'THE SYMPTOMS OF AN EXPLOSIVE SITUATION'
The Temporal Model of Genocide

∽

Introduction

The United Nations (UN) received its first official warning of the risk of geno-
cide in Rwanda in 1962—technically speaking, some thirty-two years of advance
notice. UN Commissioner Majid Rahnema, after returning from an observer mis-
sion, declared that the nation exhibited 'the symptoms of an explosive situation'.[1]
The 'social and political tension' there, he believed, 'may result either in the gradual
extermination of the majority of the Tutsi population, or it may at any moment
degenerate into violence and, possibly, civil war'.[2] Certainly, there was some cause
for concern during the decolonization process of the early 1960s. Yet within a
decade or so, the risk appeared to have passed. By the mid-1970s, experts on
Rwanda were predicting a bright future of ethnic unity.[3] In the 1980s the volatile
issue of regionalism, rather than ethnicity, dominated the political agenda; even in
1991 some Rwandans 'openly scoffed' at the idea of 'ethnic' politics.[4] For many of
the thirty-two years between Commissioner Rahnema's counsel and the eruption
of genocide, his warning seemed overstated and alarmist. Then suddenly it became
prophetic. Between April and July 1994 the most intense genocide of the twen-
tieth century tore through Rwanda, leaving close to a million Tutsi and moderate
Hutu dead in its wake. Commissioner Rahnema's prediction had eventuated. And
yet why thirty-two years later? Why did the genocide erupt in 1994 rather than
1964, or, for that matter, 1974 or 1984? Was Commissioner Rahnema's warning
in 1962 really portentous, or just an accident of history?

The objective of this book is a simple one. It is a quest to provide a greater under-
standing of why genocide occurs *when* it does. Why did the Armenian genocide

erupt in Turkey in 1915, only seven years after the Armenian minority achieved civil equality for the first time in the history of the Ottoman Empire? How can we explain the Rwandan genocide occurring in 1994, after decades of relative peace and some cooperation between the Hutu majority and Tutsi minority? In the wake of the seeming explosion of genocides that have marked the twentieth century, scholars in the field of comparative genocide studies have identified and modelled preconditions and risk factors for genocide. Yet there is only a very limited historical understanding of how such determinants develop over time. Does the risk of genocide develop over decades or generations, or can a nation escalate from a low risk to a high risk of genocide very quickly? Can the risk of genocide wax and wane, or is the progression a linear one?

Integral to understanding the processes that culminate in genocide is a conception not only of the escalatory factors, but the inhibitory factors that may delay or prevent its onset. Why did the Hamidian massacres of 1894–96, in which more than one hundred thousand Ottoman Armenians were slaughtered, not escalate into an attempt to eliminate the minority entirely? If the invasion of second-generation Tutsi refugees into Rwanda in 1990 triggered the events that led to the 1994 genocide, why did a similar refugee invasion in 1963 not trigger a genocidal response? The role of constraints in inhibiting genocide may be as significant as that of preconditions in provoking it. Moreover, the preconditions and constraints that impact upon risk of genocide are subject to change in surprising ways.

This book offers fresh insight through a detailed investigation of how risk of genocide develops over time and in varying circumstances. It presents the temporal model, a new model of the risk factors for genocide that is the first to consider the nonlinear manner in which they may develop over time. It also offers new research into the role of constraints in inhibiting genocide. Through careful historical research and theoretical analysis, this book enables greater understanding than ever before of the path that leads to genocide.

The book also comprises a comprehensive account of the history of the Armenian minority in the Ottoman Empire, from the internationalization of the 'Armenian question' to the genocide itself, and of the history of Rwanda, from the precolonial period to the 1994 genocide. The Armenian and Rwandan genocides were the culmination of long processes of intergroup division, exclusion, discrimination and intermittent outbreaks of violence. While the genocides themselves have been the focus of much scholarly attention, the long history that preceded them has often been overlooked. Yet in each case, a deep historical understanding of the roots of the violence provides essential context for understanding its culmination. It is also vital history in its own right. There is surprisingly little research on the Hamidian massacres, for example, which—while overshadowed by the subsequent genocide—were of a magnitude to merit far more attention than they have received. Similarly, the long history of relatively peaceable coexistence

between Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda is often subsumed by the far more dramatic episodes of violence. This book seeks to redress this imbalance through a careful examination of these historical periods.

Defining Genocide

It is somewhat odd that a crime well-known in biblical times, one that has occurred since antiquity, had to wait until the twentieth century to acquire a label.[5] This is even more surprising when it is the 'crime of crimes'—the destruction of entire peoples. Yet, as Winston Churchill witnessed the unfolding horrors of Nazi Europe, he could only describe Hitler's barbarity as the 'crime without a name'.[6] The dubious honour of rectifying this nomenclatural omission fell to Polish Jewish scholar Raphael Lemkin, even as he observed his own community fall victim to it. Lemkin publicly coined the term 'genocide' in 1944, combining the Greek *genos* (race, tribe) with the Latin *cide* (killing).[7] In 1946, it was largely as a result of Lemkin's determined lobbying that the issue of the prevention and punishment of genocide was first addressed at the United Nations.[8] The combination of Lemkin's determined lobbying and a world reeling in horror from the Holocaust led to remarkably rapid action at the United Nations.

On 9 December 1948, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was adopted by the UN General Assembly. The crime of genocide was defined as:

> Any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, 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.[9]

Genocide, conspiracy to commit genocide, direct and public incitement to commit genocide, attempt to commit genocide and complicity in genocide were all declared punishable. Contracting parties, nations ratifying the convention, confirmed genocide as a crime under international law, 'which they undertake to prevent and to punish'.[10] The convention came into effect in 1951, after being ratified by the minimum of twenty nations, and remains in effect and unmodified today, ratified by the vast majority of states.[11]

Arriving at a convention upon which there was general agreement, however, had meant considerable wrangling over what constituted genocide. As the

definition was drafted and debated in the United Nations, political groups came to be excluded from the definition.[12] The question of defining intent was problematic, and was eventually resolved without defining the grounds on which it would be necessary for the crime to constitute genocide.[13] The final, legal definition of genocide was achieved through negotiation and compromise between UN member states. Whilst this was a remarkable achievement, there is widespread agreement amongst genocide scholars that it is not without significant flaws. The narrowness of the definition has meant that a number of atrocities have not 'qualified' as genocide—in particular, the destruction of political groups and social classes. The requirement that genocidal acts must be committed with 'intent' also poses great difficulties, as intent is very difficult to prove conclusively.[14]

The flawed UN definition of genocide contributed to a split between scholars in the burgeoning field of genocide studies, between those who adopt the UN definition of genocide and those who work with an alternative definition.[15] Scholars who have abided by the UN definition, such as Ben Kiernan and Leo Kuper, do not deny its shortcomings, but point to its status as an internationally recognized definition of this odious crime.[16] This is the definition nations acknowledged when they ratified the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and as such it is of enormous significance. Scholars such as Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, however, have advocated the use of an alternative definition of genocide, contending that it allows the phenomenon to be defined—and therefore studied—with greater clarity and precision. Chalk and Jonassohn have defined genocide thus: '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.'[17] Utilizing this alternative definition overcomes the inconsistency associated with the convention's exclusion of political and social groups as potential victims of genocide. More recently, there has been greater acceptance within genocide studies of definitions based upon, but more inclusive than, the definition in the Genocide Convention.

The present study adopts the stance of the journal *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, subscribing to 'a broad concept of genocide consistent with but not necessarily limited to the United Nations Convention definition'.[18] It resists, however, the recent trend amongst scholars of comparative genocide to consider an expanded range of massacres as further examples of genocide, or genocidal massacres. That is, in accordance with most of the scholarship that pertains specifically to the Armenian genocide, and similarly to the Rwandan genocide, neither the Armenian massacres of 1894–96 nor the Rwandan massacres of 1963–64 will be considered genocide. Whilst quantitative scholars in particular have sought to expand the category of 'genocide' to include limited outbreaks of massacres, this study focusses upon genocide as massive outbreaks of violence with clear eliminationist intent.

The Aetiology of Genocide

Following ratification of the Genocide Convention, the topic of genocide received very little scholarly attention for almost a quarter of a century. In 1976, when Irving Louis Horowitz addressed the subject in *Genocide,* he lamented the failure of modern social science to grapple with the crime.[19] When, shortly thereafter, that failure began to be rectified, very quickly the study of the aetiology of genocide—that is, the study of the causes and factors that lead to it—became a key focus of the field. Over the past three decades, scholars have utilized several different approaches within their investigations. Many scholars, such as Kuper, Fein and others, have utilized a qualitative approach to identify preconditions for genocide, with several outlining models of the preconditions. Others, including Bauman and Levene, have proposed singular overarching factors to explain the explosion of genocides in the past century. More recently, Harff, Krain and others have presented models of the antecedents of genocide based on quantitative research. Comparatively few scholars have taken the approach of including nongenocidal examples amongst their case studies to understand why genocide is much less common than more limited outbreaks of violence. Each of these approaches has yielded valuable insights into the aetiology of genocide, and together they form the basis of our understanding of the causes of genocide. Yet it is an understanding that remains far from complete.

The Qualitative Approach

Leo Kuper, often regarded as the doyen of comparative genocide studies, laid much of the early groundwork for understanding the aetiology of genocide.[20] Kuper's early analysis identified the 'plural society' as the structural basis for genocide. He defined a plural society not simply as a society with a diversity of racial, ethnic and/or religious groups, but rather as a society with persistent and pervasive cleavages between these sections.[21] Kuper identified ideological legitimation as a further precondition necessary for genocide to occur.[22] Perpetrators use legitimizing ideologies to shape a dehumanized image of the victims in the minds of their persecutors, breaking down inhibitions against killing. Kuper noted several preconditions for what he termed 'domestic genocides', that is, genocides that arise on the basis of internal divisions within a society and not in the course of international warfare. First, he observed that in many cases there have been differences of religion between the aggressors and the victims. Second, Kuper highlighted that the catalyst is often a situation of change and of threat. Periods of war or their immediate aftermath seem to facilitate, or provide the opportunity for, large-scale massacres of civilian populations and genocide. Decolonization has also been a predisposing factor for genocide. Finally, Kuper also observed that genocide is committed mostly, but not exclusively, by governments.

Helen Fein, in a number of studies examining the causes of genocide, has further theorized on this topic. Whilst Kuper focussed predominantly upon events at a societal level, Fein's analyses explore both the role of society and that of government.[23] Fein's model of the preconditions for genocide proposed that '[t]he sequences of preconditions, intervening factors, and causes that lead towards genocide'[24] are as follows:

1. The victims have previously been defined outside the universe of obligation of the dominant group. This is an essential, but not sufficient condition for genocide.
2. The status of the state has been reduced by defeat in war and/or internal strife. This is a predisposing condition toward a political or cultural crisis of national identity in which the third step becomes more likely to occur.
3. An elite that adopts a new political formula to justify the nation's domination and/or expansion, idealising the singular rights of the dominant group, rises to power. Adoption of such a formula by a ruling elite is a necessary but not sufficient condition for premeditated genocide.
4. The calculus of costs of exterminating the victim—a group excluded from the circle circumscribed by the political formula—changes as the perpetrators instigate or join a (temporarily) successful coalition at war against antagonists who have earlier protested and/or might conceivably be expected to protest persecution of the victim. This calculus changes for two reasons: the crime planned by the perpetrators becomes less visible and they no longer have to fear sanctions.[25]

According to Fein, the third and fourth conditions taken together constitute necessary and sufficient conditions or causes of premeditated genocide.

Fein took issue with Kuper's assertion that the plural society forms the structural basis upon which genocide can occur.[26] She highlighted the fact that some plural societies that have integrated different groups into a democratic state, such as Canada and Belgium, have not been marked by intergroup violence, despite long-standing intergroup conflicts. In contrast to Kuper, Fein proposed that the status of the potential victim group as 'alien' within a society is an essential precondition of genocide against the group. Furthermore, it is the charter and structure of the state itself that may warrant or negate genocide.[27] Fein suggested a number of precipitants that may trigger genocidal responses. They include challenges by the victim to the structure of domination, opportunities for internal development impeded by the presence or habitual mode of life of the victim, and ideological strains within the worldview or utopia of the dominant group that demand social homogeneity and sacrifice of groups that do not fit the idealized image.[28]

A number of genocide scholars have built upon the theoretical analyses of authors such as Kuper and Fein through the use of a range of case studies. Florence Mazian analysed the Holocaust and the Armenian genocide to develop a six-stage model. [29] In addition to the preconditions of 'outsiders', 'internal strife' and the role of a genocidal leadership, akin to those of Fein, Mazian highlighted the role of 'destructive uses of communication', 'organization of destruction' and 'failure

of multidimensional levels of social control'.[30] 'Destructive uses of communication' highlights the crucial role of propaganda in facilitating genocide, while the 'organization of destruction' incorporates the challenging pragmatics of organizing mass murder. Importantly, the 'failure of multidimensional levels of social control'—a factor not incorporated within other models—highlights the role of the failure of normally inhibitory factors in contributing to the outbreak of genocide. These factors can include social control by the state, the role of religious institutions, the international oversight of other nations and international bodies and even the victim group's ability to defend itself.

Robert Melson conducted an examination of the processes that led to the genocides in Armenia and Nazi Germany.[31] He presented largely complementary findings to those of Mazian; however, his conclusions include two further important factors. First, Melson highlighted that, in each case, the minority group experienced something of a renaissance in the years preceding the genocide. Both the German Jewish people and the Turkish Armenians adapted with relative success to the modern world, and experienced progress in the social, economic, cultural and political spheres. This social mobilization created new tensions between the minority and segments of the majority, who found this progress unacceptable and threatening to the old order based on inequality. Second, in each case the victimized group came to be identified, either geographically or ideologically, with the enemies of the larger society and state. Melson suggested that this identification may be real or may be falsely attributed to the minority, but the important factor is that a link is established between an external and an internal threat.

Scholars working from a psychological perspective have also sought to understand the factors that lead to genocide. Ervin Staub conducted a comparative study of the Holocaust, the Armenian genocide, the Cambodian genocide and the mass killings in Argentina, from which he developed a model of the preconditions of genocide from a psychological perspective.[32] Staub identified 'difficult life conditions', such as economic or political strife, as one of the origins of genocide. Resulting actions to cope with the psychological stresses of difficult life conditions may lead to a progression along a continuum of destruction.[33] Initial acts that cause limited harm result in psychological changes that make further destructive actions possible. Gradually lost are any deeply ingrained, socially developed feelings of responsibility for others' welfare, and inhibitions against killing. Particular cultural-societal characteristics may determine whether and how difficult life conditions lead to progression along the continuum of destruction. For example, Staub cites a cultural sense of superiority interacting with an underlying (and often unacknowledged) collective self-doubt as a combination with a particularly high potential to result in genocide.[34] Strong respect for authority and a strong inclination to obedience are other predisposing characteristics for genocide, which he found in each case study. The role of bystanders is particularly important to the progression of the continuum of destruction. Indifferent bystanders facilitate the

continuum, while bystander opposition can restrain or break it. Each of Staub's case studies also featured a cycle of increasing violence prior to the genocide/mass killing. It is significant that while Staub writes from a psychological perspective, the factors he identifies as preconditions for genocide are similar and complementary to those proposed by Kuper, Fein, Mazian and others.

The psychologist Israel Charny has taken a very different approach to understanding the antecedents of genocide. Rather than focussing on preconditions, Charny identified ten 'Genocide Early Warning Processes' 'that define a series of natural psychocultural processes . . . [that] may be turned by society toward support of life, or they may be turned towards momentums of increasing violence toward human life, culminating in genocide'.[35] These processes form part of a proposed 'Genocide Early Warning System'. The ten major early warning processes include such general factors as how a society values human life, the quality of human experience, and its use of power. More specific processes include machinery for managing escalations of threat, orientation towards force for self-defence and solution of conflicts, and overt violence and destructiveness. It is only in the latter part of the model that processes more closely related to genocide are elucidated, including dehumanization of the victim group, its vulnerability, and legitimization of the victimization by authorities. The model also includes an interesting process largely omitted elsewhere: namely, 'perception of victim groups as dangerous'. This process acknowledges that victim groups, at the same time as being dehumanized and targeted, are often strangely also perceived as dangerous and threatening.[36] Charny's model identifies ten contributory processes, reflecting the complexity of genocide as a crime, and enabling a wide range of factors to be considered.

In recent years, Gregory Stanton's 'The Eight Stages of Genocide' model of the preconditions for genocide has become well-known, utilized by Genocide Watch as the basis for its list of countries at risk of genocide, politicide or mass atrocities. According to Stanton: 'Genocide is a process that develops in eight stages that are predictable but not inexorable . . . The later stages must be preceded by the earlier stages, though earlier stages continue to operate throughout the process.'[37] Stanton identified 'classification'—the classification of social groups into 'us versus them'—as the first stage of genocide.[38] Interestingly, however, he acknowledged that 'all cultures have categories to distinguish people into "us and them"', suggesting that 'bipolar societies that lack mixed categories . . . are the most likely to have genocide'.[39] The second stage is symbolization, in which groups are given names and symbols, rendering them distinguishable. Again, however, Stanton commented: 'Classification and symbolization are universally human and do not necessarily result in genocide.'[40]

The third stage 'is where the death spiral of genocide begins'.[41] Dehumanization involves the equation of the victim group with animals, vermin or diseases and the use of vilifying propaganda, each with the purpose of overcoming 'the normal human revulsion against murder'.[42] Stage four is organization, such as the training

of militias; stage five is polarization. Extremists target those adopting a moderate position, eliminating opportunities for a middle ground. During the preparation stage (stage six), genocidal plans are made, and trial massacres conducted.[43] Stage seven is extermination, as the genocide itself is conducted, whilst the final stage is denial, which can occur both during and after the genocide. Stanton's model is further enhanced by his approach of suggesting preventative strategies at each stage, 'to prevent and stop the genocidal process'.[44]

Sociological Explanations

Of particular concern to a number of sociologists has been the seeming explosion of instances of genocide in the twentieth century. Rather than focussing upon the risk factors for individual occurrences of genocide, these sociologists have sought to understand the broader mechanisms that made 'the century of genocide'. For Zygmunt Bauman, then, modernity itself is the overarching risk factor.[45] According to Bauman, the Holocaust (and by extension, genocide) was not an aberration or atavistic event in contemporary society. Rather, it represented an extreme manifestation of modernity. At the heart of modern society is the drive for control, to design and cultivate our surrounds and subject them to rational organization. The Holocaust, according to Bauman, was the ultimate attempt to achieve a fully designed, fully controlled world.

Mark Levene, by contrast, has identified nationalism, rather than modernity, as the 'one great ideological underpinning' of genocide.[46] According to Levene, whilst there is a relationship between genocide and modernity, it is more indirect than that posited by Bauman. Levene viewed genocide as particularly related to 'states which are new, or are heavily engaged in the process of state and nation building, or are redefining or reformulating themselves in order to operate more autonomously and effectively within an international system of nation states'.[47] Particularly at risk are states that possess an acute anxiety about the wide and ever-increasing gap between themselves and the global leaders within the international system. 'The genocidal mentality . . . is closely linked with agendas aimed at accelerated or force-paced social and economic change in the interests of "catching up" or alternatively avoiding, or circumventing, the rules of the system leaders.'[48] Levene has recognized that specific instances of genocide are bound up with the social and ethnic composition of a state's population, and questions 'at what point does this become toxic?'[49] The answer appears to be in crisis situations, when a regime's conscious effort to break out from its perceived fetters encounters obstacles that recall some previous failure, either its own or committed by a predecessor. At that point, the state will seek to blame its misfortune on the traditional internal scapegoat, which has popularly been held responsible for earlier failures. Levene highlighted how in this way: 'State organized genocide is actually constructed not from the top down, but bottom-up from hate models provided by grass-roots societal phobias . . . The

group is accused of *actively* disrupting or polluting the state's drive to transcend its limitations.'[50] The regime's attempt to realize the unrealizable has resulted in a crisis whereby it has boxed itself into a corner from which it is unable to retreat. The only recourse becomes massive violence. While such broad mechanisms cannot singularly explain genocide, the contributory role of modernity and nationalism in facilitating the crime is recognized by many scholars in the field of genocide studies.[51] Other overarching explanations, although somewhat less compelling, include those surrounding resource scarcity and overpopulation.

Quantitative Models

Increasingly, scholars researching the aetiology of genocide are utilizing quantitative approaches to identify its antecedents. One of the major challenges of a quantitative approach, however, has been building a valid data set. Genocide is a relatively rare event, yet quantitative researchers require a substantial number of instances of genocide to analyse in order to have reasonable prospects of obtaining statistically significant findings. To achieve this, researchers have often employed very inclusive definitions of genocide and politicide. Included within the data sets, therefore, are many examples of much more limited outbreaks of violence than have hitherto been considered 'genocide'. Whether these events are 'genocidal' is arguable; however, one of the consequences of their inclusion is that research findings from studies utilizing this approach identify preconditions not only of major outbreaks of genocide, but also of much smaller, localized incidents of targeted violence. Quantitative models, therefore, may be identifying the preconditions for massacres, smaller events previously conceptualized as 'genocidal massacres', or less targeted forms of mass killing as much as the larger events of genocide that have typically been the focus of genocide studies. Nevertheless, with appropriate awareness of these factors, quantitative studies can offer valuable insights into the antecedents of these crimes.

A pioneer of quantitative research into genocide and mass killing is Rudolph Rummel. After extensive statistical analysis, Rummel concluded that government type is the crucial factor in determining a nation's propensity to genocide.[52] Utilizing his concept of 'democide'—defined as 'the intentional killing of people by government'—Rummel concluded that democracy is inversely related to genocide, and that the level of centralization of power is the best way to predict propensity to democide:[53]

> Among a variety of social diversity (eg. Race, ethnicity, religion, language), socio-economic, cultural, geographic, and other indicators, the best way to account for and predict democide is by the degree to which a regime is totalitarian along a democratic-totalitarian scale. That is, the extent to which a regime controls absolutely all social, economic, and cultural groups and institutions, the degree to which

its elite can rule arbitrarily, largely accounts for the magnitude and intensity of genocide and mass murder.[54]

Rummel's work has been criticized by a number of scholars, who have taken issue with the estimates of death tolls in his data, the breadth of the concept of democide and his failure to adequately conceptualize the relationship between genocide and democide. Additionally, although Rummel's data may explain under which regimes one may expect to find genocides, it does not attempt to explain at what point during these regimes' lifetimes one should expect to find them.[55] Nevertheless, as Gregory Stanton has remarked, 'Rudy Rummel's meticulously documented conclusion that democracies do not commit genocide against their own enfranchised populations had often been challenged, but never refuted.'[56] It offers a very valuable contribution to the scholarship.

The political scientist Barbara Harff has conducted extensive quantitative research to identify predictors of genocide and politicide.[57] Much of Harff's work is focussed around the development of structural models of the antecedents of genocide and politicide. In a major study, Harff analysed 126 instances of internal war and regime collapse between 1955 and 1997 in an attempt to empirically differentiate between those episodes that led to genocide or politicide (thirty-five, according to her inclusive definitions of genocide and politicide) and those that did not.[58] Harff's most recent findings identify seven factors that significantly increase the risk of genocide or politicide.[59] These include prior genocides and politicides, the ethnic character of the ruling elite (that is, whether the ruling elite represents a minority communal group), the ideological character of the ruling elite and the existence of an autocratic (rather than democratic) regime. The role of trade openness is interesting, with low trade openness significantly increasing the risk of genocide or politicide, while high international interdependence decreases risk.[60] Other factors include state-led discrimination and instability risk. Harff has utilized these findings to tabulate annual lists of nations at high risk of future genocide or politicide.[61]

Further work by Harff has concentrated upon whether the escalation of a high-risk situation into genocide, such as what occurred in Rwanda in 1994, can be empirically anticipated in the year preceding the eruption of violence.[62] In order to determine this, all accelerators, triggers and deaccelerators that influenced conditions in Rwanda in the year prior to April 1994 were categorized and documented. Two matched control situations of high risk that did not eventuate into genocide, namely, Burundi in 1993 and (then) Zaire in 1990–92, were similarly documented. Harff found significant differences between the cases:

> Zaire at times shows high levels of conflictual activities, but cooperative activities rarely ever cease . . . Burundi's relatively low levels of conflictual events are accompanied by relatively high levels of cooperative events. By contrast, in Rwanda,

cooperative activity is highest six months prior to the conflict and ceases almost entirely four months prior to the outbreak of genocide . . . Thus in Rwanda . . . [there is] clearly a much sharper increase of accelerators accompanied by a steady decrease in de-accelerators in late 1993.[63]

The ultimate goal of this empirical approach adopted by Harff and others, such as Ted Gurr in the Minorities at Risk Project, is to provide early warning of risk of genocide and other conflicts.[64] This valuable approach has already contributed much to our understanding of risk factors for genocide, and has the potential to contribute much more.

Research Utilizing Nongenocidal Case Studies

Relatively few scholars have examined nongenocidal nations to explore the factors that may mitigate genocide. For Kuper, this was an integral component of understanding the aetiology of genocide.[65] Kuper identified a number of structural conditions that mitigate genocide, such as a religiously, ethnically and racially homogeneous society (which does not account for class or political differences). In multicultural societies, restraints on destructive conflicts may arise from the complex web of social relationships, and of interdependence, that cut across racial, ethnic and religious divisions.[66] A further model of the nongenocidal society is one in which ethnic or other divisions are frankly accepted, and ethnic/ racial/religious identity is used as the basis for a balanced accommodation, either in terms of the constitution or by virtue of understandings in the conduct of the affairs of the nation.

Kuper also analysed two examples of seemingly 'at-risk' societies to determine why each had not descended into genocide. Both South Africa under apartheid and Northern Ireland exhibited many of the risk factors for genocide Kuper identified, being plural and deeply divided societies with a long history of conflict. In each case, he suggested, there were powerful restraints that inhibited genocide. In South Africa, he pointed to the dependence of the economy on nonwhite labour as one such restraint. The demographic composition of the country, with the white population forming a minority of less than 20 per cent, is also significant. Explanations of restraining factors in Northern Ireland include the presence of the British army as a peacekeeping force (although Kuper is unsure just how effective this may have been), the interdependence of Protestants and Catholics in an industrialized society and the fact that the violence seemed to operate within set limits accepted by each side (for example, the inappropriateness of targeting women and children).[67] Here, Kuper has highlighted the importance of examining high-risk but nongenocidal societies to discover the role of inhibitory factors. An examination of such societies appears as important as an examination of

genocidal societies to determine the conditions that are most likely to culminate in or mitigate genocide.

Few scholars have taken up Kuper's challenge to study seemingly high-risk but nongenocidal societies in order to determine the restraining factors that may prevent genocide.[68] The political scientist Manus Midlarsky is one such scholar, having examined a number of cases where genocide might have been expected to occur but did not eventuate, 'in order to establish valid causal inference'.[69] Midlarsky's analysis focusses upon two key features of at-risk but ultimately nongenocidal societies. The first is the 'absence of loss'. According to Midlarsky, therefore, the behaviour of Bulgaria and Finland in refusing to cede their Jewish populations to Nazi control in the Second World War, in contrast to the behaviour of other European nations in this respect, can be explained through:

> the absence of territorial loss and its accompanying refugee influx. Without the large number of refugees of like ethnoreligious identity [experienced by nations that have suffered loss], sympathy can actually be extended to others of a different identity, who, through no fault of their own, are subject to deportation and a probable death.[70]

The second feature of such societies, according to Midlarsky, is the 'affinity condition'. Further expanding on Charny's concept of victim vulnerability as a risk factor for genocide, Midlarsky has identified that potential victim populations may be protected by large affine populations or governments with substantial influence, often in neighbouring countries.[71] War, however, 'may invert the affinity condition'.[72]

Midlarsky's contribution is complemented by that of Daniel Chirot and Clark McCauley. Taking a more theoretic approach, Chirot and McCauley have explored the question, 'Why is limited warfare more common than genocide?'[73] They have proposed three broad explanations. The first is that 'competing groups, be they families, clans, tribes, ethnicities, or nations, can work out rules of conflict and conciliation that dampen violence and make the complete destruction of any of the competing parties less likely'.[74] Second, 'exchanges are worked out between competing groups that give them an interest in maintaining rules of conflict to limit damage'.[75] Whether such exchanges consist of exogamy, commercial trade or ritualized interactions, they are effective mitigating strategies. The third explanation is the role of ideology. Whilst certain ideologies are far more dangerous than others, Chirot and McCauley have commented: 'As the modern world's competing groups have become larger, and technologies of communication and destruction have rapidly improved, dangerous ideological currents have vastly increased the dangers of genocide.'[76] Like Midlarsky, Chirot and McCauley conclude their contribution with an examination of factors and strategies that may potentially limit or prevent genocidal violence.

The Path to Genocide

In the past three decades, there has been tremendous progress in understanding the factors that lead to genocide. Scholars have taken a range of approaches and made a large number of findings, providing an excellent overall indication of the origins of genocide. Researchers who have focussed specifically on identifying the necessary and sufficient preconditions for genocide have developed a number of models, and they are notable for their multiple points of commonality and complementarity. Despite differing terminology and foci, a number of preconditions appear repeatedly. The existence of an outgroup, for example, whether described as 'outsiders', through 'classification' and 'polarization', or as an 'available' victim group, is a common feature of many models. Similarly, the role of propaganda is widely recognized, whether labelled as a 'dehumanization' process, 'destructive uses of communication' or 'ideological legitimation' of genocidal goals. Several models also recognize the contributory role of internal strife and a powerful dictatorial leadership. Other factors may be recognized in only one or two models, but nevertheless offer valuable insight into the risk factors for genocide. Melson, for example, has explored the role of the social mobilization or success of a potential victim group; others have examined colonial conquest and decolonization, sociocultural characteristics, and the approach of the dominant authority towards power. Many of the broad predisposing risk factors for genocide have now been identified, and their role explored.

Nevertheless, there remain substantial gaps in our knowledge of the path that leads to genocide. Current models of the preconditions for genocide, for example, offer very little information as to how these factors develop over time. Many of the predisposing factors that have been identified can be fairly stable characteristics of a society. For example, groups of outsiders such as Jews and Armenians have existed with relative stability in particular societies for centuries; a strong tradition of obedience to authority is also a stable feature of many cultures. Do such factors need to exist for some time in a society before genocide becomes likely? Or can a society progress from a very low risk of genocide to a very high risk within a short period? There is a sparse scattering of temporal information within the models: for example, Staub has identified a continuum of destruction along which societies progress, while Levene has suggested that a traditional scapegoat in society will be targeted at a time of crisis. Times of political upheaval after the emergence of a new leadership, even democratization, have also been pinpointed as potentially risky.[77] Yet there is surprisingly little information regarding the likely time period of the risk escalation process. Is a progression through the risk factors for genocide likely to be linear? Do certain risk factors cluster together closely in time? Can societies stagnate at a certain level of risk, or even experience a decline in it? Current models of the preconditions for genocide have not adequately addressed such questions.

Current models of the aetiology of genocide also lack predictive capacity. The specific role of, and distinction between, predisposing and precipitating factors for genocide is not often clearly delineated. Models have typically focussed on a small number of predisposing factors, and at times also identified one or two precipitating factors, but failed to distinguish which type of factor is under discussion. Yet this distinction is essential for identifying the catalysts that will transform a high-risk situation into genocide. Additionally, the breadth of some preconditions can make it difficult to identify their presence and severity in specific contexts. 'Internal strife', for example, can take many forms. Is an acute crisis of particular concern, or is a confluence of multiple difficulties more likely to increase the risk of genocide?

Many, if not most, societies will experience one or more of the identified risk factors for genocide at some level. The overwhelming majority of these societies will not experience genocide. Ideally, a robust model of the aetiology of genocide would offer a level of specificity that can contribute to at least some predictive capacity. Potentially, it could identify the seriousness of the risk of genocide at certain points, and at what point along 'the continuum of destruction' various forms of intervention may be required to prevent an occurrence of genocide.

As scholars such as Midlarsky, Chirot and McCauley have recognized, examining constraints that inhibit genocide is crucial to developing our understanding of the aetiology of the crime. For genocide to occur, not only must certain risk factors be present, but inhibitory factors must also be absent. Mazian's model, for example, identified 'failure of multidimensional levels of social control' as the final determinant of genocide, which encompasses the failure of religious institutions and other nations to effectively restrain the potential perpetrators. Similarly, Fein's model considered the role of war. War facilitates the onset of genocide through effectively removing the powerful restraint of potential international scrutiny or intervention. Largely, however, models have refrained from clearly delineating the specific role of inhibitory factors, and from differentiating between the removal of a constraint and the addition of a risk factor or precipitant. The study of the specific role of constraints in inhibiting genocide is still very much in its infancy. Yet arguably, the role of constraints may prove as important as that of preconditions in the aetiology of genocide. Moreover, investigating constraints may be of great value in the area of genocide prevention.

The Temporal Model

The temporal model of the preconditions of genocide has been developed to offer new insights into the timing of genocide and the role of precipitants and constraints. It extends previous models of the preconditions for genocide to elucidate a model that includes temporal progression as a component. It includes a strong focus on the specific factors that trigger risk escalation. It considers the complex

dynamics that can influence escalatory and deescalatory processes, and recognizes that the process of risk escalation that culminates in genocide is often nonlinear. It also offers a limited predictive capacity in its later stages. The eight stages of the temporal model are briefly outlined below:

1. The presence of an outgroup. This can be defined as a relatively powerless minority, with whom relations are politicized, and which is subject to legal discrimination.
2. Significant internal strife. Significant, ongoing destabilization that affects the dominant group and the outgroup, and for which there is no clear solution.
3. The perception of the outgroup as posing some kind of existential threat to the dominant power.
4. Local precipitants and constraints determine the nature and time of the dominant group's response. A violent response is typical, with the onset of massacres quite likely.
5. A process of retreat from the intensity of the circumstance, or further escalation. While the process is commonly one of retreat, repeated cycles of escalation through the preceding stages followed by retreat ultimately facilitates further escalation.
6. The emergence of a genocidal ideology within the dominant power, typically accompanied by concerted efforts by the dominant group to further augment their power, and a deepening perception of the outgroup as posing an existential threat.
7. An extensive propaganda campaign, a key component of which features attempts to present the victim group as a grave threat to the dominant power.
8. Case-specific precipitants and constraints determine the precise timing of an outbreak of genocide.

The temporal model was developed following substantial research into the events that culminated in the 1915 Armenian genocide and the genocide in Rwanda in 1994. These two particular examples of twentieth-century genocide were carefully chosen for specific reasons. Arguably, the Armenian genocide is a paradigmatic instance of twentieth-century genocide, and as such, is worthy of particular attention.[78] Also paradigmatic to many scholars, the 1994 Rwandan genocide occurred subsequent to the publication of several of the models of the preconditions for genocide. It therefore offers a fresh challenge to our current understanding of the aetiology of genocide. The primary reason for the selection of these cases, however, is that in each case, more limited massacres of the victim group occurred, which started and stopped decades prior to the outbreak of genocide. Each case, therefore, has a matched control, where genocide did not erupt (earlier) despite a seemingly high risk. Additionally, the case studies were selected for their dissimilarities, to facilitate the development of a model likely to be widely applicable. These

dissimilarities are substantial, with the genocides occurring in different continents and at the opening and closing of the twentieth century. While issues of race and ethnicity dominated in Rwanda, religion was a primary issue in the Armenian case. The Armenian genocide occurred in the context of global war, in contrast to the Rwandan genocide. Each featured very different levels of pregenocidal propaganda as well.

The following chapters present the case study analysis that provides the empirical basis for the temporal model. Historical investigation into the events leading to the Armenian and Rwandan genocides covers the period from the emergence of minority identity as a political issue to the genocide itself. The focus of the investigations revolves closely around the development of the risk of genocide over these periods. The study tracks the emergence of individual risk factors within each society, their ongoing operability and whether or not they cease to be operable during the period under study. The presence and effectiveness of constraints will also be closely examined. The study identifies triggers for risk escalation, along with any deaccelerators that may ameliorate risk. It highlights how the temporal model provides greater understanding of these processes. It also utilizes the wisdom of multiple models, investigating individual risk factors as they become salient within each case study. Such an approach allows for maximum flexibility in identifying those factors of most impact upon the temporal progression of risk of genocide. Following the historical investigations, the temporal model is further elucidated in chapters 7–9.

Notes

1. United Nations. 1962. *Question of the Future of Ruanda-Urundi: Statement Made by Mr. Majid Rahnema, United Nations Commissioner for Ruanda-Urundi, at the 1265th Meeting of the Fourth Committee,* A/C.4/525, 23 January, 17–18.

2. Ibid.

3. R. Lemarchand. 1975. 'Recent History' in section on 'Rwanda', in *Africa South of the Sahara, 1974,* London: Europa Publications, 1975, 660, quoted in M. Mamdani. 2001. *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 140.

4. B. Jones. 1999. 'Civil War, the Peace Process, and Genocide in Rwanda', in T. Ali and R. Matthews (eds), *Civil Wars in Africa: Roots and Resolution,* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 60; Mamdani, *When Victims Become Killers,* 154.

5. For an excellent discussion of biblical references to genocide, see B. Kiernan. 2007. *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur,* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, intro.

6. S. Power. 2003. *"A Problem from Hell": America and the Age of Genocide,* London: Flamingo, 29.

7. For further information on Lemkin's conception of genocide, see R. Lemkin. 1944. *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, and Proposals for Redress,* Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for International Peace.

8. L. Kuper. 1981. *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century,* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 23.

9. United Nations. 1948. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

10. Ibid., Article I.

11. For a list of these states, see the United Nations Treaty Collection. Retrieved 9 April 2013 from http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=UNTSONLINE&tabid=2&mtdsg _no=IV-1&chapter=4&lang=en#Participants

12. F. Chalk and K. Jonassohn (eds). 1991. *History and Sociology of Genocide,* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 10.

13. Kuper, *Genocide,* 33.

14. UN, Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; S. Feinstein. 2002. 'Understanding the "G" Word', in C. Rittner, J. Roth and J. Smith (eds), *Will Genocide Ever End?,* St. Paul, MN: Paragon House, 41–42.

15. For a more detailed discussion of some of the issues surrounding the definition of genocide, see D. Harris [Mayersen]. 2001. 'Defining Genocide: Defining History?', *Eras Online Journal* 1(1). Retrieved 2 October 2007 from http://www.arts.monash.edu.au/eras/edition_1 /harris.htm

16. Kiernan, *Blood and Soil,* 11; Kuper, *Genocide,* 39.

17. Chalk and Jonassohn, *History and Sociology,* 23.

18. Email communication from Henry Theriault, co-editor, *Genocide Studies and Prevention,* 9 October 2007.

19. I.L. Horowitz. 1976. *Genocide: State Power and Mass Murder,* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

20. Kuper, *Genocide,* passim.

21. Ibid., 57–58.

22. Ibid., 84.

23. H. Fein. 1984. 'Scenarios of Genocide: Models of Genocide and Critical Responses', in I. Charny (ed.), *Toward the Understanding and Prevention of Genocide,* Boulder, CO: Westview Press; H. Fein. 1979. *Accounting for Genocide: National Responses and Jewish Victimization during the Holocaust,* New York: Free Press.

24. Fein, *Accounting for Genocide,* 9.

25. Ibid.

26. Fein, 'Scenarios of Genocide', passim.

27. Ibid., 6.

28. Ibid., 7.

29. F. Mazian. 1990. *Why Genocide? The Armenian and Jewish Experiences in Perspective,* Ames: Iowa State University Press.

30. Ibid., ix–x.

31. R. Melson. 1992. *Revolution and Genocide: On the Origins of the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

32. E. Staub. 1989. *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

33. Ibid., 17.

34. Ibid., 18–19.

35. I. Charny. 1999. 'Genocide Early Warning System (GEWS)', in I. Charny (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Genocide,* Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 257.

36. Ibid., 259.

37. G. Stanton. 1998. *The Eight Stages of Genocide,* Washington, D.C.: Genocide Watch. Retrieved 30 January 2012 from http://www.genocidewatch.org/genocide/8stagesofgenocide.html

38. G. Stanton. 2004. 'Could the Rwandan Genocide Have Been Prevented?' *Journal of Genocide Research* 6(2), 213.

39. Stanton, *The Eight Stages of Genocide.*

40. Ibid.

41. Stanton, 'Could the Rwandan Genocide Have Been Prevented?', 214.

42. Stanton, *The Eight Stages of Genocide.*

43. Stanton, 'Could the Rwandan Genocide Have Been Prevented?', 216.

44. Ibid., 213.

45. Z. Bauman. 1991. *Modernity and the Holocaust,* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

46. M. Levene. 2000. 'Why Is the Twentieth Century the Century of Genocide?', *Journal of World History* 11(2), 332.

47. Ibid., 317.

48. Ibid., 319.

49. Ibid.

50. Ibid., 324–25.

51. For example, see E. Weitz. 2003. *A Century of Genocide: Utopias of Race and Nation,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; N. Naimark. 2001. *Fires of Hatred: Ethnic Cleansing in Twentieth-Century Europe,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 5–11.

52. R.J. Rummel. 1984. *Death by Government: Genocide and Mass Murder since 1900,* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

53. R.J. Rummel. 1995. 'Democracy, Power, Genocide, and Mass Murder', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 39(1), 3.

54. Ibid., 24.

55. M. Krain. 1997. 'State-Sponsored Mass Murder: The Onset and Severity of Genocides and Politicides', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(3), 332.

56. G. Stanton. 2005. 'Early Warning', in D. Shelton (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity,* Detroit, Mich.: Macmillan Reference, 271–73. Retrieved 4 October 2007 from http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutus/stantonearlywarningarticle.htm

57. See, for example, B. Harff. 1987. 'The Etiology of Genocides', in I. Wallimann and M. Dobkowski (eds), *Genocide and the Modern Age: Etiology and Case Studies of Mass Death,* New York: Greenwood Press, 41–60; B. Harff. 2003. 'No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955', *American Political Science Review* 97(1), 57–73; B. Harff. 2001. 'Could Humanitarian Crises Have Been Anticipated in Burundi, Rwanda, and Zaire?', in H. Alker, T. Gurr and K. Rupesinghe (eds), *Journeys Through Conflict: Narratives and Lessons,* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 81–102; B. Harff. 1998. 'Early Warning of Humanitarian Crises: Sequential Models and the Role of Accelerators', in J. Davies and T. Gurr (eds), *Preventive Measures: Building Risk Assessment and Crisis Early Warning Systems,* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 72–80; B. Harff. 2012. 'Assessing Risks of Genocide and Politicide: A Global Watchlist for 2012' [electronic version], in J.J. Hewitt, J. Wilkenfeld and T.R. Gurr (eds.), *Peace and Conflict 2012,* Boulder, CO: Paradigm. Retrieved 12 October 2011 from http://www.gpanet.org/webfm_send/120

58. Harff, 'No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust?', 57–73.

59. Harff, 'Assessing Risks', 54.

60. Ibid.

61. See, for example, http://www.gpanet.org/webfm_send/120

62. Harff, 'Could Humanitarian Crises Have Been Anticipated?', 81–102.

63. Ibid., 99.

64. See http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar

65. Kuper, *Genocide,* passim.

66. Ibid., 189.

67. Ibid., 204–5.
68. M. Lund. 2001. 'Why Are Some Ethnic Disputes Settled Peacefully, While Others Become Violent? Comparing Slovakia, Macedonia, and Kosovo', in Alker, Gurr and Rupesinghe, *Journeys Through Conflict,* 129. There are some exceptions; for example, studies such as T. Gallagher. 2001. 'The Northern Ireland Conflict: Prospects and Possibilities' and A.M. Tripp and C. Young. 2001. 'The Accommodation of Cultural Diversity in Tanzania', both in D. Chirot and M. Seligman (eds), *Ethnopolitical Warfare: Causes, Consequences, and Possible Solutions,* Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association; J.L. Brain. 1973. 'The Tutsi and the Ha: A Study in Integration', *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 8(1–2), 39–49.
69. M. Midlarsky. 2005. *The Killing Trap: Genocide in the Twentieth Century,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 325.
70. Ibid., 328–29.
71. Ibid., 335.
72. Ibid., 364.
73. D. Chirot and C. McCauley. 2006. *Why Not Kill Them All? The Logic and Prevention of Mass Political Murder,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 95–148.
74. Ibid., 96.
75. Ibid.
76. Ibid., 97.
77. Krain, 'State-Sponsored Mass Murder', 332.
78. A number of scholars have made this suggestion; see, for example, R. Melson. 1996. 'Paradigms of Genocide: The Holocaust, the Armenian Genocide and Contemporary Mass Destructions', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 548, 156–68.