

Neoliberalism and Genocide
The Desensitization of Global Politics

by

Robert J. Calleja Jr.

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

Approved April 2013 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Mary Romero, Chair
Daniel Schugurensky
Beth Blue Swadener

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2013

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of neoliberalism on the occurrence and intervention of genocide, particularly the ability to create othered groups through a process of dehumanization that desensitizes those in power to the human condition. I propose Social Externalization Theory as paradigm that explains how neoliberalism can be used as a means social control to create subjects vulnerable to political and collective violence that is justified as the externalized cost of economic growth, development, and national security. Finally, the conflict in Darfur (2003 - 2010) serves as a case study to analyze the influence of neoliberal policies on the resistance of the International community to recognize the violence as genocide.

Analysis of the case study found that some tenets of neoliberalism produce results that fit within the ideologies of genocide and that some aspects of neoliberalism assume a genocidal mentality. In this case, those in positions power engage in daily activities that justify some suffering as acceptable, thus desensitizing them to the harm that their decisions generate.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am pleased to have the opportunity to thank my wife Christina and our children Kyrstin and Jacob; none of this would have been possible without their understanding, sacrifices, and tremendous support. I would like to thank my committee members, Mary Romero, Daniel Schugurensky, and Beth Swadener for their support, valuable input, and most importantly – patience.

Additionally I would like to thank my colleagues, friends, and faculty members who have assisted with me with this research project.

Finally, I would like to thank Nancy Winn for her unwavering dedication to her graduate students and for her assistance during this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Focus on Neoliberalism.....	3
Introduction to Genocide.....	7
2 GENOCIDE.....	10
3 LITERATURE REVIEW	26
Genocide Literature	27
Social Control Literature.....	36
Neoliberalism Literature	41
4 NEOLIBERALISM AND VIOLENCE	47
Genocide Ideology	48
Land and Race	49
Cults of Antiquity	51
Expansionism.....	52
Neoliberalism and Development.....	54
Effects of Structural Adjustment Policies	57
Neoliberalism and Unemployment.....	58
Institutionalized Desensitization and Dehumanization	60
Othering.....	62
National Security	65
5 CASE STUDY: DARFUR.....	67
Brief History of Sudan.....	68

Darfur and the Second Civil War	69
Genocide in Darfur.....	72
Genocide Behavior.....	73
Delayed International Intervention	76
Summary	83
6 SOCIAL EXTERNALIZATION THEORY.....	85
State of Exception.....	87
Nazisim.....	90
National Security Doctrine	93
Pure Sociology/Social Control	96
Introducing Social Externalization Theory.....	97
Summary	104
7 CONCLUSION.....	105
REFERENCES	108

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

“Neoliberalization has not been very effective in revitalizing global capital accumulation, but it has succeeded remarkably well in restoring, or in some instances (as in Russia and China) creating, the power of an economic elite. The theoretical utopianism of neoliberal argument has, I conclude, primarily worked as a system of justification and legitimation for whatever needed to be done to achieve this goal.”

— David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*

The Nuremberg trials were established at the conclusion of World War II to bring those responsible for the Holocaust to justice. The rallying cry of “never again” symbolically established a precedent that would prevent future genocides and led the United Nations, in 1948, to create the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide as a mechanism to prevent future atrocities. Despite these efforts, genocide continues to happen and the international community is still reluctant to act when it occurs. What events influenced such a dramatic change in moral philosophy from never again to one of apparent tolerance? As I looked for answer to this question, I began to notice patterns in the genocide literature that started me down a different path of research.

A frequent research methodology is the use of case studies to document atrocities of genocide and as a tool for giving victims a voice. The most common direction of inquiry focuses on establishing a chain of events that led to the genocide, frequently making connections to existing ideologies supporting or explaining how the genocide occurred. Included in this approach are several themes: documentation of victims’ suffering, determining the additional destruction

resulting from delayed intervention, and challenging the definition of genocide. Comparative analysis was used to compare statistical data that examine the way traditional genocide ideologies are present prior to the outbreak of violence. What is missing from the literature is research that begins to identify changes in the world that has allowed genocide to occur more frequently in the 20th century. In addition, inquiries into the factors or guiding philosophies that have attributed to delayed recognition and response during the early stages of genocide need to be examined. And, finally, we must examine why defining genocide has become so difficult.

I realized that my proposed research on genocide was falling into a similar pattern so I redirected my focus to examine genocide from different perspectives and frameworks. When thinking about the potential impact of Neoliberalism on genocide I identified several parallel comparisons in ideologies, structural mechanisms, and use of aggression as a tool to achieve goals. These similarities present an opportunity to explore a new area of genocide studies by analyzing neoliberalism to better understand the influence that neoliberal policies and reasoning has on creating an environment for genocide to occur.

This thesis examines the potential influence that Neoliberalism has on genocide, particularly in shaping attitudes towards human suffering. To better explore this relationship I try to answer two research questions: Has the global expansion of Neoliberalism introduced policies that increase the possibility of genocide occurring in developing countries by desensitizing powerful groups to the needs, rights, and suffering of vulnerable citizens? Additionally, is the delayed intervention into genocide atrocities the result of policies that desensitized the

international community to the dehumanization of victims? Investigating these questions provides a better understanding of the way that neoliberal policies desensitize people and justifies human suffering as the externalized cost of development.

Focus on Neoliberalism

Why neoliberalism? Neoliberalism has been one of the prevailing development models since the 1970s. However, neoliberalism has several definitions that vary by discipline and how the term is applied, and as such, it is essential to define neoliberalism for this thesis. There have been several modifications through the years, as an increased priority has been given to the model known as the Washington Consensus that developed from Reaganomics¹ during the 1980s. Neoliberalism is an ideology that looks to replicate its political-economic structure globally. Neoliberalism was refined in the Chicago School of Economics² as an alternative to Keynesianism, social democracy, and socialism to counter the restrictions placed on the market by these other economic models.

The early advocates of neoliberalism strongly believed that the state's role in the economy should be reduced, particularly providing public goods and social programs. It was believed that neoliberal policies would promote freer trade across countries while maximizing profits and efficiency. The proposed advantages of

¹ The term associated with the economic policies of U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

² Variations of neoliberalism have been discussed since the 1940s, most notably the Ordoliberalism of Germany and the Mont Pelerin Society led by Friedrich Hayek. However, the work of Milton Friedman and other members of the University of Chicago School of Economics had the strongest influence on Reaganomics and Thatcherism, leading to the current neoliberal model (Peck 2010). Additional modifications have occurred more recently through the administrations of President Bill Clinton and Prime Minister Tony Blair.

neoliberalism according to John Meyer (2007) are the increased flows of capital and investment across borders, sharing of technology, more efficient production, increases in the quality of life, and increased international trade. To this end, the state would be more effective protecting the market by enforcing contractual obligations, facilitating international trade, protecting individual and property rights, and providing security (Harvey, 2007).

Neoliberals argue that individuals are best suited for making decisions concerning personal matters and that the state, or other authoritative agencies, should not interfere. The market provides a mechanism for individuals to employ their freedom of choice to make decisions for the realization of their wants and needs. Competition among producers and consumers allows the market to expand and retract as necessary without intervention from the state. Milton Friedman suggested in 1951, that “The state could only do harm [and that] laissez-faire must be the rule....Citizens will be protected against the state, since there exists a free private market, and the competition will protect them from each other” (Peck, 2010, p. 3-4).

Neoliberalism recognizes that people share a basic level of equality and that civil liberties should be protected; however, it also recognizes that some individuals have different potentials and motivations and should be allowed to pursue those goals, even if it leads to inequality. Inequality is acceptable because it is achieved through maximization of the market. Inequality is also used to justify the market as superior for providing economic and social welfare because privatized social

services and programs can be administered more efficiently than state managed programs (O'Connell, 2007).

For this thesis, I define neoliberalism as the politico-economic (liberal-democracy and capitalist economics) development model that is favored by developed nations like the United States³ that promotes deregulation and open markets. The model is defined by free trade and free flowing capital across borders, privatization of government services, and unfettered international investments (Carroll, 2009). The model also provides a framework for developing nations to follow to reduce deficits while building wealth through exportation. Human beings are driven by self-interest and society benefits the most when individuals are allowed to satisfy self-interests. As a result, neoliberal policies have removed or reduced many of the barriers that have previously restricted international trade, which has led to global economic growth. The growth of global markets has changed patterns of consumption as goods have become more readily available to people for purchase. Liberalizing markets encourages competition and efficiency within the market allowing for citizens to satisfy their needs thus freeing up the state to focus on enforcing the contracts that maintain a free market, ensuring public safety, and protecting national security (Peck, 2010).

³ Different people and disciplines define neoliberalism differently. There have been examples of capitalism that were not neoliberalism such as Keynesianism and there are examples of neoliberalism free of liberal democracy, such as Chile under Augusto Pinochet. The focus of this thesis however, is on neoliberalism based on the Washington Consensus. The Washington Consensus policy is frequently accompanied or influenced by other US policies or interests; as such, US led neoliberalism for this thesis is a combination of economic and political beliefs.

However, adoption of this model does include some negatives, including vulnerability to market trends like booms and bubbles which can also lead to inflation and changes to the quality of life of the nation's population. The result has been the deregulation of many of the mechanisms that were developed to protect the open market from being used as a tool for exploitation. "It is now widely understood that neoliberal economic policies have wreaked enormous and needless damage upon the world economy for the past thirty years" (Prasch, 2012, p. 301). The development strategy outlined and enforced by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund stress that there cannot be any deviation from the neoliberal model. "To facilitate this 'progress,' military force, violent removal/dislocations of peoples, slaughtering of different groups, and 'expansion' has always accompanied the growth of capitalism in its global reach" (Heron, 2008, p. 86).

My argument is that Neoliberalism establishes and justifies certain behaviors and attitudes that desensitize people to the human condition. A level of suffering is thought of as acceptable in the pursuit of development, trade, and expansion through the tools of Neoliberalism because human suffering is justified as the externalized cost of development. This has led to the creation of a structural framework that legitimizes aggressive behavior that distracts some outside groups from recognizing the genocidal patterns. The result has been the introduction of policies that not only increase the suffering of the population, but also increases the possibility of genocide occurring in developing countries because state leaders have been desensitized to the needs, rights, and suffering of vulnerable citizens.

Additionally, normalization of these policies has desensitized the international community so that they are slow to recognize the dehumanization and violence that victims are experiencing, which further delays intervention.

Introduction to Genocide

Complicating matters is the lack of a truly accepted definition of what genocide is, what it is not, and what events need to occur before genocide is declared. The United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide, 1948, provides us with the best working definition of genocide; however, the convention is flawed for two major reasons. First, the Convention was intentionally designed to exclude political groups as targets of genocide. The omission of political groups is problematic because more people were killed during the 20th century for political reasons than any other motive. Around 170 million people, not including war casualties, were murdered by their government for political reasons (Rummel, 1995). Under the current convention, only about 39 million, or 23%, of the deaths are considered genocide.

Second, genocide is difficult to prosecute under the convention because of the need to prove intent by the criminal party. Focusing on the intent of a crime rather than the end result provides those charged with genocide a “whoops” clause that allows them to claim ignorance or to assert that the horrific results were accidental rather than intended. These flaws in the convention, combined with other factors, leads to a slower response by the International community to both recognize the events as genocide and to intervene in the destruction.

This study intends to advance the existing knowledge in two ways. The primary focus of the research is to answer the research question addressing neoliberalism influences on genocidal behavior or occurrence through desensitizing groups or creating policies that justify human suffering. This thesis does not aim to make claims of causality, but rather to examine how existing theoretical frameworks can be used to strengthen the influence that neoliberalism has on genocide.

The study of genocide remains an area of research that lacks the attention that social scientists have given to other social issues. Despite the difficulty of some to define genocide and the reluctance of others to accept the occurrence of genocide, it never the less happens. For this reason it is important that genocide scholars continue to remind others about the current conditions and philosophies of genocide while continuing to pursue advanced frameworks of genocidal activities and goals.

I attempt to look beyond the traditional political or historical lenses that analyze genocide and move toward research questions beyond the traditional established ideologies/typologies of genocide. Identifying and acknowledging genocide ideologies is crucial, but they might not be sole reasons for the occurrence of genocide. My argument calls for the reader to understand some of the different forms of social control and conflict theories and to explore how they can be applied to genocide. Many of these theories demonstrate how “normal” people can quickly be labeled as outsiders within a civil society and can find themselves at risk. With that in mind, the process of dehumanizing “others” is a short transition from an oppressed group to a targeted group.

The main delimitating factor in this study is that I am not seeking direct causality. There are numerous examples of the use of neoliberal policies that have not led to genocide. No matter how strong the conclusions, neoliberalism cannot be considered a causal factor.

The thesis will begin with a brief discussion of the more important aspects of genocide to build a foundation upon which the influences of neoliberalism can be easier identified. A literature review follows that includes literature that is important for bridging connections between neoliberalism and genocide. A more thorough analysis of neoliberalism will be performed to explore how those in power might become desensitized to the condition of others, possibly through the process of dehumanization and exclusion. The Darfur genocide (2003-2010) will be analyzed as a case study to seek evidence of neoliberalism influence on the genocide. Finally the last chapter will focus on a theory that was developed during this research project to explain how superior groups can generate collective support for the continued targeting and aggressive actions towards a disadvantage group.

Chapter 2

GENOCIDE

History has demonstrated that genocide does not materialize suddenly; it is the culmination of a chain of events that originate from social tensions between different groups. As the tension grows, behavior towards a targeted group transitions through a series of violent phases that increase in intensity until the group is designated for destruction. Genocide is usually initiated by a sovereign state, but it can also be directed by rebel groups, and begins when actions are taken to systematically destroy the targeted group. There is ample literature that analyzes ideologies and processes that lead to genocide, and as such, this thesis does not focus on the causes of genocide. The areas of genocide that are of interest and will be discussed here is the definition of genocide, particularly how world views might alter the definition, and what impact that might have on an early recognition and intervention by the international community.

Perhaps the most well-known and studied genocide is the Holocaust that occurred during World War II. The systematic destruction of European Jews resulted in the creation of a tribunal, commonly known as the Nuremberg Trials, to prosecute those responsible for the destruction of millions of people. The United Nations entrusted Raphael Lemkin⁴ with the task of developing a convention that

⁴ Lemkin was the main advocate in identifying genocide and creating laws and policies for prosecuting genocide.

would prevent help prevent and punish future atrocities. The result was the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide, 1948.⁵

Lemkin was a lawyer and genocide scholar prior to World War II who experienced the destruction of the Holocaust first hand; while he was able to escape Poland by finding refuge in the United States, the majority of his family perished in concentration camps. Lemkin was horrified that a sovereign power could direct the mechanisms of murder and human destruction internally onto the very citizens that it was established to protect. His goal was to verbalize an act so vile that those who heard it would be outraged and would seek immediate action to condemn and prevent such acts. The result was the term “genocide” that was created by combining the Greek word *geno* (race or tribe) with the Latin word *cide* (killing) (Power, 2002). Lemkin also created the term “ethnocide” as an alternative phrase to genocide. *Ethnos* is Greek for nation; therefore, ethnocide is nation killing. Lemkin preferred genocide. Others scholars started using the term later referring to cultural genocide.

Lemkin had already been working on ideas about state led mass murder prior to World War II and published those thoughts with some updates in his book *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* (1944). Included within the work is Lemkin’s original definition of genocide.

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

⁵ Also referred to as the Genocide Convention in this thesis.

of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. The objectives of such a plan would be the 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. (P. 79)

There were objections within the United Nations General Assembly to the original definition provided by Lemkin. Several nations were concerned over the original wording and potential retroactive prosecution.

The Soviet Union was opposed to the inclusion of political groups, mainly because of the events of the Stalinist Great Purge where hundreds of thousands of political opponents and foreign nationals were targeted for elimination. The United States was particularly concerned over the possibility of retroactive prosecution, most likely their treatment of Native Americans and Blacks during slavery and the Jim Crow era. The convention went through a series of edits and modification until an acceptable version was approved as the U.N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in 1948 (Power, 2002).

The U.N. Genocide Convention provides us with the best working definition of genocide, but it contains three major flaws. The definition of genocide, the vagueness of the convention, and the difficulty of enforcement are areas that weaken the deterrence and prevention goals of the Convention.

Article II of the Genocide Convention defines genocide as:

In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such:

- (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;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

The definition of genocide remains a point of contention among scholars, legal experts, and political leaders. Lemkin's original definition was concise and benefitted from knowing exactly what behavior that he wanted to eliminate among states. The version that was settled upon lacks the clarity of what behavior it wants to deter. "The definition of genocide has provoked disagreement, intensified by the Convention's own spare formulation, with gaps in it – ambiguity, arbitrariness, even inconsistency-acknowledged by both defenders and critics" (Lang 2011, pp. 285-286). The Convention was intentionally designed to exclude political groups as targets of genocide.

The controversy over the definition of genocide goes beyond identifying which groups can be protected by the convention and includes the question about the type of actions considered genocidal. For many, genocide is the mass killing of a people, but this is incorrect as death is not a requirement for genocide. War is not considered genocide because the violence is bilateral where death and violence is directed in both directions. Genocide then, is the unilateral violence of one group towards another group; the violence only flows in one direction. Bradley Campbell

(2009) proposes that genocide varies directly with immobility, cultural difference, relational distance, functional independence, and inequality. Thus, most genocides occur when one group enjoys a power advantage over another group; that is, they possess military strength, legislative or political leverage, or socioeconomic dominance.

These power advantages replicate themselves in the international community as those who are entrusted to define, prevent, and prosecute genocide frequently find themselves distanced from the victimized, which results in the failure to recognize the needs or suffering of the targeted group. In some cases, the inability to relate to the victims leads to unrecognized genocide.

When reviewing historical cases of genocide, it quickly becomes apparent that not all state sponsored murders are carried out under the same circumstances. Perhaps more disturbing than the number of genocides, or the regularity in which they occur, is the number of genocide-like acts that are not recognized as genocide. The Indonesian occupation of East Timor resulted in the extermination of up to 25% of the population⁶ and up to 3 million Bengalis were killed and several million more were displaced because of conflict in 1971;⁷ but despite the large number of confirmed deaths and other violent acts like rape and torture, no charges of genocide were filed nor was there an International intervention.

⁶ Confirmed deaths range between 18,000 and 200,000+ depending on source.

⁷ The Hamoodur Rahamn Commission was created in Pakistan to investigate the atrocities; they confirmed that Pakistani soldiers killed 26,000 people, other reports placed the number victims much higher based upon sources.

Perhaps the inability of scholars and world leaders to identify and name historical genocide despite 600 years of indisputable examples like the Armenian Genocide, the massacres in Congo Free State under the rule of Belgian King Leopold II, and the elimination of the Zunghar people by the Chinese Qing Dynasty⁸ should present little surprise that there were difficulties drafting an U.N. Genocide Convention. Genocide is generally considered an evil act that can never be justified; yet there is resistance to developing a convention that establishes a broad definition and procedures for intervening and prosecuting genocide. How does genocide continue to occur with the existence of a ratified UN convention designed to protect people from destruction?

The Convention has moments of specificity, but is vague when clarity is needed. An example of its vagueness is in its call to action.

Article V:

The Contracting Parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective Constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III.

This Article commits signatory nations to preventing and punishing genocide, but the level of required action is indeterminate and allows the participating nations to apply the Convention at their convenience. Overall, the Genocide Convention lacks clarity and any serious call to action as a result of demands by several member

⁸ Turkey continues to deny Armenian genocide (1915-1923) by the Ottoman Empire despite popular belief. King Leopold II exploited the native population (1885-1908) to extract natural resources, but genocide is denied due to a lack of historical records. The Qing Dynasty destroyed about 80% of the population and de-established the country (1756-1758). (Kiernan, 2007)

nations. The difficulty associated with intervening and prosecuting can be attributed to the failure of the United Nations to establish an office to monitor and respond to acts of genocide. In fairness, the idea of an international court or a governing body that can issue mandates or hold states accountable for their actions did not exist when the Genocide Convention was being drafted. When the Genocide Convention entered into force in 1951, it included the notation:

Unlike other human rights treaties, the Genocide Convention does not establish a specific monitoring body or expert committee. It stipulates that any Contracting Party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the United Nations Charter, which they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide. Thus, the matter may be brought before the International Court of Justice, which may order interim measures of protection.⁹

The wording reinforces the vagueness of the convention in terms of available options for preventing genocide. Furthermore, the options that do exist are only available to states; the Genocide Convention does not extend any rights of access to individuals for filing grievances.

Enforcing the Genocide Convention is difficult because of the need to prove intent by the criminal party and the lack of a governing body. Focusing on the intent of a crime rather than the end result provides those charged with genocide a “whoops” clause that allows them to either claim ignorance or suggest that the horrific results were accidental rather than intended. Complicating matters are state actions that might demonstrate early warning signs of genocide. The United Nations adopted a clear stance of non-intervention in sovereign affairs when it was

⁹ United Nations Website (<http://www.un.org/millennium/law/iv-1.htm>)

organized. Article II, number 7 of the UN Charter clear states: “Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.”¹⁰

In comparison, the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which was created after the Genocide Convention,¹¹ is much more specific in the protection that it offers. There are also various points of access through states and governing bodies where individuals can seek assistance for violations against their rights. Under the UDHR “arbitrary” killing is never allowed and states have an obligation to protect people within their borders from violations of the right to life. Instead of reacting to arbitrary killings that should be prevented under the UDHR, parties engage in debate over the “intent” of killing when applying the Genocide Convention.

Article IX

Disputes between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfillment of the present Convention, including those relating to the responsibility of a State for genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article 3, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.

Article nine establishes the procedure for “signatory” states to follow over concerns of genocide; disputes can be submitted to International Court of Justice (ICJ). The ICJ is the official court of the United Nations and only has jurisdiction over member states; it has no authority over nonmember states or individuals. The ICJ

¹⁰Charter of the United Nations, 1945, Article 2(7).

¹¹ The Genocide Convention was adopted on December 9, 1948 and the UDHR was adopted on December 10, 1948.

should not be confused with the International Criminal Court (ICC),¹² which operates independent of the UN to prosecute individuals for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. Numerous alleged genocides have occurred since the inception of the Genocide Convention in 1948, but only two cases were submitted for review to the ICJ and both were based on conflicts in the former Yugoslavia during the 1990s.¹³

The U.N. Genocide Convention was drafted as a result of atrocities committed during World War II; the suffering and senseless destruction of so many people was so vile that the U.N. wanted to introduce policies that would prevent future atrocities. Despite the strong stance that the U.N. took in 1948, there were many alleged genocides that were ignored by the international community after the Genocide Convention entered into force in 1951. Did the lack of an enforcement committee affect the occurrence of genocide in the second half of the 20th century?

If charges of genocide were being filed and then dismissed by the ICJ, we would ask why the accusations were dismissed and begin to identify ways to build stronger support to bring charges of genocide to ICJ. However, charges are not being dismissed because formal charges are not even being filed with the ICJ. What is preventing charges of genocide from being formally filed? One explanation might be the legal definition genocide, although the criteria stipulated are more likely the reason for dismissal of charges than a reason for not filing charges. Another possible

¹² The ICJ was established in 1945 by the charter of the United Nations. (<http://www.icj-cij.org>)
The ICC was established in 2002 to serve as a permanent court to prosecute individuals for serious crimes against humanity. (<http://www.icc-cpi.int>)

¹³ The case of Rwanda was handled by the independent International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), but a formal complaint was never filed with the ICJ.

explanation is that the events of World War II were fresh in the minds of not only those responsible for drafting the Genocide Convention, but also in the minds of the public and other world leaders; and this is no longer the case. Does changing worldviews influence how genocide is perceived by people?

The ambiguity of the Genocide Convention combined with the social status of targeted groups is problematic when it comes to naming genocide and can be seen in historical cases of mass destruction. The type of violence, number of victims, and explanation of events varies depending on how the conflict is framed. The following examples are cases of extreme destruction that demonstrate the difficulty of naming genocide.

Colonization of the Americas by Europeans, and later US expansion, accounted for deaths of the indigenous population range from a few million to around 100,000,000 between 1492 and 1900.¹⁴ Many of the deaths were directly at the hands of attackers, but the introduction and spread of disease along with displacement as a result of conquest also had a major impact on the number of lives lost during this time period. Famine was used as a tool to eliminate potential political enemies in Russia (2,500,000 - 8,000,000 deaths between 1932 - 1933) and China (15,000,000 - 43,000,000 deaths between 1959 - 1961). 1,000,000 - 3,000,000 Cambodians were killed from 1975-1979 by executions and starvation under the direction of the Khmer Rouge regime and Pol Pot (Kiernan, 2007). These

¹⁴ Total number of deaths is difficult to determine and vary by source. These totals reflect the large Aztec, Inca, and Mayan populations and the numerous indigenous tribes throughout the Americas. The death figures are largely based on population estimations of the various indigenous populations in 1492.

events are considered examples of genocide by many people, but demonstrate some of the difficulty with the emphasis of intent on prosecuting genocide. The actions of regimes led massive suffering and death, but the results were not all considered to be the direct intentions. The deaths were frequently the result of actions motivated to produce regime change or were in response to attacks or deviance initiated the victims.

Lemkin's original proposal of genocide included a provision for what he called cultural genocide. Ward Churchill cites Lemkin's definition (Rodriguez, 2009, p.111) as:

The destruction of the specific character of a persecuted "group" by forced transfer of children, forced exile, prohibition of the use of the national language, destruction of books, documents, monuments, and objects of historical, artistic, or religious value.

The idea of cultural genocide was resisted during the development phase of the Genocide Convention and only the act of forcible transfer of children was included in the final draft of the convention. Cultural genocide¹⁵ can lead to the elimination of a group identity without any killing and can be exemplified through the occupation of Korea by Japan and the transfer of aboriginal children in Australia.

After the annexation of Korea by Japan in 1910, the Japanese tried to eliminate the Korean culture while assimilating them into the Empire of Japan. Teaching of the Korean language and history was outlawed and replaced with Japanese. Koreans were also required to surrender their names, replacing them with

¹⁵ The idea of cultural genocide is not furthered explored in the thesis, but it is discussed here because of its importance to the early definition of genocide.

Japanese versions, businesses and land were transferred to Japanese military forces and government officials for their use, and historical documents were routinely destroyed. Koreans practicing Christianity were tortured and had their churches burned. These efforts were designed to eradicate the Korean identity and way of life in an effort to force the assimilation of a conquered people (Takaki, 1989).

Another example occurred during the early 1900's in Australia, when the European settlers were growing concerned over the increase in the number of mixed-blood children (white and aborigine). It was believed that the aborigine race in Australia was on its way to extinction, leaving the state haunted by the "half-caste" descendants of a dead race (van Krieken, 2004). A plan was developed by the State and Church to remove the hybrid aboriginal form from "White Australia". The State was made the legal guardians of aboriginal children. Children were taken from parents and sent away to institutions so that they could be stripped of their culture to better fit into a white society; children that had "acceptable" light-colored skin were placed directly with white families to be raised. The removal of children from aborigine families was systematically managed to eliminate an undesirable social group by preventing their way life from being passed down to younger generations.¹⁶

These examples represent only a small sample of genocide, but they demonstrate different forms of genocide. The Holocaust presents the ideal study because various elements of genocide like ideology, displacement, and the

¹⁶ This policy was in place until 1970. In 2008, The Australian government offered an official apology to the Aboriginal populations and to the "Lost Generations."

systematic destruction of a people are straightforward, leaving little room for debate. Unlike the Holocaust, other genocides require more analysis to discover acts of genocide. The usage of concentration camps institutionalized genocide and compiled evidence of genocide in centralized locations. In other genocide cases it can be more difficult locating bodies or mass graves, finding witnesses or victims of rape and other violence, or even getting researches into the areas to begin the investigation of potential crimes. The difficulty in collecting data can also increase the difficulty in generating recognition among the international community for intervention.

What role should states play in the intervention of genocide? As already discussed members of the United Nations and signatories to the Genocide Convention have an obligation to prevent crimes against humanity and genocide, but they have responsibilities beyond these legal commitments. Kenneth Campbell (2004) states:

Specifically regarding genocide, states have a basic political obligation to stop genocide because it threatens the basic integrity of the international system. State leaders are obliged to prevent genocide because of the disintegrative effects of unchecked genocide on international political, economic, and security institutions--the architecture of the international system--upon which all states depend for their security, prosperity, and general well-being. Since no state can exist outside of the international system, state leaders have an obligation to their own citizens as well as to other states to stop genocide. (p. 33)

Campbell also raises an interesting point, that the three leading Western states (England, France, and the United States) have a greater obligation than other states when it comes to genocide for three reasons. First, they have better military,

economic, and persuasion capabilities than other countries. Second, they were also the driving force behind the original commitment to create a genocide convention and continue to position themselves as the leaders against genocide. Finally, Campbell suggests that these three states have had the greatest impact in shaping the current system of open societies and free markets and have the most to lose when genocide occurs.¹⁷

Over the past two hundred years, Britain, France, and America have combined to embed deeply into the foundation and structure of the international system the liberal values of freedom, equality, democracy, and human rights...Thus, the United States, Britain, and France have, objectively speaking, a compelling combination of moral interests and national interests in stopping genocide. (Campbell, 2004, p. 34)

The responsibility on the leading Western powers to respond to genocide directly addresses the concern of how current worldviews direct how the international community responds to genocide. The United States, England, and France direct the response of the international community towards genocide; because of their power, these countries also strongly influence worldviews. "The critical point of breakdown in the international response to contemporary genocide has been and continues to be the lack of political will to intervene with appropriate force in a timely manner" (Campbell, 2004, p.36). This idea serves as the departure point for the remainder of the thesis as it is necessary to understand what shapes the views of genocide within the leading countries and how those interests are created.

¹⁷ Bradley Campbell makes a strong point here, but it worth noting that these same parties are also responsible for setting up territorial lines after WWII that contributed led to future and war.

Despite its ambiguous nature, the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide does need to be recognized for its attempt to identify and prevent the atrocity that is genocide; but it also needs to be acknowledged that a less ambiguous policy needs to be created to truly address genocide. Clearly defining genocide and outlining the obligations of international states concerning potential genocide will not stop the occurrence of atrocities, but it serves an important role in prevention. The term genocide was developed to conjure strong feelings within people by merely referencing the word because it would clearly be understood what events were transpiring. Ironically, world leaders are hesitant to name events as genocide out of fear for the potential political consequences of their government not responding to charges of genocide.

Too frequently victimization continues while those with the capabilities of stopping the suffering become embattled in debate during the early stages of mass destruction about the events as potentially genocidal, if they warrant intervention, and how intervention would be accomplished. Rather than arguing over a suitable classification for the killing, states need to focus on how to prevent and interrupt future genocide. It is essential for the leading states to recognize that they have special obligations to establish the precedent for preventing genocide, even if they might have played a role in establishing the conditions, while also recognizing that they have a strong influence on the perception of genocide among other states.

The following chapter is an overview of select literature on genocide. It examines literature that includes historical cases of genocide, typologies and ideologies that lead to genocide, and intervention. Neoliberalism will also be

discussed to identify potential areas of influences on genocide. Additional literature will be reviewed to better understand how genocide is used as a form of social control to address deviance.

Chapter 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

Although numerous scholars examine various aspects of neoliberalism and genocide, they are not addressed together to explore the relationship between neoliberalism and genocide and together do not exist as a “body of literature”. Much of the literature on genocide is presented as either a historical reference or by social scientists to analyze comparative cases, document and explain types of atrocities, or aim to give voice to victims of genocide. The literature on neoliberalism is expansive as the topic can be approached from numerous positions. Literature exists on the history of neoliberalism, economics and political science has addressed the topic, and social scientists have discussed everything from the theoretical framework of neoliberalism to the suffering of imperialist subjects under the veil of neoliberal policies.

In the following review of neoliberalism, I only examine features of neoliberalism relevant to the study; that is, research that details human rights implications of neoliberal policies. Since the thesis of this study is not designed to critique, endorse, or even question the use of neoliberalism, I focus on identifying aspects of neoliberalism that is relevant to my research questions, specifically on literature that addresses the violent and social control aspects of neoliberalism.

A major body of literature on social control is found in criminology, which generally examines political or social mechanisms used to manipulate conformity within a group, community, or state. The primary goal of social control theory is to understand the role that society performs in maintaining order by limiting deviance.

Maintaining society without physical force requires members to internalize a shared belief system of norms and values, which operates by individuals controlling themselves and others (Campbell, 2009). This process creates a method for addressing deviance. Social control theory is useful for making the connection between neoliberalism and genocide because of the ability to identify processes designed to control or manipulate bodies.

Genocide Literature

Other scholars have revisited Lemkin's definition of genocide and suggest other ways of framing genocide. In his article "Democracy, Power, Genocide, and Mass Murder," R.J. Rummel supports the premise of Lemkin's work, but calls for a more inclusive definition. Rummel (1995) coined the term democide to "Encompass all instances where a state's government or ruling social group intentionally targets another group for destruction" (p. 4). His data shows that 432 independent states existed between 1906 and 1987; of those, 142 of the states committed some form of democide. The result was the death of nearly 170 million people that were killed by governments in various forms of genocide, massacres, and extrajudicial executions.

According to Rummel, democide is a better term to explain the degree that a state is empowered along a democratic to totalitarian dimension and to the extent that it is involved with war or rebellion. Rummel's argument is based on Democratic Peace Theory (DPT), which claims that democracies do not make war with each other. The more democratic two nations are, the less violence there will be between them. Additionally, the more democratic a nation, the less internal violence they will experience. Democracy is thus a general method for nonviolence. The basis of the

argument is that democracies have more avenues of conflict resolution and are less likely to engage in violence; conversely, chances of genocide increases as the state becomes a more totalitarian regime. Ben Kiernan examines genocide that resulted from actions of totalitarian regimes, and other types of genocide, in his much studied book *Blood and Soil*.

Unfortunately, mass murder by government is not a new occurrence; governments have been systematically killing large numbers of people since early in recorded history. Ben Kiernan's book, *Blood and Soil*, details genocides of "the modern era" (the six centuries since 1400). Kiernan emphasizes the connection between state power and the organized destruction of people. Through the coverage of modern genocides Kiernan (2007) identifies his four ideologies that form the foundation of genocidal intent: "racism, expansionism, agrarianism, and antiquity" (p. 38).

Kiernan applies the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide, 1948, retroactively to historical cases of genocide to generate comparative analysis. The case studies illustrate how regimes justify state sanctioned violence through the use of social and political values. More importantly, the case studies support the genocide ideologies put forth by Kiernan, with the exception of a few cases like Stalinist Russia and Maoist China. Kiernan concedes this, but does not offer other potential theories. The book could have benefitted from more analytical discussion about genocide theory and applications of theory; however, as a historical narrative this is understandable.

Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn take a similar approach in *The History of and Sociology of Genocide* by providing a historical background of genocide through case studies; but unlike Kiernan, they provide a conceptual framework. Like those before them, the authors criticize the U.N. definition of genocide because it is limited and is rarely used to identify the early onset of genocide. Chalk and Jonassohn (1990) suggests, “The United Nations, once a body that condemned the practice of genocide, is rapidly becoming one that condones it” (p. 12).

The authors cover the prominent genocides of “the modern era” by providing insight to the political and economic conditions that existed before and during the events of genocide. Chalk and Jonassohn (1990) define genocide as “a form of one-sided mass killing in which a state or other authority intends to destroy a group, as that group and membership in it are defined by the perpetrator” (p. 23). They call for an improved definition of genocide drawing from a sociological perspective because the addition of sociology ideologies and theories would protect more people, essentially groups of people, while restricting who can commit genocide to the state and other authority groups. The purpose is that when identifying genocide sociologically, the focus would be on the victimized group as perceived by the attacker, which would provide a better understanding of the conflict.

Additionally, Chalk and Jonassohn’s definition attempts to separate war from genocide. The need for one-sided mass killing demonstrates a unilateral violence that does not exist when engaged in war: “When countries are at war neither side is defenseless” (Chalk & Jonassohn, 1990, p. 23). All out war results in bilateral violence that produces a large number of casualties on both sides; therefore war is

not genocide. A concern with their definition is the lessened emphasis placed on acts that do not result in death. Other acts like destroying culture, relocating children, and the like are considered to fall into other categories like ethnocide. Chalk and Jonassohn argue that these additional acts require specific descriptions as decided by law, which removes them from the concern of social scientists.

When generating typologies of genocide they suggest that causes of genocide are threat (real or perceived), elimination, and spreading terror among enemies, economic growth, and acting on internal beliefs, theories, or ideologies. These topologies are slightly different from the topologies proposed by Kiernan, but they share the basic tenets. Like Kiernan, Chalk and Jonassohn find stronger support for the first three theories in older cases of genocide and acknowledge that the fourth topology is more prevalent in more recent genocides.

Helen Fein moves beyond historical reporting and transitions into understanding genocide as larger issue within human rights discourse. In her book *Human Rights and Wrongs: Slavery, Terror, and Genocide*, Fein makes an important distinction between war and slavery, terror, and genocide. While there might exist moral objections to war, warfare is an accepted part of humanity and arguments can be made for the necessity of war. However, slavery, terror, and genocide cannot make the same claim and therefore are actions made by choice rather than necessity, as Fein (2007) states: “They are rational strategies to control people and organizations” (p. 17).

Fein reintroduces her concept of “life integrity rights,” which are identified as including the basic tenets of human rights needed to claim more advanced political

and economic rights. She then applies the concept to identify states that have violated these rights and demonstrates how they were able to justify denying the life integrity rights of targeted people. In their justification, some states have been able to make slave labor profitable and tolerated. Fein points to the caste system in India as an example of how an internal system of discrimination, coupled with a lack of outside pressure, can create environments that tolerate slave labor. Fein establishes the use of “othering” as a means for aggressors to legitimize human trafficking for slave labor and sex work through differences in gender, race, religion, and ethnicity.

Of particular interest is her analysis on how states have used torture and cruelty against portions of their own population. In her case studies of Argentina and Algiers, she analyzes state terror to identify internal and external factors that instigated its use. Once introduced, the terror is rationalized and allowed to exist, and in some cases like Guatemala and Iraq, the terror becomes a precursor to genocide. The data she presents supports the argument that those in power turn to genocide only when there exists a group within the larger population that can be identified as culturally different. Identifying a group as different permits the use of exclusionary policies and reduces the targeted group to subjects outside of universal justice and protection.

Fein’s work serves as a good transitioning point in the literature from a historical project to a theoretical project, which seeks to identify and understand structural mechanisms that can foster genocidal behavior. By understanding genocide better global leaders can identify and intervene in potential cases genocide. The U.N. Security Council has a responsibility to intervene when genocide

becomes likely because of the stance they took after World War II and the ratification of the UN Conventions on the Prevention and Prosecution of Genocide.

Kenneth Campbell addresses this responsibility in his article “The Role of Individual States in Addressing Cases of Genocide.” According to Campbell (2004) “All states have a fundamental moral obligation to maximize international civility and minimize international barbarity” (p. 33). However, the application of the Convention has been less than stellar in his view because the UN lacks the political will to intervene and genocide has been given a lower priority than traditional state interests.

Campbell analyzes the actions of the western powers during the crises of Bosnia and Rwanda and determines that their response was too slow and they continued to define the conflicts in a manner that legitimized aggression, thus allowing them to avoid action. Campbell closes with a discussion about the need for genocide scholars to educate the humanitarian community about the difference between genocide and humanitarian catastrophes. Humanitarian catastrophes are events like civil war, failed states, and mass starvation that can be devastating to human life and living conditions, but these events are generally given lower priorities because they are accepted occurrences within sovereign states. Campbell stresses the need for scholars to generate a better understanding of genocide among global leaders because political will can stop genocide.

Daniele Conversi builds on Campbell’s call for scholars to expand the understanding of genocide in his article “Demo-skepticism and Genocide.” Conversi suggests that most recent research and literature concerning genocide is based on

and presented in a historical context. However, the impact of recent genocides in Rwanda, Bosnia, and Darfur have drawn the interests of non-traditional genocide scholars from departments like anthropology, comparative politics, history, and other social sciences. This emerging interdisciplinary approach to genocide has brought several new insights to genocide scholarship, including a focus on the link between modernity and genocide.

Conversi critiques the work of Michael Mann connects democracy and genocide. Mann argues that ethnic cleansing is the “dark side if democracy.” The most recent prevailing dogma of political science has been Mann’s book, *Democratic Peace Theory*, which claims “Democracies rarely fight one another because they share common norms of live-and-let-live and domestic institutions that constrain the recourse to war” (Conversi, 2006, p. 1). According to Mann, democracy has been contracted into an overlap of democracy, liberalism, and neoliberalism, which he terms “Liberal Democracy.”

Conversi examines at the claims made by Mann and acknowledges that democracy has received some deserved criticism because of the war on terror, which introduced “anti-terror” legislation that sacrificed human rights in the name of security. Governments are becoming more powerful while citizens are becoming more cynical and disenchanted with their government. Mann’s liberal democracy questions whether we still live in a democratic age.

In response to Mann’s critique of democracy has been the rise in what Conversi labels “demo-skepticism” or challenging democratic peace theory and the legitimacy of democracy. Conversi expresses concern that democratic peace theory

is an “ideological imperialism with the goal of instilling a form of corporate government that reinforces private power against human needs and rights” (Conversi, 2006, p. 1). Conversi presents the traditional view that genocide can only occur in either authoritarian or totalitarian regimes and counters Mann’s argument that democracy, particularly failed democratic states, can lead to genocide. A definitive answer is not provided, but Conversi is not willing to dismiss Mann’s theories and suggests that it belongs in the body of genocide.

In her book *A Problem From Hell*, Samantha Power discusses genocide history, but does so with an emphasis on the work of Ralph Lemkin and the role of the international community in preventing genocide. She notes that Lemkin explained, “Sovereignty implies conducting an independent foreign and internal policy, building of schools, and construction of roads....all types of activity directed towards the welfare of people. Sovereignty cannot be conceived as the right to kill millions of innocent people” (Power, 2002, p. 19).

Power restricts her scope of genocide to cases during the twentieth century and the role of the United States in each case. Political leaders in the United States have taken a stance to never again let evil rise and destroy innocent victims through systematic oppression and domination similar to atrocities of the past, but Power argues that US leaders repeatedly fail to choose a course of action that prevents or puts an end to genocide once it has started. Her criticism is not limited to the United States but holds the international community accountable for their lack of action.

Power (2002) reiterates her emphasis on intervention throughout the book and addresses in detail some of the processes that delay intervention. Offending

parties frequently control in-state media outlets and restrict their flow of information in an attempt to isolate the country from the international community. Refugees will eventually escape and relay the conditions to others, but the combination of the horrific details coupled with the lack of similar information from within the country leaves outsiders unwillingly to believe the refugees' stories. As details of the atrocities surface non-action becomes justified through framing the conflicts as "civil war" or "age-old hatred" and by positioning intervention as means of impeding state sovereignty.

Power identifies a recurring belief among U.S. leaders that policymakers, journalists, and general citizens are capable of rational behavior during times of war and that they can protect themselves simply by staying out of the way. This approach requires a clear point of demarcation of where violence occurs. Perhaps with a clearly defined "line of fire" innocent civilians are able to remove themselves from harm; but in reality, modern warfare, particular urban warfare, rarely produces well-defined combat zones.

In "Ethnic Cleansing Bleaches the Atrocities of Genocide," Shira Sagi suggests that using the term "ethnic cleansing" as an euphemism for genocide also delays intervention. Ethnic cleansing has no legal status and is often used as a method for explaining massacre. The term enforces a dehumanized view of victims as sources of filth and disease and gives legitimacy to the perverse ethics of the aggressive party. Worst of all, the term lessens the impact of atrocities and allows nations to avoid getting involved because there is no ultimate genocide. The term, according to Sagi, corrupts the interpretation of events, judgments, and action and should be removed

from official use as it has no legal status and only serves to weaken intervention responsibilities of international bodies.

Social Control Literature

There have been several theories proposed by scholars outside of genocide studies to understand and explain genocide; some have been better received than others within genocide scholarship. Identifying genocide as a means of social control provides a framework for connecting genocide and neoliberalism. The connection is not one directly correlating to the other, but rather because actions that coerce populations share similar strategies and outcomes that can be found in both genocide and neoliberalism.

In his article “Violentization Theory and Genocide,” Mark Winton argues for the legitimization of criminology in genocide studies. Winton (2011) acknowledges that, “Criminologists and sociologists have tended to avoid applying the vast criminology research on conflict and state crimes to genocide” (p. 363). Pointing to the work by John Hagan and Wenona Raymond-Richmond, Winton argues that criminologists can collect and analyze data for prosecution, particularly data on the racial aspect of genocide, the dehumanization process, and the role of the state. Winton notes a lack of viable criminology methods and theories to explain the scale of atrocities and the intent of offenders, but suggests both can be addressed through interdisciplinary collaboration.

Winton also applies Lonnie Athens’ “violentization theory” to the genocide cases of Rwanda and Bosnia. Athens’ violentization theory describes the four-stage process that occurs in serial killers. Athens stresses the importance of focusing on

the offender's self image, social interaction, use of symbols, and the understanding the interpretation of interactions with others to understand how and when they became violent. Winton (2011, pp. 365-366) summarizes Athens violentization theory as the following:

1. Brutalization Stage: Violent Behavior is learned through observation and demonstration, sometimes forced into action by others.
2. Defiance Stage: Violence is framed within a belief system for the offender that violence is necessary to protect themselves from the violent actions of others.
3. Violent Dominance Engagements Stage: This is where violent acts occur. A belief system is in place that encourages violent acts towards others. Offenders can develop the confidence carry out their violent acts in this stage and can receive rewards for actions when performed in a group environment.
4. Virulency Stage: This moment is achieved when an individual or group recognizes themselves as violent and dangerous. The offenders instill fear into others and use violence to control, shame, and dominate others.

Winton conducts a content analysis of court transcripts, interviews, and official documents for case studies of Rwanda and Bosnia and analyzes the data using violentization theory. Winton's findings show that violentization theory is consistent with the data and is effective in explaining how these genocides occurred. However, violentization theory was only applied at the micro-level. Additional cross case analysis is needed to determine if the theory can provide a macro-level framework.

Athens' violentization theory provides a framework for understanding how the transformation can happen in a population to commit genocide once a targeted group has been identified, but it does not provide a strong enough model for making

a connection between genocide and neoliberalism. This connection, as we will see, can be drawn from the theories of sociologist Donald Black.

Donald Black (1983) introduces a typology of violence that makes a distinction between moralistic violence and predatory violence to explain how groups respond to deviance as a means of self-help. The typology has been met with mixed reviews because it moves away from conventional ideologies of politics and criminology. In their article "Typologizing Violence, A Blackian Perspective," Mark Cooney and Scott Phillips discuss how a relevant typology should be constructed and the strength of Black's distinction between moralistic and predatory violence. According to Black, moralistic violence is rooted in conflict while predatory violence is rooted in exploitation: "Moralistic violence occurs in the context of prosecuting a grievance, seeking justice, or exacting justice. Moral violence is social control or conflict management. Predatory violence in contrast involves the exploitation of the person or property of another" (Cooney & Phillips, 2002, p. 81).

This distinction between moral and predatory violence can be seen in international warfare. War leads to death and destruction regardless of the motivations that direct violence and the motivations can be different. Predatory violence in warfare can be observed in the invasion of one country by another in attempt to acquire resources or to enslave people. This model can be located within colonial expansion and imperial relations. At the other end of the spectrum is violence that draws motivation from prior grievances or moments of serving justice. For instance, countries wage war to recover lost territories, to seek revenge over previous humiliations, power struggles, or issues of morality. These motivations

allow for framing warfare as the battle between good and evil, or right and wrong, and are therefore based on moralistic values. This distinction is important because it demonstrates how one framework is derived from exploitation whereas the other is rooted conflict.

Cooney and Phillips present the criteria identified in typology literature and scientific theory that explains what makes a typology valid. The criterion requires a typology to be powerful, theoretical, general, and parsimonious. They argue that the moralistic-predatory typology is powerful because it brings order to a range of violence concepts and is theoretical able to distinguish the situating of conflict versus predatory violence. Since the typology is general, it is relevant at different structural levels, in different times and places. Finally, the typology achieves parsimony by emphasizing conflict and the classification of violence. The authors conclude that Black's moralistic-predatory typology makes a valuable contribution to the study and understanding of violence.

In addition to the moralistic-predatory typology, Donald Black (2000a) also introduced his "Pure Sociology" theory for explaining human behavior. The theory has been useful in explaining a broad range of behaviors from terrorism to genocide. Roberta Senechal de la Roche uses pure sociology to analyze collective violence in her article, "Why is collective violence collective?" Senechal de la Roche (2001) states, "The goal of a collective violence theory is to predict and explain when and how it occurs from one case of conflict to another" (p. 126). A successful theory will address two problems: Why conflicts are handled by violence rather than other

methods of conflict management and why conflicts are handled collectively rather than individually.

This article is the second work of a two-piece volume that examines constructing a theory of collective violence. Senechal de la Roche addresses the concerns of why collective violence is violent and uses this to address the problem of why collective violence is collective. In applying the theory of partisanship, Senechal de la Roche demonstrates how collective violence is a direct function of strong partisanship. When two groups become spatially separated by their closeness, partisanship happens when a third party finds itself socially close to one group while feeling remote from the other. Strong partisanship occurs when third parties become involved and support one side against the other and when they are solidary. Groups are solidary when they are intimate, culturally homogenous, and interdependent. The primary purpose of Senechal de la Roche's theory of collective violence is to predict and explain how and when violence happens to better understand why violence is chosen over alternatives methods of conflict management.

Bradley Campbell expands the theory of partisanship and applies it to the larger work of social geometry, which includes the theory of partisanship to frame genocide. In "Genocide as Social Control," Campbell defines genocide as the organized and unilateral mass killing of people based on ethnicity. Campbell is concerned with the tendency of scholars to classify genocide as a type of evil, primarily because this classification requires theories of evil to explain behavior. He also warns against using theories that classify genocide as "madness" or as a crime

that can be explained through criminality. Campbell (2009) addresses his concerns by explaining that: “Evil, crime, and madness are evaluative labels, not sociological categories of human behavior” (p. 151). Acts that are considered evil, mad, or criminal lack sociological commonalities and often require different theories. Not only does genocide lack commonalities with other evil acts, the offenders frequently identify their victims as being evil.

Genocide is considered by some as a type of deviance; but it is also a form of social control, which itself is a response to deviant behavior. This point is important because many people consider genocide as violence without moral constraint. Campbell argues that genocide does not occur when morals are ignored, but rather it occurs when morals are present and applied. Genocide then is a type of moralistic violence. In other words, those who commit genocide are often viewed as the instigators, but the reality is that those who commit genocide are usually using genocide as a defense to what they viewed as an aggressive action from the victim.

Neoliberalism Literature

“Considerations on the Connections Between Race, Politics, Economics, and Genocide,” by Guillermo Levy makes a compelling case for the comparison of the Holocaust genocide to killings that took place in Latin America and were sanctioned or rationalized by the U.S. Doctrine of National Security in Latin America. The comparison is not over the methods or number of people killed, but rather on the intent of government agencies to target people deemed as potential enemies of the state. It has been debated that Neoliberal policies could be considered genocidal, or more accurately genocide by omission because “Those in power use borders to

demarcate distinction” (Levy, 2006, p. 137). Levy makes an important distinction that Nazism introduced an unprecedented reversal in the social contract where sovereign authorities were no longer only attacked external threats of sovereignty, but were now willing to actively look for and attack perceived internal enemies.

The US Doctrine of National Security expanded on this idea as traditional colonial racial borders were replaced with ideological borders generated by politics and allowed labeling of groups to justify their extermination. Extermination of “other” groups is justified because they are placed “outside” politically, socially, and symbolically. Neoliberalism has co-opted this attitude and aims to concentrate the power of capital, mercantilize social relationships, and destroy existing and emerging opposition. The result is a political structure that seeks advancement regardless of the social cost and anybody who stands in the way faces destruction without repercussion.

The US Doctrine of National Security in Latin America helped neoliberalism find its way into Latin America and other parts of the world through similar policies. Henry Giroux argues in that neoliberalism has commercialized everyday life, corporatized education, rolled back the welfare state, created militarized zones in public spaces, and has privatized much of the public sphere. “Corporations have been increasingly freed from social control through deregulation, privatization, and neoliberal measures” (Giroux, 2005, p. 2). The result has been an increase in the difficulty of addressing social agency and the importance of democratic public spheres; it also means that active and critical political agents need to be molded, educated, and socialized within the same political landscape.

Neoliberalism lacks a theoretical paradigm that connects education to social change and current political situations appear to lack the power necessary to theorize the crisis of political agency and pessimism in the face of neoliberalism. Giroux (2005) claims “Politics has become empty as it is reduced to following orders, shaming those who make power accountable, and shutting down legitimate modes of dissent” (p. 4). Giroux argues that people are becoming detached from utilizing public forums as tools discussing social issues. The result has been a diminished political agency replaced by a market-based driven form of cultural politics. Within cultural politics, personal gratification and notoriety replace social responsibility there is less effort to generate systematic change.

Giroux ‘s primary argument is that neoliberalism has created a vast educational propaganda machine and that people challenging the status quo need to rethink the project of politics within the changed conditions of a global political/pedagogical sphere. He views political agency as a fundamental challenge facing educators, intellectuals, social movements, and others who cling to the promise of global democracy. The prominent issues of the times require global politics to pedagogy, international alliances, and solidarity groups to push educators and others to envision alternatives to create and implement alternative models.

Building on Giroux’s argument, Johanna Oksala (2011) frames violence as a consequence of neoliberalism. She suggests that the relationship between neoliberalism and political violence has often been understood in two opposing ways; with one opinion shared by neoliberalism supporters and the other opposing view shared by its critics.

Supporters of neoliberalism refer to Friedrich Hayek's (1944) claim that a planned economy requires coercion to work on large scale. Opponents of neoliberalism turn to Naomi Klein's claim that neoliberalism can only be implemented through repression and force. The argument is essentially over the nature of neoliberal violence with one side positioning political violence as a minor necessity to launch policy change. The counter argument is that people do not want to accept the policy changes and that violence is necessary to force compliance. Oksala argues that the free-market is not automatic and it has to be produced through effective government action. Her concern is that the motivation for violence is the wrong focal point; the focus should address why a system that presupposes violence is an option.

Oksala's second argument is that neoliberal violence is positioned as economic based rather than political-moral based. "Neoliberalism was understood as a political rationality that attempted to bring the social and political domain under economic rationality" (Oksala, 2011, p. 480). The idea of "homo economicus" as a rational being that uses economic knowledge to make decisions is based the cost versus benefit value. Neoliberalism takes this a step further by stating that all rational behavior, even violence, can be analyzed economically by looking at the cost versus benefit (profit) model. This has resulted in violence, particularly state violence, no longer being viewed as right or wrong, but instead judges behavior and actions on cost-effectiveness.

Simon Springer examines the risks of creating an over-generalized idea of neoliberalism, which ignores the effect of local variations of neoliberalism.

Neoliberal economics have been promoted by international financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank as a means to build economic wealth and equality in global south countries. The policies enact changes that on the surface seem as if they would be rejected by existing elites in the areas, but the policies are actually embraced by those in power and other elites. Within the framework of neoliberalism exist opportunities for people with connections to gain control of markets and rewards to build their personal wealth.

These local appropriations of neoliberalism are the areas that need to be accounted for within the neoliberal framework to see the true impact of policies, regulatory actions, and ideologies on the transformation of a region. The “actually existing” articulation of neoliberalism in Cambodia is a patronage system that has allowed local and regional elites to co-opt, transform, and design reforms through a framework that consumes public resources and increases the amount of corruption, coercion, and violence in the general public. “Conditions of patronage in Cambodia engender considerable violence, as those without its protections are frequently forcibly removed from their lands when and where speculation determines a monetary value” (Springer, 2011, p. 2560). These evictions are a form of displacement and occur violently at times as companies rely on military and police resources to enforce evictions.

Springer provides numerous examples of the violence occurring in Cambodia as a result of neoliberal policies and suggests that disadvantaged citizens must choose between the lesser of two evils. “The poor must either look to the domination of the patronage system to ensure their livelihoods, or seek official

economic channels as an alternative - where they become easy prey to usury” (Springer, 2011, p. 2564). The poor are reduced to seeking assistance from a patronage system that is designed to benefit the elite rather than the poor or to accept accumulation by dispossession through international assistance. Springer calls for a closer examination of neoliberalism at the local level because the effects of neoliberalism are neither everywhere nor the same in each case.

The literature chosen represents a combination of fundamental works, historical pieces, and critiques of popular theory for genocide, neoliberalism, and social control. It is not a comprehensive list, but it provides the theoretical frameworks for this thesis. Having reviewed the core works, I will now move forward with the remainder of the thesis.

Chapter 4

NEOLIBERALISM AND VIOLENCE

“It never occurred to me at the time that I was helping to develop machinery that would make possible a government that I would come to criticize severely as too large, too intrusive, too destructive of freedom. Yet, that is precisely what I was doing. Rose [Milton’s wife] has repeatedly chided me over the years about the role that I played in making possible the current overgrown government we both criticize so strongly.”

-Milton Friedman

This chapter analyzes and critiques neoliberalism in an effort to identify connections between genocide and neoliberalism. The emphasis is on the influence that neoliberalism has on desensitizing people in power to the suffering of vulnerable people and how violence is justified as the externalized cost of development or for national security. The goal of this chapter is to better understand how neoliberalism creates and justifies violence¹⁸ and how socially inferior groups are excluded. To achieve this I return to my research questions. Namely, has the global expansion of neoliberalism introduced policies that increase the possibility of genocide occurring in Global South nations by desensitizing groups in power to the needs, rights, and suffering of vulnerable citizens? Additionally, have these policies also desensitized the international community to the dehumanization of victims that result in delayed intervention during atrocities?

My argument is that neoliberalism establishes and justifies certain behaviors and attitudes that desensitize people to the human condition. A level of suffering is considered acceptable when framed as occurring within the pursuit of

¹⁸ Violence refers to both patterns and moments of violence. The violence can be either intentional or unintended.

development,¹⁹ trade, and expansion. Victim suffering is justified as the externalized cost of economic growth, development, and national security. As Linda Green (2001, p. 370) states, “Disposable people fit into a system in which violence, fear, and impunity are crucial components.” There are three areas within neoliberalism that will be analyzed to identify the impact on genocide. First, I will apply the four primary ideologies of genocide to neoliberalism to identify if any similarities exist. Second, do neoliberal policies and agendas establish a roadmap that can lead to violence, possibly genocide, by desensitizing those in power to the human condition? Finally, how does the neoliberal concern for national security impact the occurrence of violence and genocide?

Genocide Ideology

The first area of interest to analyze is how neoliberalism is viewed through the dominant ideologies of genocide. Examining genocide in the work of Ben Kiernan (2007) helps to identify elements of genocidal behavior that may be related to the tenets and impacts of neoliberalism. Kiernan identifies four fundamental ideologies of genocide: expansionism, cults of antiquity, agriculture/cultivation (land), and race. These ideologies are frequently embedded in the actions of regimes that commit genocide as a method for “protecting” the state. Kiernan focuses on the four primary ideologies, but places an emphasis on race and land. Deconstructing these ideologies expose similar characteristics found in both genocide and

¹⁹ The relationship between developed and developing nations is also referenced as the North/South divide as the discourse refers to Northern (developed) states and Southern (developing) states.

neoliberalism. Following are descriptions of the ideologies and analysis of how neoliberalism relates to the ideology.

Land (Agrarian/Cults of Cultivation) and Race.

The genocide ideologies of land and race are intertwined. Kiernan (2007) connects genocidal thought to “idealized conceptions of the world, utopian or dystopian, divorced from reality but capable of being forcefully imposed upon it” (p. 21). Race is a social construct; there is no empirical support for the superiority of one race over another. Likewise, there is no official mandate that details land usage. Yet, many cases of genocide can trace their beginnings to race or a belief that people are using their land incorrectly.²⁰ The genocides in Rwanda, Darfur, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, and many others trace their beginnings to the ideologies of land and race.

Neoliberalism reinforces this behavior by dictating to nations how they should use their land. Liberalizing markets encourages competition and efficiency through comparative advantage, which promotes specialization. Carmen Gonzalez (2011) explains comparative advantage as a theory “that each country should specialize in the goods that it produces relatively more efficiently and should import the goods that it produces relatively less efficiently” (p. 737). The relevance is that self-determination is limited because Global North states dictate modes of

²⁰ Cults of cultivation or agrarian ideologies of genocide romanticize farm life and agriculture. Cultivating crops is considered one of the oldest professions and has a history of providing for the needs of citizens and soldiers. Deviating from this purpose is considered putting land to incorrect use.

development and any deviation from an established plan is met with reprisal from more powerful nations.

Race factors into two roles within neoliberalism: the suffering disproportionately placed on racialized bodies and the dehumanization process associated with race. According to David Roberts (2010, p. 249) “race is mobilized to show that racialized subjectivities are essential in justifying certain impacts of neoliberalization that are experienced disproportionately within racialized communities.” There are negative outcomes like pollution, reduction of social welfare programs, and unemployment that are associated with neoliberal development and are more frequently distributed along racial lines. Race justifies the unequal distribution of negative outcomes by “allow[ing] for the imagining of the inhumanity and rule over foreign people and the sovereign right to exterminate - or, in this context, render killable, disposable, and exploitable – certain populations” (Rosas, 2012, p. 17).

The motivations for destruction are based on beliefs of land use and racial hierarchies and are arguably the most dominant reasons leading to genocide based on historical analysis of cases; however, genocide frequently consists of a combination of ideologies. The next section discusses the ideology of genocide based on cults of antiquity²¹ and will examine the fit of neoliberalism, like genocide, to multiple ideologies.

²¹ Cults of antiquity refer to the idolization of previous societies or ancient models of organized states. Hitler viewed Sparta as the model racialist state tried to incorporate elements of Spartan society in Nazi Germany.

Cults of Antiquity.

Regimes that commit genocide often do so with the intent of creating a utopian state based upon a romanticized political model. There is a belief that a group of people has led to the contamination of society and that a return to purity can be achieved by removing the group. “Even as they require technological dominance, genocide and extermination betray a preoccupation with restoring purity and order” (Kiernan, 2007, p. 27). Regimes engaged in genocide place an emphasis on historical societies as they symbolize mythical pasts that should be emulated for their superiority.

Neoliberalism presupposes the developed nation, particularly the modern Western state, as the ideal political and economic state. Similar to a regime that establishes a symbolic nation to emulate, Global South nations are expected to adopt the capitalist-democratic development path as the roadmap to success. Institutions like the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and World Trade Organization have been entrusted with enforcing compliance among developing nations. Those who resist the system are branded deviants and denounced for impeding progress. They are targeted for containment, punishment, and removal.

Cults of antiquity places a premium on ancient idealized states as models to imitate, it should then be little surprise regimes that commit genocide emphasize the importance land and farming (Rosas, 2012). In *The History of Florence and the Affairs of Italy*, Nicolo Machiavelli claimed that unhealthy countries become healthy if a vast number of men occupy them suddenly and cultivate the soil (Morton, 2007). Machiavelli’s statement leads to a discussion role of expansion within genocide.

Expansionism.

Expansionism is the fourth and final primary ideology of genocide. The ideology is established on the underlying principles of the land and antiquity ideologies. Based on the expansionism ideology the destruction of people occurs most frequently to save land that is not being utilized or considered to not be used efficiently. "Land in this view should not remain wilderness, but should by culture and husbandry yield things necessary for man's life" (Kiernan, 2007, p. 31). Industrialization and urbanization reinforces romanticism of pristine land as rural areas and viewed as a way to escape the effects of city life. The emphasis placed on the expansionism ideology meets the demands of the growing global population. The perceived proper use of land becomes more central as regimes seek more land to better provide for citizens.

Under neoliberalism, this process intensified the removal of trade barriers and created markets that are easier to enter for trading goods, gaining access to labor, and acquiring resources. Comparative advantage is frequently presented to Global South nations as a way to maximize their strengths by supporting the needs of Global North nations. Comparative advantage promotes specialization and suggests states concentrate on the extraction of resources or products to produce goods and to purchase other commodities as needed. Increased use of protectionist policies²² have allowed developed nations to use comparative advantage as a leveraging tool to maintain economic superiority.

²² Protectionist policies are economic policies like tariffs and quotas that restrict trade. Protectionist policies are a contradiction as neoliberalism promotes free trade; however, these

A more detailed discussion of comparative advantage will be discussed later, but the present focus is the relation to expansionism genocide ideology. The development strategy instituted by Global North for Global South establishes the acceptable way to utilize land and resources by focusing on strengths and avoiding areas of weakness. If the Global South nation pursues land and resource projects that are not approved, they risk reprimand for using their land incorrectly.

These concepts are nothing new; deconstructing these ideologies, particularly expansionism, expose similar characteristics found in both settler colonialism and modern neoliberalism. It has been argued by some that neoliberalism simply repackaged colonialism into a framework that focuses on the sovereignty of developing countries. Pablo Casanova (1996) states:

To be precise, an updated theory of the state or of sociology must also take note of the adverse effects of globalization on Third World countries, on the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and of the fact that current globalization maintains and reformulates colonial structures of dependency, of the equally solid structures of late 19th-century imperialism, and of central and peripheral capitalism structured between 1930 and 1980. (p. 41)

This section has introduced the four primary genocide ideologies of land, race, antiquity, and expansionism and discussed how they relate to each other. “Genocidal conquerors legitimize their territorial expansion by racial superiority or glorious antiquity at the same time as they claim a unique capacity to put conquered lands into a productive agricultural use” (Kiernan, 2007, p. 29). The purpose of comparing genocide ideology and neoliberalism was to demonstrate that a

policies are used to protect developed nations while maintaining their superiority over developing nations.

connection between neoliberalism not to establish a correlation. The next section will analyze neoliberalism to identify policies and agendas that might establish pathways to violence and genocide.

Neoliberalism and Development

Global South countries that adopt neoliberalism as a development model gain access to a vast network of resources that are intended to assist with economic growth and development. The resources provide access to funding for development projects, technology, various consultants, and access to trade networks. The access however, comes with a cost, and that cost is the agreement to follow the mandates and policies of management agencies like the World Trade Organization (WTO), World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The policies and agendas originating from these organizations are the source of concern because 1) the policies are not negotiable and are generalized without regard to the needs or situation of the developing nation; and 2) the assembly line mentality of development establishes a routine that desensitizes administrators because of the isolation of the human element within development.

Many developed nations have benefitted, at some point in their history, from an influx of capital and resources from the exploitation of colonies. Neoliberalism has provided Global North a development model that continues to exploit weaker nations for the advancement of more powerful nations. Trade agreements appear structured in a way that benefits both developed and developing nations; but a closer examination exposes mechanisms that favor developed nations over developing nations.

Developing nations are exploited for their resources and labor. Trade agreements are less bilaterally beneficial as policies, such as Trade-related Investment Measures (TRIMS), Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) protect developed nation's interests. These protectionist policies empower companies (often located or headquartered in developed nations) of manufactured goods while placing restrictions on primary goods producers, which are common among developing nations.

According to Gilbert Rosas (2012) Mexico's investment in neoliberalism resulted in an economic crisis that caused the state to stop regulating society and providing welfare programs. Rosas points to NAFTA²³ as an agreement that was positioned as a program that was going to improve the living conditions of the Mexican population while securing the U.S. and Mexico border. The reality however, was a rapid descent into economic crisis that destroyed industry, jobs, and prompted Mexican citizens to seek employment and better lives elsewhere.

Increased use of protectionist policies allowed developed nations to use comparative advantage as a leveraging tool to maintain superiority. "Comparative advantage plays a central role in legitimating both the ideology of free trade and the economic policy recommendations of the WTO, the World Bank, and the IMF" (Gonzalez, 2011, p. 737). This is accomplished by establishing trade terms that keep expensive goods at the forefront of agreements because as a manufactured good

²³ North American Free Trade Agreement: Established a trade bloc between Canada, Mexico, and the United States to reduce trade and investment barriers.

decreases in price it becomes more common. There are usually new and improved goods waiting to replace the former, thus maintaining higher revenue streams. Conversely primary goods fall in price with fewer replacement goods available to maintain revenue streams.

Nations producing primary goods are more focused on securing basic survival needs and have little income available to accumulate manufactured goods. William Rees (2002) adds, “developing countries must compete with each other for first-world markets. This bids down the prices for developing countries’ commodity exports in relation to the prices of the manufactured goods and services they must import” (p. 258). The disparity of purchasing power widens the income and quality goods gap between developed and developing nations, which reduces available income for infrastructure development and welfare programs.

Structural Adjustment Policies (SAP) are used to ensure debt repayment to the International Monetary Fund and World Bank effectively institutionalizing double standards for developing countries. SAPs require developing nations to export more goods to pay debts; the preferred exports are usually cash crops or basic commodities that other poor countries sell, which deflates pricing. “Many debtor nations are forced to spend more of their income servicing debts to the world’s richest nations rather than providing social services to their own impoverished citizens” (Rees, 2002, p. 256). Issues of inequality are fairly simple to recognize. Michael Carroll (2009) even suggests: “Increasing inequality is a logical result of the neoliberal one-size-fits-all prescription for economic reform” (p. 2). The question remains, what is the connection to violence and genocide?

Effects of Structural Adjustment Policies

Developed nations are the benefactors in these trade agreements as they can acquire primary goods at a discounted price. As exports bring in less revenue, developing states are forced to export even more to make up for lost revenue to pay debts. Reduced income translates into reduction in government spending, consumption, and building of infrastructure. Less time and money is being dedicated to development as efforts are increased to pay outstanding debts. Further complicating matters is that institutions like the IMF and World Bank dictate to developing nations the financial terms they need to follow and threaten to withhold development funds if developing states do not adhere to the institution's recommendations or miss loan payments.

Donald Bray (2002) explains that these policies are defended based on the principal argument "that the present exploitation of labor in poor countries will ultimately lead to sufficient technology transfer and local capital accumulation to generate general economic uplift" (p. 119). The more realistic long-term impact is that budget cuts to social programs will decrease levels of education and health while increasing unemployment, infant mortality rates, disease, and poverty, which are all warning signs of potential extreme violence (Hagan & Raymond-Richmond, 2009).

The use of trade agreements and structural adjustment policies by the World Bank, WTO, and IMF in the Global South, increases trade and development in the beginning, but has demonstrated a tendency to weaken states (while strengthening multinational corporations) long-term. There is a direct connection to structural

policies that weaken developing states economically, resulting in less money for social programs and state infrastructure. The consequences, especially loss of social services, trickle down to the population over time, but the immediate loss is state and business income. Beyond fewer jobs, what is the effect on individuals and those in power, and how does this generate desensitization and violence?

Neoliberalism and Unemployment

Siswo Pramono (2003) crafts a compelling argument, that if genocide is a policy that leads to the destruction of a particular group, prompting the collapse of a whole society, then it is worth discussing how neoliberalism might possess a genocidal mentality. Pramono (2003) is concerned with the working class and argues that:

“Neoliberalism is by nature genocidal (and suicidal) because in order to survive, it has to eat its own tail. In other words, by 'killing' the working class, capitalism is digging its own grave. When the working class is dying, society is dying, which at the end will lead to the death of capitalism itself” (p. 121).

The significance is that neoliberalism not only impairs the global economy, but it can potentially undermine human society as values and the free market is determined through the lenses of neoliberalism. “Thus, human society is transformed into a market society based on laissez-faire capitalism...resulting in the corrosion of the value of work and worker as an integral part of social structure” (Pramono, 2003, p. 122).

Pramono’s argument revolves around the importance of employment for maintaining an orderly society. Employment imposes social control on people as work creates order by addressing the individual self-interest of earning wages,

keeps them busy and contributing something of worth to society. Unemployment removes societal control over people and leads to disorganization, potentially transforming the industrious working class into a violent mob or law-breakers. As Robert Prasch (2012) warns, the public might actually engage in civil disobedience or rebellion if they feel abandoned by the state.

The loss of employment also leads to distress and intensifies as the quality of life declines due to the loss of wages, particularly in developing countries.

“Neoliberal global politics incite anger, rage, and the motive for *retaliation* and *harm doing*” (Staub, 1989; see also Pramono 2003, p. 129), as frustration builds over the suffering experienced by the unemployed. Conflict and violence can arise as the unemployed turn their frustration towards those who they feel are responsible for their bleak outlook. “Negative growth shocks make it easier for armed militia groups – which are often major combatants in Africa’s civil wars – to recruit fighters from an expanding pool of underemployed youths” (Miguel, Satyanath, & Sregenti, 2004, p. 728). This offers groups challenging state power, or blaming the state for suffering, a potential pool of youths to recruit.

The discussion of Neoliberalism thus far has analyzed how structural adjustment policies mandated by international financial institutions like the IMF, WTO, and World Bank assist with the short-term development of Global South states, but become problematic in the long-term. Primary concerns are the decrease of social programs resulting from funding cut to meet debt obligations to financial institutions, the rise in unemployment, and the introduction of business practices that dehumanizes employees while desensitizing administrators to the needs and

suffering of workers. These are important factors as they are precursors to violent activities. The next section further examines neoliberal decisions and the process of desensitization and dehumanization.

Institutionalized Desensitization and Dehumanization

Neoliberal markets require the commodification of land, resources, and labor to function. These commodities are then traded based on the laws of supply and demand. The commodification of labor is essential to neoliberalism by relying on technology to improve efficiency. Comparative advantage and trade agreements allow the outsourcing of jobs to maximize profits.

The commodification of labor reduces workers to nothing more than a cost of production. The process is detrimental for two reasons: first it begins a process of dehumanizing that transforms people to subjects; second, administrators begin to experience less sensitivity to subjects in comparison to people. The commodification of labor converts workers from human employees to units of labor effectively removing the human element from labor. People are not laid off, but rather, labor hours are reduced. Maximizing profits through technology does not take into consideration employee welfare; it is only concerned with the reduction of production costs (labor) through increased efficiency. Administrators involved with labor cuts become desensitized to the affect of layoffs on employees because they are not dealing with human elements like names, family size, or years on the job, they are simply reducing the number of labor units required to complete a job.

Populations defined as others find themselves under the increased control of the sovereign power as their worth is devalued and steps are taken to increase their

productivity. Marion Iris Young recognizes this as the paradox of democracy by which “Social power makes some citizens more equal than others, and equality of citizenship makes some people more powerful citizens” (Young, 1989, p. 259).

Worker rights are reduced, if not outright dismissed, as wages are reduced, bathroom breaks are limited and monitored, surveillance methods are increased to monitor employee activities, working spaces are compacted to make room for more employees, and welfare benefits become harder to secure. “Such disciplinary techniques over low-wage workers and migrants are intended to instill both productivity and political stability, thus creating conditions profitable for global manufacturing” (Ong 2006 p. 79). Management can use the threat of termination as a method to force low-skilled laborers to obey and conform because there is a plethora of replacement candidates. This leads employees to suffering in silence as the small benefits and wages they receive are better than being terminated.

This exploitation is encouraged because of the need for developing states to participate in neoliberal models of development and to establish itself as a normalized actor on the world stage (Meyers, 2007). The oppression and exploitation begins with little events that are justifiable because the suffering is minimal. Local labor is glad to work a double shift because they need to buy food for their family and the extra money is welcomed. Working in tight spaces is acceptable because the factory is new and processes are still being perfected. Increased surveillance measures are tolerated because it comes with the new prosperity that is being promised (Apostolidis, 2010).

However, two secondary events are simultaneously occurring that have more severe implications. First, creating a small amount of discomfort is not only justified for profit, but it moves the standardized norm of acceptable discomfort from none to a little. This continues a process of desensitization among elites like managers, administrators, and government officials that establishes a normalized degree of discomfort that can lead to greater suffering. Establishing a baseline of suffering allows those in power to increase suffering slightly a little more than the established norm. Each adjustment establishes a new baseline of acceptability and by the time the discomfort becomes unacceptable and those suffering speak up, too much suffering has been normalized and those in control do not want to change existing policies.

As discussed, labor is dehumanized through commodification in a process that also desensitizes those in power to the suffering or discomfort resulting from policies. Central to the process is the othering of people to reduce the human quality of life of targeted groups. With othering comes the potential for more extreme violence, particularly when groups progress are refined as simple deviants to serious threats. The following section looks at othering in the interest of national security and the increase in violence.

Othering

Achieving normalcy and being considered a legitimate actor is the ultimate goal of any developing nation and the smoothest transition to becoming an actor is to incorporate the collective rules of established models (Meyer, 2007). Aihwa Ong (2006) discusses the importance of actor hood in Southeast Asian countries and are

following this trend by using neoliberalism to articulate themselves with the market-centered logic of the contemporary world. State agency comes from being recognized as an actor in a world that views “others” as different and looks down upon them. This process is so ingrained within the thinking of states that it transfers the way of thinking onto its citizenry as similar policies and laws are designed to establish the normalized citizen and designates the non-ideal citizen as the “other.”

Neoliberal economy and politics position some nations as powerless within the global market. Even states that are reluctant are forced to participate in market ideologies or risk being left behind. Ong (2006) uses Foucault’s theory of biopolitics²⁴ to identifying the transformation citizens of the world into a new type of subject, subjects that are controlled through the use of biopower.²⁵ In capitalist economies norms like labor rights, pensions, health care, and other employee concerns have been reassessed as a result of neoliberalism and have become tools to manipulate bodies.

Foucault recognizes that states do not seek to enhance biological vitality for all populations equally, but rather aims to “normalize” the majority of the population. No longer is being a rational and disciplined person enough to be considered an ideal citizen. To exist in society, a person must also be flexible, creative, and full of knowledge. Anybody lacking these qualities is likely to become labeled as the “other” and face exclusion from the state. Persons who can adapt to

²⁴ “Biopolitics refers to a series of regulatory controls exerted on the population and on individuals in order to harness and extract life forces.” (Ong, 2006, p.13)

²⁵ The use of power over a group meant to subjugate groups through the manipulation of their bodies.

changes are included and retain access to the rights of citizenship while those deemed less desirable quickly see their rights disappear. Workers, particularly immigrant and low-skilled laborers, are subjugated to greater disciplinary controls.

As Ong (2006) claims:

Components formerly tied to citizenship—rights, entitlements, as well as nation and territoriality—are becoming disarticulated from one another and rearticulated with governing strategies that promote an economic logic in defining, evaluating, and protecting certain categories of subjects and not others. (p. 16)

The privileged citizens then begin a process of suppression to control the othered group. Staub (1989) discusses the role of devaluation (part of dehumanization process) and identifies it as a necessary precondition for doing harm. “Distinctions in race, religion, status, wealth, power, and political views are the main sources of differentiation” (Staub, 1989, p. 60). This marginalized group is frequently vilified and criminalized in an effort to reinforce the exclusion of societal rights. To reinforce the exclusion of the other, they are frequently framed as being diseased, uneducated, drains on welfare programs, perpetrators of crime, and largely responsible for the breakdown of civil society. Othered groups traditionally consist of migrant workers, immigrants, indigenous people, and those in poverty within the existing population.

Those being othered are becoming stripped of societal recognition as they descend into spaces of exception. They find themselves at the mercy of sovereign authorities with no protection from the oppression and dominance that the state can promote. More specifically, Giroux (2005) writes:

Neoliberalism has become complicitous with this transformation of the democratic state into a national security state that repeatedly uses its military and political power to develop a daunting police state and military-prison-education-industrial complex to punish workers, stifle dissent, and undermine the political power of labor unions and progressive social movements. (p. 8)

Once a group has been othered, they find themselves in the state of exception and are exposed to the full force of the state.

Indeed, the state of exception has today reached its maximum worldwide deployment. The normative aspect of law can thus be obliterated and contradicted with impunity by a government violence – while ignoring international law externally and producing a permanent state of exception internally – nevertheless still claims to be applying the law. (Agamben, 2005, p. 87)

Being reduced to bare life, members of othered groups remain physically alive, but cease to exist socially or within the realm of state responsibility. With the removal of state responsibility to the othered group, it becomes possible to target the group for violence or removal. The process of dehumanization and desensitization makes it easier to deny the suffering of the group and their destruction becomes less disturbing.

National security

The labeling, and eventual othering, of groups as threats to national security present the greatest risk of violence and potential genocide. Labeling the othered group as deviant allows the state to focus on the threat posed by the group and in this process generates fear among the larger population. Fear of the group can turn into anger or hatred that justifies state violence as an acceptable method of

protecting the state and citizens from the threat, including genocide in extreme cases (Hiebert, 2008). The process of othering and exclusion that is prominent in neoliberalism is integral to this process as a state of exception that allows citizens to accept the destruction of groups, particularly when the threat is perceived.

This chapter has discussed neoliberalism and the role of international financial institutions and their use of structural adjustments policies to direct development in Global South countries. The focus was on the influence that policy enforcement has on the increase of violence during development, especially in the potential outbreak of genocide. A degree of suffering is accepted as the cost of economic growth, development, and national security. The process largely occurs through the othering process that devalues and dehumanizes people considered not worthy of social inclusion. “Neoliberalism does not merely produce economic inequality, iniquitous power relations, and a corrupt political system; it also promotes rigid exclusions from national citizenship and civic participation” (Giroux 2005, p.14). The dehumanization of othered bodies and the laissez-faire (do nothing) beliefs has led to an increase of the amount of suffering that is tolerated by those in power.

Chapter 5

CASE STUDY: DARFUR

Sudan is a country located in northeastern Africa that is strongly influenced by both Arabs from the Middle East and Africans from southern Africa. Darfur is a region within Sudan that borders the country of Chad in the west; it was the location of one of the longest running genocides (Hagan & Rymond-Richmond, 2009). According to a 1995 United Nations survey,²⁶ the country is home to more than fifty ethnic groups and another six hundred tribes, with most falling into African or Arab categories. The northern population is primarily Arab Muslim; whereas, the western and southern regions are settled by African Christians (Taber, 2008, p. 178). The Darfur region is settled by the Fur, Massalit, and Zaghawa African ethnic groups and is surrounded by nomadic Arab groups. The genocide stems from the relationship between these three tribes and nearby Arabs.

Gathering accurate data during times of violent conflict and war can be difficult and it should come as no surprise that there are discrepancies when looking at death estimates. Official reported deaths ranged from 60,000 to 400,000. This wide range was attributed to a combination of political agendas and data collection methods. Bob Zaremba (2011) claims that as many as 90% of the African villages in Darfur have been destroyed forcing as many as 2.7 million people from their homes. Over 200,000 citizens of Darfur are currently residing in neighboring Chad while

²⁶ The 1995 survey represents the last comprehensive survey before the outbreak of genocide. (<http://unic.un.org/imucms/khartoum/36/499/sudanese-tribes.aspx>)

there are around 1.65 million people living in Internally Displaced People (IDP) camps within Darfur.

It is important to note that the civil conflict in Sudan is rooted in the formation of the state. A brief introduction to the history of Sudan to better explain the underlying conditions of a Sudanese power struggle that was waged for forty-five years prior to the outbreak of genocide in 2003.

Brief History of Sudan

Sudan gained its independence from Great Britain in 1956, which subsequently launched years of political violence and conflict. The British favored the northern Arabic population and transferred political power to them over the southern and western Africans (Zaremba, 2011, p. 44). The action left the southern Sudanese without a voice in state affairs and resulted in political unrest that spanned the existence of Sudan. Bob Zaremba (2011, pp. 44-46) further explains the country has since experienced two major civil wars. The first civil war (1955-1972) was a direct consequence over the failure of the northern Arab based government in Khartoum to follow through on promises to extend some political power to the southern African population.

The second civil war (1983-2004) started over the intent of the Arab government to implement Islamic Shari'a law for both Muslims and non-Muslims. The non-Muslim Africans in the south rebelled against the government's disregard of their political voice. The southern Africans engaged in violence to force equality into state governance. The violence inflicted by the north was positioned as a necessary response to insurgency. The civil war represented another twenty years

of violence until the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2004 bringing the hostilities to a close, However violence continued as promises were again abandoned (Katete, 2005).

Why is the Second Sudanese Civil war relevant to Darfur? The connection can be difficult to make because Darfur is located in the west and is primarily Muslim. Succession was not an issue in Darfur, yet the genocide occurred during the latter stages of the civil war. The next section will examine how Darfur fits into a larger framework of civil war.

Darfur and the Second Civil War

Darfur literally means “Land of the Fur.” The population is a mix of nomadic, sedentary, Arab, African, and Afro-Arab groups, nearly all of whom are Muslim (O’Fahey, 2008). The region has a long history of land ownership based on a tribal system. The Fur were settled farmers that grew crops and shared their land with nomadic herders who used the land to graze their cattle. The partnership was built on respect between groups and for the sustainability of the land. It was a harmonious relationship until the second civil war.

Tensions between the groups began to materialize during the 1980s as drought began the process of desertification. Rapid population growth environmental degradation accelerated the process forcing nomadic herders to alter migration patterns. The relation began to change as the nomadic Arab tribes began to destroy the land by overgrazing, leaving the land no longer arable. The Arabs then had to find new land as arable is at a premium in the region. Darfur quickly became primary location of arable land because of their dedication to the soil as farmers.

Arabs moved in their herds to graze on the land of Darfur despite protest by the tribes that were residing on the land.

The elders of Darfur appealed to the Khartoum government for assistance, but their requests were denied or conflicts were routinely decided in the favor of Arabs. African communities in Darfur decided to protect themselves by creating two resistance groups. The first group Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) and the Sudanese Liberation Army (Slim, 2004, p. 813). Unlike the agenda of southern regions that were seeking succession to establish a separate South Sudan, the JEM and SLA were trying to resist the aggressions of the Sudanese government while Darfur elders negotiated for more inclusive political and social participation.

The second civil war had three important events that escalated conflict to genocide in Darfur. First, the actions of the government in Darfur were similar to responses described as counterinsurgency in the south; thus members of the international community saw the events in Darfur and dismissed them as designed to repress rebellion. The second event of influence was rise into power of Omar al-Bashir. The final influential event was the civil war itself. Attention was focused on getting the warring parties to agree to a peace agreement and emphasis was placed on resolving the conflict before moving onto Darfur (Slim 2004).

The Khartoum government has demonstrated on several occasions a propensity to apply a divide and conquer strategy when dealing with civil conflict (Shaw, 2011). Sudan political and military leaders are knowledgeable about the various tribal conflicts and disputes throughout the country and exploit those tensions by providing weapons to the rivals of the group that the state wants to

suppress. Arming rival groups creates violence that works towards state goals without direct state involvement resulting in a conflict that assumes its own identity, free of state control. The strategy was the preferred method of the National Islamic Front (NIF) political party that seized power in Sudan through a coup d'état in 1989 (Hagan & Rymond-Richmond, 2009). The NIF was led by Hassan al-Turabi and his top general Omar al-Bashir. In 1993, Omar al-Bashir appointed himself president of Sudan, but retained Hassan al-Turabi in varying roles until 1999 when al-Bashir dissolved parliament (Flint & De Waal, 2005). The al-Bashir regime would be a major influence in the Darfur conflict, largely because of its commitment to Arab alliances and agendas.

The primary conflict between the northern and southern Sudan became the focal point of the international community for two reasons. First, many months and resources had been used towards negotiating the peace process and there were concerns that bringing Darfur into the talks would introduce added pressure on the Khartoum government causing them to end peace talks. The second reason was that the violence was African Muslim on Arab Muslim violence, which is different than the north/south civil war based on Muslim and non-Muslim ideals. The conflict appeared to be over land or other some other minor dispute between the local populations. The international community decided its interests were best served by addressing the north/south peace agreement because the results have a larger impact than any intervention in Darfur.

Genocide in Darfur

Starting around February 2002, the Fur, Masalit, and Zaghawa African tribes began forming alliances for the protection of African communities from Arab raiders. One of the earliest militia groups of note was the Darfur Liberation Front (DLF). The DLF received aid, weapons, and training from rebels in the south and the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA)²⁷ and as a result, were able to go on the offensive. DLF forces attacked a government post near Nyala (Daly, 2007) to send a message to Khartoum that they were neither going to be neglected nor continue to accept policies that favored Arab.

The DLF became the Sudan Liberation Army (SLA), and together with the JEM, they were able to provoke the Khartoum government (Daly, 2007, p.276). The two rebel groups continued with their attacks on government targets. In April 2003, the rebels began a series of attacks that started with the occupation of an airport and destroyed airplanes (Flint, 2007). The attacks continued through May 2003, with the skirmishes targeting strategic targets like Sudanese soldiers and support troops.

The NIF government "became instantly determined to avenge the insults" (Flint, 2007, p. 152). The state responded by arresting rebel supporters in Khartoum, declaring a state of emergency in Darfur, and throwing its full weight behind the Arab raider solution, or what Flint & de Waal have termed "counterinsurgency on the cheap" (Flint & de Waal, 2005). However, when African

²⁷ Originally created as the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM), but became the official army of the Republic of South Sudan. It is referred to as (SPLM, SPLA, or SPLM/A).

tribes attacked the government in response to their perceived preference for the Arabs, the government in Khartoum was able to pursue genocide in Darfur under the guise of counter-insurgency.

GENOCIDE BEHAVIOR

The Sudanese government again decided to arm a rival group to help suppress civil unrest.

The Sudanese government armed their militias, known as the Janjaweed, to put down the rebellion. The government and the Janjaweed adopted a “scorched earth” tactic to calm the rebellion, targeting areas viewed as potential bases for the JEM and SLA and burning villages to the ground and displacing or killing their residents (Bannon et al., 2005, p. 3).

The Sudanese military was spread thin as it was primarily engaged in the south with SPLM soldiers and other skirmishes throughout the country. The Janjaweed presented Khartoum with a dual-purpose solution. According to Flint and de Waal (2005), the government was able conserve resources while simultaneously positioning the violence as “age old” conflict rather than civil war (p.57).

The violence continued to escalate bilaterally throughout 2003, but as the conflict progressed, the toll began to move in a more unilateral direction. The Janjaweed appeared to be specifically targeting the Fur, Masalit, and Zaghawa tribes. The violence began to become standardized as Janjaweed entered villages: burn buildings, rape, steal cattle, mass executions, and dropping bodies into water wells to poison the water and warned those who tried to return of their fate (Hagan & Rymond-Richmond, 2009).

The genocidal acts were not isolated to moments of individual renegade action; there was collectivization of violence as other Janjaweed members, and at times the Sudanese military, participated in the violence. In 2007, the International Criminal Court (ICC) led by Chief Prosecutor Louis Moreno-Ocampo investigated the possibility of genocide in Darfur. Some of his findings about collectivization follow:²⁸

When the Janjaweed and Sudanese military worked together, the likelihood of hearing racial epithets was higher than when they were alone. The most common epithets used were derogatory names. However, when Janjaweed members acted alone racial epithets were less likely to be used. Moreno-Ocampo makes an important discovery. The epithets used were negative in nature, but they were not universal beliefs of Arabs. When Arab militias would attack alone, they would not use the racial epithets. To Moreno-Ocampo this represented a possible desire for the land more than the elimination of Black Africans. However, he feels confident that the military's motivation was the elimination Black Africans based on their methods and statements.

John Hagan and Wenona Rymond-Richmond wrote extensively about the victim interview in the Atrocities Documentation Survey (ADS) that was conducted by the U.S. State Department in refugee camps throughout eastern Chad. The purpose of the ADS was to help determine if genocide was occurring in Darfur. Hagan & Rymond-Richmond (2009) reported that the Sudanese government initiated bombing campaigns against villages, launched ground based attacks in conjunction with Janjaweed militias, and encouraged campaigns of sexual violence and rape in an attempt to displace Black Africans from their lands. These events

²⁸ Office of the Prosecutor, International Criminal Court, The Situation in Darfur, Fact Sheet, February 27, 2007. <http://www.haguejusticeportal.net/index.php?id=6177>

were conducted with the goal of redistributing land from the Black African to Arab groups for the purpose of resettlement.

The events were racially motivated and served to perform ethnic cleansing of the area. Racial elements are apparent during all attacks and events, which included the use of racial epithets during acts of violence. Common reported phrases during attacks included “This is the last day for blacks. You are black and deserve to be tortured like this. We will destroy all the black-skinned people” (Hagan & Raymond-Richmond, 2009, p. 172). During rape, Black Africans were told by assaulters that “They want to eliminate all blacks from lands and that will make all new babies born red (Arab)” (Hagan & Raymond-Richmond, 2009, p. 22).

The commander of the western military zone was given orders from Musa Hilal²⁹ who cited orders from Omar al-Bashir:

You are informed that directives have been issued...to change the demography of Darfur and empty it of African tribes” through burning, looting and killing of intellectuals and youths who may join the rebels in fighting (Hagan & Raymond-Richmond, 2008, p. 133).

Katherine Taber (2008) provides an example of how the directive from al-Bashir was implemented:

A typical attack starts before daybreak when air assaults drop crude bombs on villages, killing the people while they are still in bed. Amid the ensuing chaos, government troops in military vehicles and Janjaweed forces on horseback commence ground attacks on the villages. They utterly destroy the villages by burning the homes and the crops and looting any livestock and other goods. They kill the men and throw the dead bodies into the drinking water.

²⁹ A top militia leader and adviser to Omar al-Bashir.

They rape the women and abduct or kill the children. As they ravage the village, they yell racial slurs at the villagers who are trying desperately to stay alive. Anyone lucky enough to escape the attack is driven into the desert to search for refuge. (Taber, 2008, p. 184)

Delayed International Intervention

Darfur represents another example where the international community failed to protect citizens from state sponsored violence. The underfunded African Union (AU) took the early lead in intervention, but they lacked the resources and ability to mount a lasting intervention (Zaremba, 2011). The European Union (EU) and North Atlantic Trade Organization (NATO) pledged financial backing, but offered little logistical support. According to Nick Grono (2006), "What makes these failings all the more tragic is that policy-makers and leaders around the world know exactly what is taking place in the region. They cannot plead ignorance" (p. 625).

The United Nations was slow to react during the early stages of conflict by recognizing it as civil war; preferring to let the warring factions work it out. They were even slower to recognize, or even use the term genocide. Hugo Slim (2004) acknowledges this hesitancy during the destruction in Darfur:

Many of them—the UN in particular—were acutely alert to the possibility that the violations reported in Darfur could add up to genocide, although they never used the term, resorting instead to alternatives like ethnic cleansing, war crimes and crimes against humanity. (p. 821)

The United Nations withheld comment until a year after the atrocities in Darfur began. The UN Security Council issued an official statement on May 25, 2004, where they recognized the deaths of thousands and acknowledged that hundreds of

thousands of people were at risk of dying in the coming months. The Statement by the President of the Security Council (S/PRST/2004/18, May 25, 2004) reads:

The Council also expresses its deep concern at the continuing reports of large-scale violations of human rights and of international humanitarian law in Darfur, including indiscriminate attacks on civilians, sexual violence, forced displacement and acts of violence, especially those with an ethnic dimension, and demands that those responsible be held accountable. The Council strongly condemns these acts which jeopardize a peaceful solution to the crisis, stresses that all parties to the N'Djamena humanitarian ceasefire agreement committed themselves to refraining from any act of violence or any other abuse against civilian populations, in particular women and children, and that the Government of Sudan also committed itself to neutralizing the armed Janjaweed militias, and urges all parties to take necessary steps to put an end to violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. (UN Security Council, 2004)

Despite the possibility that violations of the UDHR are taking place, which are sufficient reasons for intervening in conflict, states become reluctant to act while they debated the intent of possible genocide and appropriate responses. Eric Reeves (2004) adds to the discussion of delayed intervention in Darfur: "Although hundreds of thousands of lives are already doomed, the decision to intervene can still hundreds of thousands more. Every day the decision is deferred brings us closer to catastrophic mortality rates" (p. 23).

The UN Commission of Inquiry conducted by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, performed an investigation of Darfur in 2005. The commission found that the government of Sudan did not pursue a policy of genocide. Furthermore, it found that forced displacement was more common than the killing of entire villages and suggested that the violence resembled a brutal

counter-insurgency with potentially “individual” acts of genocide, rather than systematic government elimination (International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur, 2005). The UN maintained a policy of non-intervention, mostly negotiating a series of peaceful mandates and resolutions.

The United States had mixed views on Darfur. The US has switched positions several times during the conflict, at times denying claims of genocide while acknowledging genocide at others. Colin Powell was sent by the United States State Department to determine if genocide was occurring. Powell addressed Congress and in his findings clearly demonstrated that genocide was happening. His report resulted in the U.S. declaring that genocide was taking place in Darfur and began to take necessary actions; however, the decision was reversed shortly after by the State Department. The State Department diverted U.S. intervention by changing its stance on Darfur allowing the genocide to continue. Several days after the U.S. changed its stance on Darfur, several lucrative trade agreements were created between the U.S. and the regime in control of Darfur. These policies would have been prohibited if genocide were being committed in Darfur, but suggests that genocide may have been ignored for the purpose of economic gain (Hagan & Rymond-Richmond, 2009).

There has also been speculation that the “War on Terror³⁰” campaign of the US influenced the change in their stance. The US established a relationship with Sudanese General Salah Gosh that was based on the sharing of military intelligence

³⁰ The War on Terror is campaign initiated by the US in response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

as part of the US counter-terrorism plan. Acknowledging the genocide in Darfur would result in General Gosh being implicated as a war criminal; therefore removing his knowledge and networks access (Collins, 2007, Hagan, 2008, Zaremba, 2011). In this regard, the denial of genocide was in the best interest of US National security. Subsequently, the US State Department released a revised lower-estimated death toll, in effect to protect General Gosh rather than making him out to be a war criminal (Hagan, 2008, p. 116).

Russia and China were also criticized for their lack of concern over the genocide in Darfur. Both nations emphasized the importance of non-intervention in Darfur out respect for Sudan sovereignty. However, their support was less about their concern for Sudanese sovereignty and more about their own political and economic interests. Russia and China were motivated to have the conditions of alienated minorities remain internal matters of the state rather than becoming interests of the international community due their respective issues in Chechnya or Tibet and Xinjiang.

They were able to position themselves as defending Sudan's sovereignty, while privately working towards the protection of their own trade interests and domestic human rights issues. Post-communist Russia has placed more attention on internal restructuring and has become less concerned over foreign affairs. The state sponsored violence in Chechnya had been a topic of discussion among the international community that Russia wanted to avoid. Roberta Cohen (2006) suggests that supporting intervention would be problematic for Russia:

One reason the international community finds the Darfur problem difficult to address is that state reliance on excessive force against ethnic or racial groups seeking greater autonomy is not unique to Sudan. Other governments bent on maintaining the dominance of a particular ethnic group have also waged brutal wars against their own populations. The Russian Federation, for example, has conducted a scorched earth campaign against the Chechens. A veto-wielding permanent member of the Security Council, Russia has opposed diplomatic pressure or sanctions against the Sudanese government for fear of setting a precedent. (p. 7)

China similarly has been involved in state led domestic violence in Tibet and the Xinjiang province and wanted to avoid setting a precedent for future humanitarian intervention. Arguing for non-intervention through a framework of sovereignty, Russia and China appeared to be pursuing the interests of the Khartoum government, but were ultimately pursuing their own national interests and security.

Beyond arguing for non-intervention for the interest of national security, there are direct neoliberal economic links from Russia and China to Sudan. The new millennium has seen Russia reemerge as world power as they have begun to recover from the end of the Cold War and has also witnessed the rise of China as a world power. The economic growth and development was achieved through the cheap resources of Global South states like Sudan. These two nations again argued for non-intervention so that the established trade relationship with the Khartoum government would remain intact.

China is the largest international importer of Sudanese oil and both Russia and China are primary weapons suppliers to Sudan. "It is argued that China could influence the resolution of the Darfur conflict because of its large trade with and

investment in Sudan” (Zaremba, 2011, p. 53). Again, both countries benefitted economically from maintaining the government in Khartoum. According to Roberto Belloni (2006), China and Russia resisted UN intervention to protect their access to Sudanese oil reserves.

In 2006, China became the second largest oil consumer behind the United States and the third largest importer behind the US and Japan. China was able to produce a little over half of its daily consumption of 7.4 million barrels of oil, which meant that the other half needed to be imported (US EIA). China has imported most of its oil from African countries. Peter Goodman (2004) wrote an article for the Washington Post detailing China-Sudan oil trade relations, including interviews with Sudanese officials. In an interview with Sudan Energy and Mining Minister Awad Ahmed Jaz states:

The Chinese are very nice, they don't have anything to do with any politics or problems. Things move smoothly, successfully. They are very hard workers looking for business, not politics. (Goodman, 2004)

Goodman further suggests that:

Part of a broader push by China to expand trade and influence across the African continent, its relationship with Sudan also demonstrates the intensity of China's quest for energy security and its willingness to do business wherever it must to lock up oil. (Goodman, 2004)

China's willingness to overlook Sudan's record of domestic state sanctioned violence provided them with a competitive advantage over other states that were not willing to conduct business with Sudan. Continued violence benefitted China as it limited the opportunity of competitors to gain access to Sudan's oil reserves.

While China has established extensive oil agreements with Sudan, both Russia and China have also benefitted from the sales of weapons to Sudan. An Amnesty International report from 2007 states:

The Government of Sudan violates the UN arms embargo and disguises some of its military logistics operations in Darfur, and what arms supplied to Sudan from China and Russia - two Permanent Members of the Security Council - have been used for violations of the Security Council's own mandatory arms embargo. (Amnesty International, 2007, p.2)

Statistics from the Amnesty International Report (2007) show that Sudan imported \$24 million worth of arms and ammunition, \$57 million worth of aircraft parts and equipment, \$2 million worth of helicopter parts and equipment from China in 2005 (p. 7). The same report lists 2005 exports from the Russian Federation to Sudan as \$21 million worth of aircraft and equipment and \$13.7 million worth of helicopters and parts (p. 8). The 2005 Russian exports followed the sale of \$200 million worth of fighter jets in 2004.

Russia and China invested heavily in Sudan and were adamantly opposed to international intervention in Sudan. Both countries threatened to veto UN Security Council votes on intervention on several occasions. The actions of Russia and China were directed to protect their own investments, trade relations, and access to oil. Those in positions of power within Russia and China dismissed the suffering of populations within Sudan, at times with the understanding that actions would increase the suffering, to promote economic growth, development, and national security/interests.

Summary

The conflict in the Darfur region of Sudan has been perceived differently among the International community. This lack of a unified assessment of the conditions in Darfur resulted in a slow response from the International community to recognize atrocities as they were happening and hampered attempts of intervention to prevent further genocide.

There are wide ranges of statistics that are available from different agencies regarding the deaths in Darfur. Two major issues that complicated collecting data were (1) the constantly changing political stances of the International community, particularly the United States State Department, on the validity of genocide in Darfur and how many deaths occurred; and (2) finding a way to accurately collect data detailing the atrocities. Gathering accurate data during times of violent conflict and war can be difficult because of challenges that are created during violent conflict resulting in discrepancies of death estimates. What is problematic though is the size of the discrepancies. Official reported deaths ranged from 60,000 to 400,000. This wide range was attributed to a combination of political agendas and data collection methods. Two different surveys were used to collect victim data from refugee camps in Chad. The lower estimates of deaths and missing people came from the World Health Organization (WHO) survey whereas the higher estimates came from the Atrocities Documentation Survey (ADS) created by the U.S. State Department.

The racial elements of the attacks are the primary examples for the charges of genocide, but are questioned by some. Dehumanizing a group of people because

of race, class, ethnicity, gender, and religion is a common theme during mass killing. The dehumanizing behavior is thus a necessary condition for genocide. However, a necessary condition is not a sufficient condition. Desertification of arable land led nomadic Arab herders to remove settled Black Africans.

The genocide in Darfur was allowed to continue because of a commitment by the international community to avoid intervention in hopes that the situation would work itself out. Desensitization to the suffering of victims played an important role in delaying response. As Helen Fein (2007) stated:

Western states related to Sudan based on their own security needs, especially security from terrorism sponsored by Sudan and its allies against the United States and Egypt, its regionally ally. The question of aid and starvation became secondary. (p. 31)

Russia and China both benefitted economically from non-intervention in the Darfur genocide and contributed directly to the conflict by providing arms to the Sudanese government. The United Nations acknowledged the atrocities, but failed to launch a serious intervention effort for several years after the first claims of genocide. As a result, there is a strong belief that the genocide was allowed to continue un-named because it was in the best interests economically and in terms of national security of states that could have strongly influenced intervention.

The general public generally is not accepting of groups in power taking advantage of inferior groups; however, the acceptance is a necessary condition for committing genocide. The following chapter will examine the role of collective action and violence and will provide an explanation for the public acceptance of violence towards an inferior group by a superior group.

Chapter 6

SOCIAL EXTERNALIZATION THEORY

“The general fact is that the most effective way of utilizing human energy is through an organized rivalry, which by specialization and social control is, at the same time, organized co-operation.”

-Charles Horton Cooley

Political violence has been recognized as a method for redistributing power among a population; the reasons for political violence vary, but in the case of neoliberalism it is frequently aimed at transferring or strengthening power among corporations, political and economic elites, and landowners. According to Johanna Oksala (2011) outside of neoliberalism’s assumed unpopularity, there is no direct connection between neoliberalism and violence. Some of the difficulty making direct connections stems from an inability to explain how an economic philosophy and related policies can create a climate that fosters violence.

The social control aspect of neoliberalism is where I locate the process of desensitization that allows violence towards dehumanized and othered bodies to become both justified and accepted. Drawing from pure sociology, which according to Black (95, 98, 2000a, 2000b) uses social geometry and the relationship of groups to predict and explain social life, I have developed what I term Social Externalization Theory to explain social life as influenced by neoliberalism.

The goal of Social Externalization Theory, or SET, is to establish a paradigm that explains how neoliberalism can be used as social control that creates subjects vulnerable to political and collective violence that is justified as the externalized cost of progress and national security. Such a theory offers two explanations. First,

how can those in power intentionally³¹ target internal populations for violence when it is commonly accepted that democratic countries do not intentionally cause harm to their own people? Second, the theory needs to address why deviance, in what many has argued as an unpopular politico-economic model, is handled collectively rather than individually.

Overall, the theory will be guided by Donald Black's (1976, 1990, 1998, 2000a, 2000b) pure sociology paradigm and the works of Giorgio Agamben (1998, 2005) to explain how collective violence varies based on the social geometry of those involved. Black's paradigm addresses the impact of relational distance, cultural distance, and inequality between groups during collective violence. The paradigm explains how groups can become socially distant from each other, reducing solidarity. As the degree of social polarization increases those labeled deviant face a greater risk of becoming recognized as outsiders and being located within what Agamben (1998, 2005) terms the state of exception, where people are most vulnerable to political violence. Nazism and National Security Doctrine have been influential in providing techniques for sovereign states to target citizens. A more in-depth analysis will address the importance of Nazism and National Security Doctrine for creating spaces of exception for the targeting of people.

³¹ The intentionality of actions should be clarified here. First, actions are not necessarily devious in nature. Some consequences are the result of utilitarian decisions that harm a few while benefitting many. It should also be recognized that not all harmful consequences are intentional as some action produce unintended negative results. The idea of intent here focuses on the conscious decisions of those in power to identify and target social groups for removal, extermination, control, or exploitation.

State of Exception

Giorgio Agamben conceptualizes much of his work about sovereign power around the state's ability to control life through the inclusion or exclusion of societal protection. *Homo Sacer* (Agamben, 1998) details human life as composed of two distinct parts. First is the *zoe*, which is a Greek term that represents the human in its purest biological form of existence. The second part is another Greek term *bios*. *Bios*, is the realization of a human as a political actor. A human cannot live without *zoe* because it represents life itself; however, one can have *zoe*, that is be alive, without having *bios*. In this sense a person is physically alive, but is both politically and socially dead. The ability of the sovereign to combine or separate these two parts is where the authority's power originates. Combining *zoe* with *bios* endows humans with dignity and value through ideas like human rights and juridical protection. The sovereign can revoke *bios* through banishment. When humans only have *zoe*, they are reduced to what Agamben (1998) calls *Bare Life*. Bare life has no value to the sovereign power and as such, exists outside of the sovereign's protection.

It is important to note that the ability of human life to have value remains contingent upon the ability of the sovereign to grant value. Furthermore, human value is only worth having if it has been commodified by withholding it from others. Agamben expands this concept in *State of Exception* (2005), by suggesting that sovereign powers must routinely bestow value upon some citizens while devaluing others citizens to maintain its authority. This is accomplished when the sovereign exerts its power, sometimes in violation of the very laws it claims to uphold and with force if necessary, so that citizens recognize and fear the sovereign's power.

How can a sovereign power operate outside of the rules that the sovereign itself created out of necessity to protect its citizens? Where or how does the sovereign gain the ability to act outside the laws that are required to maintain and protect its sovereignty? Agamben answers these questions by explaining that the sovereign generates this ability within itself. What he calls the state of exception is a realm within the sovereign where law defers to the almighty sovereign. Quoting Carl Schmitt, Agamben refers to the state of exception as when “The state continues to exist, while law recedes” (Agamben, 2005, p. 31). Law becomes suspended in the state of exception. However, it is not simply the suspension of law that distinguishes the state of exception; law can be suspended because the exception is found outside of normalized society. The state of exception is a state of chaos or anomie.³²

The sovereign authority demonstrates power by banishing people from normal society and positioning them within the state of exception where they lose their worth as a human being as they become suspended outside of state protection and concern.

When life is suspended by the sovereign in this way it becomes *homo sacer*, that is, the bare life that is outside of protection and which can be taken without being sacrificed, meaning that this taking of life has no significance since it has already been banned from the realm of sovereignly ordained meaning. (Gerhardt, 2011, p. 8)

The conception of sacrifice suggests that death prematurely ended a life with value. Bare life cannot be sacrificed because it has no value; death is merely the end of the biological life, or *zoe*. Bare life can be killed without punishment because the

³² A state or condition characterized by a breakdown or absence of social norms and values, as in the case of uprooted people.

life had no value, so no worth was lost. Thus the true power of the sovereign is in the ability to position humans as either subjects or citizens with the full force available to the sovereign to enforce its decision without question.

Agamben introduces the idea of the camp as the ultimate representation of the sovereign's ability and desire to banish life to reify its authority. The use of internment and detention camps to suspend law epitomizes the paradigmatic setting for the sovereign to ban life, not to kill, but separate the *zoe* and *bios*. Those located in the camp are identified as the "other" and represent a type of threat to normal society that requires protection by the sovereign. In this way, the sovereign demonstrates its dominance over life; it creates the threat that citizens need to be protected from. Agamben (1998) refers to this as the "Paradox of sovereignty because the sovereign is, at the same time, outside and inside the juridical order" (p.15).

The purpose of the camp is not always death, it can be used to separate the *bios* from the *zoe* in an effort to create bodies that are full of life, but devoid of societal rights. These bodies can serve a multitude of purposes including labor, disciplinary examples for disobedience, and justification for governmental policing. However, the state of exception "allows for the physical elimination not only of political adversaries but entire categories of citizens who for some reason cannot be integrated into the political system" (Agamben, 2005, p. 2). Agamben has written about the camp, particularly the Nazi concentration camps during World War II, on several occasions because of the exemplification of the state of exception. The establishment of concentration camps as a space of exception creates a place for

separating bios from zoe, but merely creating camps will not populate them with prisoners. Equally important to the use of Nazi camps was the ability to establish a paradigm that condemned citizens deserving of placement in such camps, and the acceptance of the paradigm by other citizens. The following section will address the importance of this process.

Nazism

The Holocaust continues to be studied by scholars across a range of disciplines, but all too frequently an important historical process goes mostly unnoticed. Perhaps the most damaging impact of Nazism was the ability to identify and target internal threats for destruction. Nazism introduced the concept of *Lebensraum*³³ as an important ideology for the advancement of the German people. The Nazi regime introduced a new racial discourse that combined the two concepts of race and the nation into one; the result was that state borders became racial borders. Guillermo Levy (2006) states that Nazi Germany adopted the racial paradigm commonly found in the foreign policy of many European nations operating in Africa. The paradigm suggests that some people are sub-human and “otherness” can be used to justify the dehumanization of African natives. Through internalization of the paradigm, Germany was able to identify groups of people that did not meet the criteria of the “true” German citizen and then target them for removal.

³³ Living Space. (German) “Additional territory considered by a nation, especially Nazi Germany, to be necessary for national survival or for the expansion of trade.” (dictionary.com) The Nazis thought that space should be allocated to a singular race. A primary objective of German foreign policy during World War II was to increase Aryan living space conquering the East.

The change in ideology was pivotal because it fundamentally changed the discernment about which groups of people could be targeted for genocide, and to a larger extent, recognized by the sovereign power as a threat to the state.

Nazism brought about a crucial, unprecedented reversal. Whereas in colonial genocides the enemy was designated as “external”—language which colonial powers in Africa took from eugenics, which proposed sterilization of “outsider” women to eradicate “lives which do not deserve to be lived”—Nazis adapted the phrasing to justify the extermination of “races which do not deserve to live.” The racialized other, who was “external” before, now became an “internal” enemy, since he lived among “us,” was seen to dominate “us,” and even contaminated “us” with his existence. Therefore, in this case, the extermination was “internal,” but was perpetrated against an Other who could not help being seen as “external.” (Levy, 2006, P. 139)

The amalgamation of race and politics allowed the Nazis to identify Jews living within German borders as an internal threat to the German way of life. This reorganization in the identification process explains how the state was able to separate groups within the state as deviant, but not why citizens were willing to allow the state to destroy members of the population that were previously considered equals. A key element in the process was the demonization of those considered as others.

Nazism did not suspend the social contract that creates obligations of the state to the people that it governs; however, it reinforced the belief that contracts were only valid between equals. The merging of racial and political identities into a singular category delimited insiders and outsiders. Jews in Germany were identified for not only their race, but were also considered as the driving force behind communism (Browning & Matthäus, 2004). Several prominent members of

the Russian Bolshevik party were of Jewish ancestry, which the Nazis used to launch a propaganda campaign suggesting that communism was a Jewish conspiracy.

The Nazi party might have experienced more resistance internally if Jewish citizens were targeted solely because of race. There are numerous historical examples of populations being destroyed purely based on their race, but it is becoming more difficult to build mass support for the destruction of people based only on race.

Moving beyond race by including politics allowed Nazis to target not an undesirable race, but rather, a population category that posed a risk to the sovereign power. The Jewish race was no longer the target of the state; it was the ethnic-political category of Judeo-Bolshevik that became identified as the undesirable group. The group was deemed undesirable and targeted for destruction for both racial and political reasons (Levy, 2006).

This categorical group became the internal enemy, or outside other located inside the borders. At this point, the Jewish population of Germany was no longer recognized as an equal to the Aryans of Germany because they had nothing to contribute to society. The social contract no longer applied to German Jews and thus they became located in a state of exception. Agamben analyzed the Holocaust in depth because of the relation between homo sacer, the Jews, and the state of exception. The treatment of Jews by Germany is the perfect example of the state of exception because the state enforced its power on a subject that they did not deem worthy of state attention.

National Security Doctrine

Nazism set the precedent for targeting internal citizens, but that does not mean that citizens can be targeted at all times with the full force of the state's power. State violence, and extreme violence like genocide, is more likely to occur with totalitarian regimes. The more totalitarian a regime the more likely violence is to occur (Rummel, 1995). Conversely, state violence will decline as a government becomes more democratic.

Democratic countries do not attack their citizens mainly because internal mechanisms exist to address grievances between citizens and the state. However, it would be a difficult argument to suggest that democratic states never attack their own citizens. A more practical argument is that democratic states do not attack their citizens in similar ways as totalitarian regimes; instead, they attack them for reasons that threaten state security or democracy. Analysis of the U.S. Doctrine of National Security in Latin America provides examples of the emergence of policies for identifying either internal targets or targets within democratic countries. This chapter will further discuss how democratic states, through neoliberalism, can maintain the idea of democratic peace theory by creating non-inclusive groups that can be labeled as the "other."

The Doctrine of National Security in Latin America³⁴ was an ideology used in Latin America during the 1960s through the early 1980s. The focus was on

³⁴ The U.S. Doctrine of National Security is more complex than what is briefly covered in this thesis. "To find and weave the threads of the national security agreement is not easy for no single document exists and military regimes are reluctant to divulge the origin of their biases" (Prasch, 1989, p. 412).

economic development and state security – security from both external and internal threats. There was a belief that the United States and the Soviet Union would not engage in war directly, but instead would use countries in the Latin American periphery to fight each other; there was additional concern that the Soviet Union would use revolution as a means of gaining a foothold in Latin America (Dash, 1989). These potential initiatives were the focal points of external security while internal security fixated on potential disruptions of subversive activities and the people who orchestrated them, and class warfare (Levy, 2006). The possibility of disruption originating from within the state elevated internal security to be considered equally as important as external security when it came to protect national security. National security becomes the basis for most, if not all, state decisions and takes precedence over individual rights (Pion-Berlin, 1989).

Fundamental to this process was the adaption of Nazi techniques for targeting citizens. Latin American states were able to create a point of demarcation based upon ideology. Those who resisted or challenged the ideology set forth by the state were classified as threats to national security and were targeted for their ideological choices. “The so-called fight against communism involved the total repression of practices that subverted the capitalist order, and also the repression of groups which performed the practices” (Levy, 2006, p. 141).

The relevance of National Security Doctrine to this thesis is in the prominent subject areas and the influence on U.S. foreign policy and Third World³⁵ development theories based upon Western ideologies. David Pion-Berlin (1989) identifies these subject areas as state, national security, and strategy. The primary role of the state is to protect national security and all policies are measured for the effectiveness in achieving that goal. State managers are elevated to an elite status as they become endowed with powers to determine what is in the best interest of the state and the public. "Officials of this apparatus retained unto themselves the prerogative, in effect, to suspend or circumvent law in dealing with urgent threats to national security" (Dash, 1989, p. 69).

The strategy of National Security Doctrine assumes that the Third World is subjected to total warfare, that is, there is little distinction between civilians and combatants. Belligerent activity renders traditional battlefields obsolete as the separation between war and peace and between military and civilian becomes blurred. The strategy was to identify subversive groups and to eliminate them. The targeted groups posed threats to the state, not simply because of their activities, but because of what those groups could achieve if they were able to legitimize their agency. Thus the strategy "...is an interlocking system of political, economic, psychological, and military action, which at certain moments takes the form of armed aggression and at other moments, of unarmed yet calculated manipulation of

³⁵ The term Third World here refers to the alternative use referring to development rather than the traditional capitalist or communist political alignment of a nation. Third World nations are considered under-developed and receive various forms of assistance from developed nations.

the public” (Pion-Berlin, 1989, p. 418) to repress workers, labor organizers, revolutionaries, and other perceived threats to the state.

The concepts of “inside” and “outside” are central to this discussion. In Nazism and under the National Security Doctrine, as in most neoliberal policies, those in power use borders to demarcate distinctions. In order to exterminate an “other,” that other must first be placed outside, geographically, but also politically, socially, and symbolically. The inside is safe, while the outside is always threatening. (Levy, 2006, p. 137)

Nazism and National Security Doctrine are integral for understanding how political powers can look inward for the identification of threats to the state and for explaining the state’s reasons for attacking targets. National Security Doctrine is not neoliberalism, but it shares and established many of the fundamental ideas that were intrinsic to the Washington Consensus under President Reagan and Thatcherism in Great Britain, that directly molded the current form of neoliberalism. Drawing from Donald Black’s Pure Sociology I will explain how neoliberalism can also be used as a form of social control to collectivize the violence towards citizens and other vulnerable subjects.

Pure Sociology/Social Control

Pure Sociology is a sociological paradigm developed by Donald Black to explain human behavior. Pure sociology moves beyond the individualistic aspects of human behavior to focus on social life, or how the individual actions of people create a social entity. Donald Black (2000, p. 347) explains pure sociology as:

The subject of pure sociology is not human behavior in the usual sense. It is not the behavior of a person or a group of persons. It is a new subject in the history of science: the behavior of social life. Pure sociology thus violates common sense by removing humans from human behavior and eliminating

what has always been central to the visualization of the subject, scientifically and otherwise: people. It reverses the direction of human action by reconceptualizing the action of a person or group as the action of a social entity such as law or science or art. Social action becomes truly social.

Pure sociology has been pivotal in the formulation of my theory about the relationship between neoliberalism and violence by making a connection through social control and collective action as a means to respond to deviant behavior.

Bradley Campbell (2011) explains that conflict can arise when people have grievances towards behavior they define as deviant; he further defines social control as responses for handling deviant behavior (p. 587). According to Roberta Senechal de la Rocha (1996) deviance is not merely behavior that could be commonly considered abnormal or illegal; it is any action - however seemingly trivial, inoffensive, or innocent - that is subject to social control (p. 98).

Introducing Social Externalization Theory

Social Externalization Theory (SET) was developed by applying the principles of pure sociology to explain how neoliberalism creates zones of exception through the use of social control to achieve neoliberal agendas, promote economic growth, and protect national security. The foundation of Social Externalization Theory is based on the belief that that a state (1) recognizes that a social cost exists in development, economic growth, and state security and (2) that placing that cost on “othered” bodies is acceptable. Henry Giroux (2005) states, “Neoliberalism does not merely produce economic inequality, iniquitous power relations, and a corrupt political system: it also promotes rigid exclusions from national citizenship and civic participation” (p. 14). The exclusions that Giroux mentions are my primary concern

as they represent the point where the sovereign authority can suspend law, thus reducing targets to bare life within a space of exception.

The type and severity of social control depends on the social location and direction of a conflict, which is determined by its social geometry – multidimensional social space³⁶ (Black, 1976, 1990, 2000a, 2000b). Social actions are measured vertically based on their social status. Actions between similar parties of higher social status are situated at a higher elevation than actions between similar parties of lower social status. A difference in social status results in vertical distance because the parties involved are located at different elevations. The vertical distance increases as the difference in social status increases. Social actions can have three directions: up towards a higher status, down towards a lower status, or lateral towards equals. The horizontal dimension of social space consists of relational distance (degree of intimacy), radial distance (degree of social integration), and cultural distance (language, religion, customs) (Senechal de la Rocha, 1996, 2001).

Social life comprises the variables that affect multidimensional social space. Parties that are socially close have more in common and are less likely to have conflict between them. When conflict does occur it tends to be low in severity and in duration because of the small social distance between parties. Parties that are socially distant have less in common and are more apt to conflict because there is

³⁶ Social geometry is a multidimensional (vertical and horizontal) space where groups are positioned spatially based on their social status and other factors. People are socially close when they have more things in common and are socially distant as they have less in common.

more potential for disagreement or grievance. The severity and duration of conflict usually increases as parties become more socially distant from each other.

The spatial distance between parties influences the severity and duration of conflict, but it still does not account for violent collective action. Black's theory of partisanship (Senechal de la Rocha, 2001) states "Partisanship is a joint function of the social closeness and superiority of one side and the social remoteness and inferiority of the other" (p. 128). Bradley Campbell discusses the impact of partisanship in his article *Genocide as a matter of degree* (2011, p. 594):

Greater organization is also associated with strong partisanship. Third parties act as strong partisans when they give intense support to one side of a conflict over the other, and strong partisanship is present whenever groups engage in violence (Black, 1998, pp. 131–132; Senechal de la Roche, 2001, p. 128). The geometry of a conflict predicts the pattern of partisanship: First, strong partisanship occurs when one side of a conflict is superior to the other, as third parties support the higher-status adversary. Second, it occurs when third parties are close to one side of the conflict and remote from the other, as they support the closer adversary (Black, 1998, pp. 131–132). Third, strong partisans are more likely to form groups necessary for collective violence when they are socially close to one another – or solidary (Senechal de la Roche 2001, pp. 128–129).

Collective violence then not only becomes more likely with partisanship, but the severity increases as relational distances grow between parties. According to Senechal de la Roche (2001) "The collectivization of violence is a direct function of strong partisanship. Strong partisanship occurs when (1) third parties support one side against the other and (2) are solidary among themselves" (p. 128).

As previously discussed, collective violence is form of social control used as a response to deviant behavior. Liability assigns accountability for an offence to the

person or group that must pay the debt. A single offender would be considered an individual liability, whereas collective liability places accountability on a group of people that share social characteristics (Campbell, 2011, p. 598). Examples of social characteristics include identifiers like race, religion, political affiliation, labor unions, and nationality. Since collective violence targets a group that is considered collectively liable for deviant behavior, then it is commonly employed as a moralistic response rather than a predatory response to deviant behavior.³⁷ As Senechal de la Roche (1996) suggests, "Aptly enough, it is sometimes described as 'popular justice'" (p. 98).

Solidarity is essential to forming a strong partisanship between a third party and a group involved in the conflict. Solidarity among third parties increases with intimacy (relational distance), cultural homogeneity (cultural distance), and interdependence (radial distance) (Senechal de la Roche, 2001, pp. 128-129). All adversaries can form partisanship with third parties; it is not limited to the superior party.³⁸ However, collective violence is unilateral because the violence only flows in one direction. Unilateralism is associated with inequality and is most extreme when inequality is the greatest (Black, 1998, pp. 78-79, Campbell, 2011, p. 597). Inequality occurs when one group enjoys a power advantage over another group so any

³⁷ Moralistic violence occurs in the context of prosecuting a grievance, seeking revenge, or exacting revenge. It is considered social control. Predatory violence involves the exploitation of the person or property of another. (Cooney, 2002, p. 81)

³⁸ Superior groups and inferior groups both have the ability to form alliances. A superior group can have partisanship with a third party and direct violence downward, like a state agency and a corporation removing people from land. Inferior groups can have partisanship and direct violence towards the superior group. An example would be two groups that ban together to revolt against the treatment from a superior group.

violence tends to unilateral, or flowing in one direction, because the violence flows from the superior group to maintain dominance over disadvantaged groups. The disadvantaged group can direct violence towards superior groups when they rise against oppression.

Senechal de la Roche (1996) discusses the flows of collective violence and explains that violence can flow from either the top down or from the bottom up. Violence that flows from the bottom up tends to be more rational and comprehensible because the violence can be considered reasonable, even drawing sympathy at times for subordinate groups struggle under the oppression of a superior group. In contrast, top down violence is much less understood and tolerated because the power originates from a group that already enjoys dominance or advantages over inferior groups (p. 99).

This can be exemplified through prison violence. Prison guards are considered to be in positions of power over inmates and in the relationship it is generally understood and accepted that guards use the power to supervise inmates. If the guards started to abuse their power by mistreating prisoners and inflicting physical abuse or withholding food, collective violence is originating at the top and flows down. The prison guards are the superior group and prisoners are the inferior group. Despite the deviant categorization of prisoners, the extreme actions of the guards would be considered illegitimate and would most likely be met with disgust by the general public. In contrast, if the prisoners acted out in violence to protest the poor conditions, there would be more understanding and justification of their

actions. The actions are not necessarily condoned, but the grievances can attract the sympathies of outsiders.

The flow of collective violence is a key element to Social Externalization Theory under neoliberalism. Those in power justify human suffering as the externalized cost of development and national security; however, we would expect that the victimization of a socially inferior group by a social superior group would not be tolerated by the general public or other democratic nations. The actions that exploit, marginalize, and suppress groups of people through neoliberal policies and agendas should be condemned, but they are not. Through the process of othering, social superiors are able to transform the image of the inferior group from one of vulnerability to one capable of self-determination and full of agency. In some cases, the inferior group is repositioned as an aggressor that poses a threat to superior group. The reduction of vulnerability in the inferior group serves two purposes: the superior group engages the inferior group as perceived equals and they can build partisanship.

Social distance continues to be increased or decreased based on the principles of social geometry. It is through the process of othering that the distinction between inferior and superior becomes blurred allowing for partisanship between the superior group and third parties. The degree of othering determines the severity and longevity of collective violence while placing the blame for conflict on the inferior party. Conflict can be positioned as necessary for the greater good, which justifies a small amount of suffering among a few as acceptable because of the benefit to a larger group of people. This utilitarian approach attracts

partisanship because the beneficiaries are the many and does not require extreme devaluing of the other group.

Extreme othering devalues and dehumanizes groups to the point that are reduced to bare life. Bare life is the result of an inferior group being repositioned as a threat to groups in power, and in particular, the sovereign power. Collective violence is most severe at this point because of the extreme distance between the groups. The perceived threat of the inferior group generates an “us versus them” mentality that justifies the state of exception as necessary for the protection of the superior group. Conflict becomes more severe as the inferior group is blamed for the existing conditions and suggests that they can stop the violence at their discretion by ceasing perceived illegal activity.

Undocumented immigration in the United States exemplifies this process. Illegal immigrants from Mexico represent a threat, real or perceived, to the American workforce as illegals take jobs from abled bodied Americans and destroy the welfare system. The legitimacy of this claim is irrelevant, but the superior group believes it and labels the inferior illegal immigrant group as deviant. Illegal immigrants are then located in the state of exception and are subject to collective violence aimed at punishing deviants while deterring others. Physical abuses, questionable detention practices, forced labor of illegals awaiting deportation, and a plethora of other violent activities are justified in the protection of U.S. borders and the American population. Since the illegal immigrants are viewed as the aggressors who pose the threat, they are considered to be responsible for their own suffering because they initiated the action and end the violence by ceasing illegal activity.

Undocumented immigration is more complex than suggested here; this simplified example is for the purpose of demonstrating the theory.

Summary

I argue that neoliberalism can be used as a form of social control that desensitizes those in power to the human condition and justifies suffering in inferior groups for the purposes of increasing economic growth, development, and national security. Social Externalization Theory explains how those in power can target inferior groups for social exclusion while simultaneously gaining the approval of third parties for their actions. Individually, parties are close or far apart based on their similarities and differences. Collective actions manifest when multiple parties become solidary. Social Externalization Theory is useful for predicting potential collective violence and understanding how superior groups position themselves as victims to gain the support of third parties, allowing for violence to occur.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

This thesis has examined the difficulty associated with the United Nations and the creation of The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide in 1948, and has discussed some of the complications that still exist because of its ambiguity and different interpretations. The emphasis of this thesis was on the influence of neoliberalism on genocide.

Poverty and a shortage of economic opportunities are important factors leading to genocide. There are several ways for impoverished conditions to arise, and neoliberalism is a source. Despite promises of prosperity and equality, neoliberal policies have the potential to send developing nations spiraling deeper into debt and misery. People reduced to subhuman living conditions can look to rebellion to stop suffering or to change regimes. These moments of defiance present opportunities for violence by both perpetrators and through the state response to deviance. When the state represses uprising with violence, particularly in developing countries, there exist a possibility for extreme violence including genocide.

The majority of western-based developed countries have adopted neoliberalism as a politico-economic philosophy that promotes minimum state involvement and laissez-faire beliefs when it comes to intervention. Those in power have become desensitized to the suffering of othered groups, as the routine discomfort of people has become understood as costs of economic growth, development, and national security. The result has been an increase in the

willingness of the international community to accept justifications for state violence as a matter national security or response to deviance. National security is often used as a means of justification for state violence, but the routine othering of groups and daily suffering through neoliberal policies and agendas have allowed the justifications to become easier for the international community to accept.

I am not arguing that every instance of development through neoliberalism will lead to the degradation of citizen rights, but there have been instances where it has. The oppression can be realized through actions like restricted voter's rights, reduced access to food and water, restricted housing rights, limited to no medical treatment, limitations are placed on movement within the state, and personal safety. Neoliberalism stresses a reduction in the role of the state in governing and prefers instead allowing society to adjust naturally to needs through markets. The result has been the deregulation of many of the mechanisms that were developed to protect the open market from being used as tool for exploitation.

An analysis of neoliberalism was performed to explore possible connections to the occurrence genocide and delayed intervention. The analysis showed that some neoliberal policies, agendas, and actions fit within the four primary ideologies of genocide and that the attacks on the working class constitute a genocidal mentality.

Furthermore, neoliberalism establishes and justifies certain behaviors and attitudes that desensitize people to the human condition. According to Fein (2007):

It is not necessary to have a dehumanized victim in order to demonstrate destructive obedience to authority. But it appears to make it easier for

perpetrators, because “blaming the victim” justifies the types of crimes that happen during genocide, pogroms, and lynching. (p. 15)

The dehumanization of othered bodies and the laissez-faire (do nothing) beliefs has led to an increase of the amount of suffering that is tolerated by those in power, especially when the targets are perceived deviants, and a tendency of non-response so that conflicts will resolve themselves naturally.

The Darfur genocide was used as a case study to examine how neoliberalism influenced the conflict in Sudan and the genocide in Darfur. The primary findings were the stances taken by Russia and China to maintain a policy of non-intervention in Sudan for their benefit. The United States resisted naming events as genocide because they had interests in Sudan that directly affected US national security and recognition of genocide would go against those interests. Social Externalization Theory was developed during the study as a theory for explaining the collective violence of a superior group towards an inferior group and how the superiors build solidarity with the third parties while othering the inferior group.

It has been sixty-five years since the adoption of the UN Genocide Convention, yet the atrocities continue. Neoliberalism has introduced a level of desensitization that delays the response of the international community to genocide when it occurs. It is necessary for the United Nations to address the deficiencies in the current Genocide Convention and it is equally important that true intervention capabilities and procedures are established to prevent future genocide.

REFERENCES

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life* [Homo sacer. English.]. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G. (2005). *State of exception*. Chicago, IL, USA: University of Chicago Press.
- Aguiar, L. L. M. L. L. M. (2006). Janitors and sweatshop citizenship in Canada. *Antipode*, 38(3), 440-461.
- Akman, W. (2002). Atrocities against humanity during the liberation war in Bangladesh: A case of genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 4(4), 543-559.
- Amnesty International. (2007). Sudan: Arms continuing to fuel serious human rights violations in Darfur. Retrieved from <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/AFR54/019/2007/en/c29fa387-d396-11dd-a329-2f46302a8cc6/afr540192007en.pdf>. Accessed April 13, 2013.
- Apostolidis, P. (2010). *Breaks in the chain: What immigrant workers can teach America about democracy*. Minneapolis, MN, USA: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bagchi, A. A. K. (2008). Immigrants, morality and neoliberalism. *Development and Change*, 39(2), 197-218.
- Bannon, A., Cover, A., Ghosal, N., Marcuse, D., Robinson, N., & Shivaram, S. (2005). An analysis of select companies' operations in Sudan: A resource for divestment. *The Allard K. Lowenstein International Human Rights Clinic & the Allard K. Lowenstein International Human Rights Project*, Yale Law School. 1-47.
- Belloni, R. (2006). The tragedy of Darfur and the limits of the responsibility to protect. *Ethnopolitics*, 5(4), 327-346.
- Black, D. (1983). Crime as social control. *American Sociological Review*, 48(1), 34-45.
- Black, D. (1995). The epistemology of pure sociology. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 20(4), 829-870.
- Black, D. (2000). Dreams of pure sociology. *Sociological Theory*, 18(3), 343-367.
- Black, D. (2000). The purification of sociology. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(5), 704-709.
- Black, D. J. (1976). *The behavior of law*. New York: Academic Press.
- Black, D. J. (1989). *Sociological justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Black, D. J. (1998). *The social structure of right and wrong*. San Diego, CA: Academic

- Press (revised edition; first edition, 1993).
- Bray, D. (2002). Beyond neoliberal globalization. *Latin American Perspectives*, 29(6), 117-126.
- Browning, C. R., & Matthäus, J. (2004). *The origins of the final solution: The evolution of Nazi Jewish policy, September 1939-March 1942*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Campbell, B. (2009). Genocide as social control. *Sociological Theory*, 27(2), 150-172.
- Campbell, B. (2011). Genocide as a matter of degree. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 62(4), 586-612.
- Campbell, K. (2004). The role of individual states in addressing cases of genocide. *Human Rights Review*, 5(4), 32-45.
- Carmichael, C. (2006). Violence and ethnic boundary maintenance in Bosnia in the 1990s. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(3), 283-293.
- Carroll, M. (2009). The social economics of neoliberal globalization. *The Forum for Social Economics*, 38(1), 1-18.
- Casanova, P. G. (1996). Globalism, neoliberalism, and democracy. *Social Justice*, 23(1-2), 39-48.
- Chalk, F. R., & Jonassohn, K. (1990). *The history and sociology of genocide: Analyses and case studies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Cohen, R. (2005). The international response to Darfur. *Forced Migration Review*, 23(5), 7-9.
- Collins, R. (2007). Civil wars in the Sudan. *History Compass*, 5(6), 1778-1805.
- Comaroff, J. (2007). Beyond bare life: AIDS, (bio) politics, and the neoliberal order. *Public Culture*, 19(1), 197-219.
- Conversi, D. (2006). Demo-skepticism and genocide. *Political Studies Review*, 4(3), 247-262.
- Coombe, R. R. J. (2010). Honing a critical cultural study of human rights. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 7(3), 230-246.
- Cooney, M., & Phillips, S. (2002). Typologizing violence: A Blackian perspective. *The International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 22(7), 75-108.
- Daly, M.W. (2007). *Darfur's sorrow: A history of destruction and genocide*. Cambridge England; New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Dash, R. (1989). U.S. foreign policy, national security doctrine, and Central America -- the dangerous doctrine by Saul Landau / condemned to repetition by Robert A. Pastor / national security and United States policy toward Latin America by Lars Schoultz / and others. *Latin American Perspectives*, 16(4), 67-85.
- Fein, H. (2007). *Human rights and wrongs: Slavery, terror, genocide*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Flint, J., & de Waal, A. (2005). *Darfur: A short history of a long war*. London: Zed Books.
- Gebrewold, B. (2008). Defining genocide as epistemological violence. *Peace Review*, 20(1), 92-99.
- Gerhardt, H. (2011). Giorgio Agamben's lessons and limitations in confronting the problem of genocide. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 7(1), 5-17.
- Giorgi, G. (2006). Zones of exception. *Diacritics*, 36(2), 99-108.
- Giroux, H. H. A. (2005). The terror of neoliberalism: Rethinking the significance of cultural politics. *College Literature*, 32(1), 1-19.
- Gonzalez, C. (2011). An environmental justice critique of comparative advantage: Indigenous peoples, trade policy, and the Mexican neoliberal economic reforms. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law*, 32(3), 723-803.
- Goodman, P. (2004). China invests heavily in Sudan's oil industry; Beijing supplies arms used on villagers. *The Washington Post*, A.01.
- Gourevitch, P. (1998). *We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families: Stories from Rwanda* (1st ed.). New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Grandin, G. (2005). The instruction of great catastrophe: Truth commissions, national history, and state formation in Argentina, Chile, and Guatemala. *The American Historical Review*, 110(1), 46-67.
- Gratton, P. P. (2006). A 'Retro-version' of power: Agamben via Foucault on sovereignty. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 9(3), 445-459.
- Green, L. (2011). The nobodies: Neoliberalism, violence, and migration. *Medical Anthropology*, 30(4), 366-385.
- Grono, N. N. (2006). Briefing - Darfur: The international community's failure to protect. *African Affairs (London)*, 105(421), 621-631.
- Hagan, J. J. (2008). The collective dynamics of racial dehumanization and genocidal victimization in Darfur. *American Sociological Review*, 73(6), 875-902.

- Hagan, J., & Rymond-Richmond, W. (2009). *Darfur and the crime of genocide*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *Brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, GBR: Oxford University Press, UK.
- Heron, T. (2008). Globalization, neoliberalism and the exercise of human agency. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 20(1-4), 85-101.
- Hiebert, M.S. (2008). Theorizing destruction: Reflections on the state of comparative genocide theory. *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, 3(3), 309-339.
- Hoffman, D. D. (2004). The civilian target in Sierra Leone and Liberia: Political power, military strategy, and humanitarian intervention. *African Affairs (London)*, 103(411), 211-226.
- Holzmeyer, C. (2009). Human rights in an era of neoliberal globalization: The alien tort claims act and grassroots mobilization in Doe v. Unocal. *Law & Society Review*, 43(2), 271-304.
- Howard-Hassmann, R. R. E. (2005). Genocide and state-induced famine: Global ethics and western responsibility for mass atrocities in Africa. *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*, 4(3), 487-516.
- Karl, T. L. (1997). *The paradox of plenty*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Katete, G. O. (2010). The regional outcome of the comprehensive peace agreement five years down the road: Are external forces playing a progressive role? *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies*, 5(1), 161-170.
- Katz, C. (2005). Partners in crime? Neoliberalism and the production of new political subjectivities. *Antipode*, 37(3), 623-631.
- Kieh, G. G. K. (1992). Combatants, patrons, peacemakers, and the Liberian civil conflict. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 15(2), 125-143.
- Kiernan, B. (2007). *Blood and soil: A world history of genocide and extermination from Sparta to Darfur*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Krieken, R. v. (2004). Rethinking cultural genocide: Aboriginal child removal and settler-colonial state formation. *Oceania*, 75(2), 125-151.
- Lang Jr., A. F. (2002). Global governance and genocide in Rwanda. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 16(1), 143-150.
- Lang, B. (2011). Between genocide and “genocide”. *History and Theory*, 50(2), 285-294.

- Lazzarato, M. (2009). Neoliberalism in action. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(6), 109-133.
- Lemkin, R. (1944). *Axis rule in occupied Europe; laws of occupation, analysis of government, proposals for redress*. Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of International Law.
- Levy, G. G. (2006). Considerations on the connections between race, politics, economics, and genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(2), 137-148.
- Lieberman, B. (2006). Nationalist narratives, violence between neighbours and ethnic cleansing in Bosnia-Herzegovina: A case of cognitive dissonance? *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(3), 295-309.
- Lin, J. (2009). Should industrial policy in developing countries conform to comparative advantage or defy it? A debate between Justin Lin and Ha-Joon Chang. *Development Policy Review*, 27(5), 483-502.
- Marion Young, I. (1989). Polity and group difference: A critique of the ideal of universal citizenship. *Ethics*, 99(2), pp. 250-274.
- Meyer, J. (2007). Globalization. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 48(4), 261-273.
- Miguel, E., Satyanath, S., & Sergenti, E. (2004). Economic shocks and civil conflict: An instrumental variables approach. *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(4), pp. 725-753.
- Minow, M. (1998). Between vengeance and forgiveness: South Africa's truth and reconciliation commission. *Negotiation Journal*, 14(4), 319-355.
- Mohan, G. G. (2001). Human rights & development in Africa: Moral intrusion or empowering opportunity? *Review of African Political Economy*, 28(88), 177-196.
- Moore, D. (2001). Is the land the economy and the economy the land? Primitive accumulation in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 19(2), 253-266.
- Moore, D. (2001). Neoliberal globalisation and the triple crisis of 'modernisation' in Africa: Zimbabwe, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and South Africa. *Third World Quarterly*, 22(6, The Post-Cold War Predicament), 909-929.
- Morton, A. D. (2007). *Unravelling Gramsci: Hegemony and passive revolution in the global political economy*. London, GBR: Pluto Press.
- Mulaj, K. (2005). On Bosnia's borders and ethnic cleansing internal and external factors. *Nationalism & Ethnic Politics*, 11(1), 1-24.

- Navarro, V. V. (2007). Neoliberalism as a class ideology; or, the political causes of the growth of inequalities. *International Journal of Health Services*, 37(1), 47-62.
- O'Connell, P. (2007). On reconciling irreconcilables: Neo-liberal globalisation and human rights. *Human Rights Law Review*, 7(3), 483-509.
- O'Fahey, R. S. (2008). *The Darfur sultanate: A history*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Oksala, J. (2011). Violence and neoliberal governmentality. *Constellations*, 18(3), 474-486.
- Ong, A. (2006). *Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Outram, Q. Q. (1997). It's terminal either way: An analysis of armed conflict in Liberia, 1989–1996. *Review of African Political Economy*, 24(73), 355-371.
- Peck, J. (2010). *Constructions of neoliberal reason*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pion-Berlin, D. (1989). Latin-American national-security doctrines - hardline themes and softline themes. *Armed Forces and Society*, 15(3), 411-429.
- Power, S. (2002). *A problem from hell: America and the age of genocide*. New York: Basic Books.
- Pramono, S. (2003). The genocidal global politics and neoliberalism. *Journal of Economic and Social Research*, 5(1), 115-137.
- Prasch, R. E. (2012). Neoliberalism and ethnic conflict. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 44(3), 298-304.
- Rees, W. (2002). Globalization and sustainability: Conflict or convergence? *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 22(4), 249-268.
- Reeves, E. (2004). Darfur: Ongoing genocide. *Dissent*, 51(4), 19-23.
- Roberts, D. J. (2010). Neoliberalizing race, racing neoliberalism: Placing "race" in neoliberal discourses. *Antipode*, 42(2), 248-257.
- Roche, R. S. d. I. (1996). Collective violence as social control. *Sociological Forum*, 11(1), 97-128.
- Roche, R. S. d. I. (2001). Why is collective violence collective? *Sociological Theory*, 19(2), 126-144.

- Rodriguez, D. (2009). *Suspended apocalypse: White supremacy, genocide, and the Filipino condition*. Minneapolis, MN, USA: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rosas, G. (2012). *Barrio libre. Criminalizing states and delinquent refusals of the new frontier*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Rummel, R. J. (1995). Democracy, power, genocide, and mass murder. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 39(1), pp. 3-26.
- Sagi, S. (2008). Ethnic cleansing bleaches the atrocities of genocide. *European Journal of Public Health*, 18(2), 204-209.
- Schaack, B. (2005). Darfur and the rhetoric of genocide. *Whittier Law Review*, 26, 1101-1217.
- Scherrer, C. P. (2002). *Genocide and crisis in central Africa: Conflict roots, mass violence, and regional war*. Conn.; London: Praeger.
- Schmidinger, T. T. (2009). Tyrants and terrorists: Reflections on the connection between totalitarianism, neo-liberalism, civil war and the failure of the state in Iraq and Sudan. *Civil Wars*, 11(3), 359-379.
- Shaw, M. (2007). The general hybridity of war and genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 9(3), 461-473.
- Slim, H. (2004). Dithering over Darfur? A preliminary review of the international response. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 80(5), 811-828.
- Springer, S. (2011). Articulated neoliberalism: The specificity of patronage, kleptocracy, and violence in Cambodia's neoliberalization. *Environment and Planning*. 43(11), 2554-2570.
- Staub, E. (1989). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. Cambridge England; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Straus, S. (2007). Second-generation comparative research on genocide. *World Politics*, 59(3), 476-501.
- Suny, R. (2011). Historicizing genocide. *History Workshop Journal*, 71, 259-266.
- Taber, K. (2008). Bringing peace to Darfur: Lessons of the Darfur peace agreement. *Houston Journal of International Law*, 31(1), 171-212.
- Takaki, R. T. (1989). *Strangers from a different shore: A history of Asian Americans* (1st ed.). Boston: Little, Brown.

- United Nations. (1945). Charter of the United Nations. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter1.shtml>. Accessed November 20, 2012.
- United Nations. (1948). Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/millennium/law/iv-1.htm>. Accessed October 12, 2012.
- United Nations. (1948). Universal declaration of human rights. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr>. Accessed October 12, 2012.
- United Nations. (2004). Statement from the President of the Security Council. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PRST/2004/18. Accessed April 3, 2013.
- Verdeja, E. (2002). On genocide: Five contributing factors. *Contemporary Politics*, 8(1), 37-54.
- Verdeja, E. (2010). Genocide: Clarifying concepts and causes of cruelty. *The Review of Politics*, 72(3), 513-526.
- Wade, M. (2009). Genocide. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 19(2), 150-174.
- Wade, R. H. (2003). What strategies are viable for developing countries today? The World Trade Organization and the shrinking of 'development space'. *Review of International Political Economy*, 10(4, Tenth Anniversary Issue), 621-644.
- Watson, V. V. (2006). Deep difference: Diversity, planning and ethics. *Planning Theory* 5(1), 31-50.
- Weissman, F. F. (2004). Humanitarian action and military intervention: Temptations and possibilities. *Disasters*, 28(2), 205-215.
- Williams, P. P. (2001). Review article: Indifference and intervention: International society and human rights in Africa. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 5(2), 140-153.
- Winton, M. (2011). Violentization theory and genocide. *Homicide Studies*, 15(4), 363-381.
- Zaremba, B. (2011). Conflict in Darfur: Calculation and inadequate international response. *Journal of Theoretical & Philosophical Criminology*, 3(2), 43-62.