and Prevention of Genocide: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide* (Boulder, CO; Westview Press, 1984).

63 For more on the uniqueness debate, see Alan Rosenbaum, ed., *Is the Holocaust Unique: Perspectives on Comparative Genocid*e (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996).

64 Donald Bloxham, *The Final Solution: A Genocide* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 7.

65 Steven Leonard Jacobs, "From Holocaust to Genocide: The Journey Continues," in *Pioneers of Genocide Studies*, p. 515.

66 Donald Bloxham and A. Dirk Moses, "Editors Introduction: Changing Themes in the Study of Genocide," in *Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*, ed. Donald Bloxham and A. Dirk Moses (Oxford, UK and New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 2.

67 Some of these comparative works include: Mark Levene, *Genocide in the Age of the Nation State* (vols. 1 and 2) (London, UK: I. B. Tauris, 2005); Gellately and Kiernan, eds., *The Specter of Genocide*; Benjamin Valentino, *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005); Samuel Totten, William S. Parsons, and Israel Charney, eds., *Genocide in the Twentieth Century: Critical Essays and Eyewitness Testimony* (New York, NY: Garland Publishing, 1995).

68 Dan Stone, "The Holocaust and its Historiography," in *The Historiography of Genocide*, p. 374.

69 For example, see Olaf Jensen and Claus-Christian W. Szejnmann, eds., *Ordinary People as Mass Murderers: Perpetrators in Comparative Perspectives* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

70 For example, see Sheri Rosenberg and Everita Silina, "Genocide by Attrition: Silent and Efficient," in *Genocide Matters*, p. 107.

71 Hinton, "Critical Genocide Studies," pp. 54–5.

72 Joan Ringelheim, "Women and the Holocaust: A Reconsideration of Research," *Signs* 10:4 (1985), pp. 741–2.

73 Sybil Milton, "Women and the Holocaust: The Case of German and German-Jewish Women," in *When Biology Became Destiny: Women in Weimar and Nazi Germany*, ed. Renate Bridenthal, Atina Grossman, and Marion Kaplan (New York, NY: Monthly Review Press, 1984), p. 297.

74 Lisa Pine, "Gender and the Family," in *The Historiography of the Holocaust,* p. 364.

75 Esther Katz and Joan Ringelheim, eds., *Proceedings of the Conference, Women Surviving the Holocaust* (New York, NY: Institute for Research in History, 1983). Some of the earlier scholarship from the 1980s and early 1990s included: Marlene Heinemann, *Gender and Destiny: Women Writers and the Holocaust* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986); Joan Ringelheim, "Thoughts about Women and the Holocaust," and Myrna Goldenberg, "Different Horrors, Same Hell: Women Remembering the Holocaust," in *Thinking the Unthinkable*: *Meanings of the Holocaust*, ed. R. Gottlieb (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1990), pp. 141–9, and 150–66, respectively; C. Rittner and J. Roth, eds., *Different Voices: Women and the Holocaust* (New York, NY: Paragon, 1993). For some (but by no means all) of the more recent scholarship on gender and the Holocaust, see the following books: Judith Baumel, *Double Jeopardy: Gender and the Holocaust* (London, UK: Valentine Mitchell, 1998); Rochelle Saidel, *The Jewish Women of Ravensbruck Concentration Camp* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004); Nechama Tec, *Resilience and Courage: Women, Men, and the Holocaust* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003); Elizabeth R. Baer and Myrna Goldenberg, eds., *Experience and Expression: Women, the Nazis, and the Holocaust* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2003).

76 Joan Ringelheim, "The Split between Gender and the Holocaust," pp. 346–7; quote from Jacobs, *Memorializing the Holocaust*, pp. xxiii.

77 For the connection between sexual violence and these genocides and the study of sexual violence during the Holocaust, see Waxman chapter in this volume. Also see Catherine MacKinnon, "Turning Rape into Pornography: Postmodern Genocide," *Ms. Magazine* 4:1 (1993). For some of this new academic work, see Sonja M. Hedgpeth and Rochelle G. Saidel, *Sexual Violence against Women during the Holocaust* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2010); Robert Sommer, "Camp Brothels: Forced Sex Labour in Nazi Concentration Camps," Regina Mühlhäuser, "Between 'Racial Awareness' and Fantasies of Potency: Nazi Sexual Politics in the Occupied Territories of the Soviet Union, 1942-1945," and Na'ama Shik, "Sexual Abuse of Jewish Women in Auschwitz-Birkenau," in *Brutality and Desire: War and Sexuality in Europe's Twentieth Century*, ed. D. Herzog (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, 2011), pp. 168–196, 197–220, 221–47, respectively. In addition to studying sexual violence, some scholars have begun to investigate the significance of sexuality, more generally, for understanding Nazism and the Holocaust. For an overview of this scholarship and its importance, see Elizabeth Heineman, "Sexuality and Nazism: The Doubly Unspeakable," in *Sexuality and German Fascism*, ed. Dagmar Herzog (Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, 2005), pp. 22–66. See the chapters in this same book for some of this new scholarship.

78 A few of the earlier works include Isabel Kaprielian-Churchill, "Armenian Refugee Women: The Picture Brides 1920–1930," *Journal of American Ethnic*

History 12:3 (1993), pp. 3–29; Donald Miller and Lorna Touryan Miller, "The Experience of Women and Children," *Survivors: An Oral History of the Armenian Genocide* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA and London, UK: University of California Press, 1993). Scholarship in the last fifteen years includes but is not limited to A. Sarafian, "The Absorption of Armenian Women and Children into Muslim Households as a Structural Component of the Armenian Genocide," in *In God's Name: Genocide and Religion in the Twentieth Century*, ed. O. Bartov and P. Mack (New York, NY and Oxford, UK: Berghahn Books, 2001), pp. 209–21; Vahram Shemmassian, "The League of Nations and the Reclamation of Armenian Genocide Survivors," in *Looking Backward, Moving Forward: Confronting the Armenian Genocide*, ed. Richard Hovannisian (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2003); Katharine Derderian, "Common Fate, Different Experience: Gender-Specific Aspects of the Armenian Genocide, 1915-1917," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 19:1 (Spring 2005), pp. 1–25; Vahé Tachjian, "Gender, Nationalism, Exclusion: The Reintegration Process of Female Survivors of the Armenian Genocide," *Nations and Nationalism* 15: 1 (2009): 60–80; Matthias Bjornlund, "'A Fate Worse Than Dying;' Sexual Violence During the Armenian Genocide," in *Brutality and Desire*, pp. 16–58; Rubina Peroomian, "Women and the Armenian Genocide: The Victim, the Living Martyr," in *Plight and Fate of Women*, p. 14; Ayse Gul Altinay, Fethiye Cetin, *The Hidden Legacy of* "*Lost*" *Armenians in Turkey*, trans. Maureen Freely (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2014); Fethiye Çetin and Maureen Freely, *My Grandmother: A Memoir*, trans. Maureen Freely (London, UK: Verso, 2008); Arlene Voski Avakian, "Surviving the Survivors of the Armenian Genocide: Daughters and Granddaughters," in *Voices of Armenian Women*, ed. Barbara Mergeurian and Joy Renjilian-Burgy (Belmont, MA: AIWA Press, 2000); Arlene Voski Avakian, "A Different Future? Armenian Identity through the Prism of Trauma, Nationalism and Gender," *New Perspectives on Turkey* 42 (Spring 2010), pp. 203–14.

79 Slavenka Drakulic, *Café Europa: Life After Communism* (London, UK and New York, NY: Penguin Books, 1996), p. 213.

80 These crimes included forced collectivization and *dekulakization*, which resulted in a terrible famine and the mass deportation and death of millions of peasants; the purges of 1936–7, which led to the execution of hundreds of thousands (if not more) and imprisonment in the Gulag of millions of so-called enemies of the people (political and national "enemies" as well as alleged intellectual, economic, and military opponents); the mass operations of 1937–8, which entailed the mass repression of millions of "socially harmful elements" (e.g., petty criminals, hooligans, and prostitutes), "former people" (e.g., former members of non-Bolshevik political parties and former Whites), and nationally suspect peoples (who had "foreign contacts" or lived in the borderlands); the execution of over 20,000 Polish army officers in the Katyn massacre of 1940; and the forced deportations of Chechens, Crimean Tatars, and other "punished peoples" in 1944. There is a vast and excellent literature on these topics. For some recent examples, see Paul Hagenloh, *Stalin's Police: Public Order and Mass Repression in the USSR, 1926-1941* (Baltimore, MD; Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009); Wendy Z. Goldman, *Terror and Democracy in the Age of Stalin: The Social Dynamics of Repression* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge

University Press, 2007); Lynne Viola, *The Unknown Gulag: The Lost World of Stalin's Special Settlements* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2007); Oleg Khlevniuk, *The History of the Gulag: From Collectivization to the Great Terror*, trans. Vadim Staklo (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004); J. Arch Getty and Oleg V. Naumov, *The Road to Terror: Stalin and the Self-Destruction of the Bolsheviks, 1932-1939* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999); David Shearer, *Policing Stalin's Socialism: Repression and Social Order in the Soviet Union, 1924-1953* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).

81 Nicholas Werth, "The Mechanism of a Mass Crime: The Great Terror in the Soviet Union, 1937-1938," in *The Specter of Genocide*, p. 238; Norman Naimark, *Stalin's Genocides* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), p. 137, respectively.

82 Naimark, *Stalin's Genocides*, pp. 3, 14.

83 For the Holocaust and Roma and Sinti women, see Sybil Milton, "Hidden Lives: Sinta and Roma Women," in *Experience and Expression*, pp. 53–75. For more on the Romani experience in general, see Gabrielle Tyrnauer, "The Fate of the Gypsies During the Holocaust" and Ian Hancock, "Gypsy History in Germany and Neighbouring Lands: A Chronology Leading to the Holocaust and Beyond," in *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe*, ed. David Crowe and John Kolsti (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1991); Ian Hancock, "Romanies and the Holocaust: A Reevaluation and an Overview," *in The Historiography of the Holocaust*, pp. 383–96; Janos Barsony and Agnes Daroczi, *Pharrajimos: The Fate of the Roma during the Holocaust* (Budapest, Hungary: Central European University Press, 2008). Scholarship on the Nazi persecution of gay men and lesbians includes, but is not limited to, Richard Plant, *The Pink Triangle: The Nazi War against Homosexuals* (New York, NY: Holt, 1986); Gunter Grau, ed., *Hidden Holocaust? Gay and Lesbian Persecution in Germany, 1933-1945*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1995); Claudia Schoppmann, "National Socialist Policies towards Female Homosexuality," in *Gender Relations in German History: Power, Agency and Experience from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, ed. Lynn Abrams and Elizabeth Harvey (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996); Stefan Micheler, "Homophobic Propaganda and the Denunciation of Same-Sex Desiring Men under National Socialism," and Erik Jensen, "The Pink Triangle and Political Consciousness: Gays, Lesbians, and the Memory of Nazi Persecution," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 11:1 and 2 (2002), pp. 105–30, and 319–49, respectively.

84 For Bangladesh, see Anthony Mascarenhas, *The Rape of Bangladesh* (New Delhi, India: Vikas Publications, 1971); Yasmin Saikia, "Overcoming the Silent Archive in Bangladesh: Women Bearing Witness to Violence in the 1971 'Liberation' War," in *Women and the Contested State*, ed. M. Skidmore and P. Lawrence (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007); Yasmin Saikia, *Women, War, and the Making of Bangladesh: Remembering 1971* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011); Nayanika Mookherjee, *The Spectral Wound: Sexual Violence, Public Memories and the Bangladesh War of 1971* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012), and "The Bangladesh Genocide: The Plight of Women," in *Plight and Fate of Women during and*

Following Genocide, ed. Samuel Totten (London, UK and New Brunswick, NY: Transaction Publishers, 2009), pp. 47–66. For more on women and the Darfur genocide, see "The Darfur Genocide: The Mass Rape of Black African Girls and Women," in *Plight and Fate of Women*, pp. 137–68; Kelly Dawn Askin, "Prosecuting Gender Crimes Committed in Darfur: Holding Leaders Accountable for Sexual Violence," in *Genocide in Darfur: Investigating the Atrocities in the Sudan*, ed. Samuel Totten and Eric Markusen (New York, NY: Routledge, 2006), pp. 141–60. For more on women and the Cambodian genocide, see Judy Ledgerwood, "Death, Shattered Families, and Living as Widows in Cambodia," in *Plight and Fate of Women,* pp. 67–81. Ledgerwood maintains that "the specific plight of women in this period [the Khmer Rouge Revolution and genocide] has not been the focus of research" (p. 67). As of now, more research exists on women after the Cambodian genocide.

85 Originally a chapter on masculinity and violence in the former Yugoslavia was supposed to be included in this section of the edited collection, but in the end, this did not come to pass. For some scholarship on this topic, see Euan Hague, "Rape, Power and Masculinity: The Construction of Gender and National Identities in the War in Bosnia-Herzegovina," in *Gender and Catastrophe*, ed. Ronit Lentin (London, UK: Zed Books, 1997), pp. 50–63; and Aleksandra Milićević, "Joining the War: Masculinity, Nationalism and War Participation in the Balkans War of Secession, 1991–1995," *Nationalities Papers* 34: 3 (1996), pp. 265–87; Dubravka Zarkov, "The Body of the Other Man: Sexual Violence and the Construction of Masculinity, Sexuality and Ethnicity in Croatian Media," in *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*, ed. Caroline O. N. Moser and Fiona C. Clark (London, UK: Zed Books, 2001).

86 For example: Claudia Koonz, *Mothers in the Fatherland: Women, the Family and Nazi Politics* (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1987); Gisela Bock, "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany: Motherhood, Compulsory Sterilization, and the State," in *When Biology Became Destiny*, ed. Renate Bridenthal, Atina Grossman, and Marion Kaplan (New York, NY: Monthly Review Press, 1984), pp. 271–96. Gisela Bock, "Ordinary women in Nazi Germany: Perpetrators, Victims, Followers and Bystanders," in *Women in the Holocaust*, pp. 85–100. For more recent work, see E. Harvey, *Women and the Nazi East: Agents and Witnesses of Germanization* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003); S. Heschel, "Does Atrocity Have a Gender? Feminist Interpretations of Women in the SS," in *Lessons and Legacies: New Currents in Holocaust Research, Vol. IV*., ed. Diefendorf (Evanston, IL; Northwestern University Press, 2004), pp. 300–21; Wendy Adele-Marie Sarti, *Women and Nazis: Perpetrators of Genocide* (Palo Alto, CA: Academica Press, 2012); Irmtraud Heike, "Female Concentration Camp Guards as Perpetrators: Three Case Studies," in *Ordinary People as Mass Murderers*, pp. 120–42; Wendy Lower, *Hitler's Furies: German Women in the Nazi Killing Fields* (New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin, 2013).

87 For example, see Zoë Waxman, "Towards an Integrated History of the Holocaust: Masculinity, Femininity, and Genocide," in *Years of Persecution, Years of Extermination: Saul Friedlander and the Future of Holocaust Studies*, ed. Christian Wiese and Paul Betts (London, UK: Continuum, 2010);

Jane Caplan, "Gender and the Concentration Camps," in *Concentration Camps in Nazi Germany: The New Histories*, ed. Jane Caplan and Nikolaus Wachsmann (London and New York: Routledge, 2010), pp. 82–107. Jacobs, *Memorializing the Holocaust*; Nechama Tec, *Resilience and Courage: Women, the Men, and the Holocaust* (New Haven, CT and London, NY: Yale University Press, 2003).

88 For more on women's complicity, see Lisa Sharlach, "Gender and Genocide in Rwanda: Women as Agents and Objects of Genocide," *Journal of Genocide Research* 1:3 (1999), pp. 387–99; and the other sources listed in Hogg and Drumbl's chapter in this volume.

89 For more analyses of the male-on-male sexual violence in the Bosnian conflict, see Simić's endnotes as well as Elysia Ruvinsky, "*My Heart Bleeds, But Where To Take My Grief Is Not There:*" *Wartime Sexual Violence Against Men in the Balkan and Great Lakes Regions* (thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2012).

90 This anti-Semitism, in conjunction with antiliberalism, homophobia, and misogyny, created a toxic political environment, which contributed to the political downfall of my stepfather.

01 Introduction.indd 34 4/7/2015 2:24:57 PM