

The Genealogy of Genocide

The Education of the Intellectual Architects of Genocide:

A Social Learning Analysis

By Suzanne Julia Elaine Le

**Thesis presented to the Graduate School of the University of Ottawa and Saint Paul
University as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
(Conflict Studies)**

Directed by Dr. Jean-Guy Goulet

Ottawa, Canada

2011

Abstract

It is my position that those wishing to prevent genocide are not the only ones studying it. A clear understanding of how genocides are initiated and carried out also helps regimes recognize when genocide is a viable option, and offers functional insight into how to initiate it. In this investigation I examine how and what genocidal leaders learn from other genocides. It is my contention that the information gathered by leaders from other genocides is utilized for the planning and preparation of genocide in their society. This investigation focuses on how the genocide of Armenians in 1915 informed the planning and preparation for the Holocaust, and how both the Armenian genocide and the Holocaust informed the leaders of the Rwandan genocide. This paper considers genocide by focusing on the outside factors that determine the environment in which genocide develops. I examine the interconnection of genocide within the context of politics, media and propaganda, third party actors, and law using a historical institutionalist lens. This investigation will utilize the theoretical framework of social learning theory to examine data.

Genocide, even when perfectly contained is a threat to international peace and security because one genocide sets the stage for the next. The international community has often responded to genocide ineffectively. My goal is to identify some of the actions and omissions of the international community that may encourage a favourable environment for genocide. I intend to achieve this using a case study approach with a qualitative methodology. A clearer understanding of the role of the social learning process of the genocide leaders in past genocides will provide a framework for recommending future actions, and offer a better understanding of how the world can respond prior to, and in the aftermath of, genocide in order to prevent future genocides.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction	1
Theoretical Background	6
Research Design	22
Chapter Two: Modeling Leadership in Genocide	28
Symbolic Learning and the Final Solution	33
The Role of Motivation in Mass Murder: Looting and Living space	42
Innovation and Social Learning Theory: The New and Improved Genocide	47
The Neutralization of Condemnation	50
Chapter Three: Teaching Genocide	60
Symbolic Learning: The Utility of Propaganda in Genocide	63
The Role of Motivation in Mass Murder: The Utopian Dream	70
The Neutralization of Condemnation	74
Chapter Four: Response Consequences and Genocide: The Role of Bystanders	84
The Informative Function and Bystanders	87
Learning by Response Consequences: Genocide and Punishment	98
Conclusion	104
Implications: SLT and Genocide Applied to the Future	108

Bibliography	114
List of Appendixes	iii
List of maps	iii
List of Commandments and Laws	iii
List of Glossaries	iii

List of Appendixes

Rwandan School Room Photo	83
1.1 Common Features of the Armenian, Jewish, and Rwandan Genocides, as Seen According to Raul Hilberg’s Four Stages of the Destruction Process	120

List of Maps

1.2 Map of the Decline of the Ottoman Empire: Losses from 1807-1924	122
1.3 Maps of Post World War I Turkey under the Treaty of Sevres and the Treaty of Lausanne	123
1.4 Map of German Spoken Populations in Europe	124
1.5 Map of Germanic Language Populations in Europe	125

Lists of Commandments and Laws

The “Ten Commandments” of the Committee of Union and Progress, 1914-1915	126
The Nuremberg Laws	127
The Hutu Ten Commandments	131

List of Glossaries

General Glossary	132
Glossary of Names	136

Acknowledgments	139
------------------------	------------

Chapter One: Introduction

Thus, for those who feel called to educate people, it is their task to learn from history and to apply their knowledge practically without regard to the understanding, comprehension, ignorance, or even repudiation of the masses.

- Adolf Hitler in *Mein Kampf*, p.38-39

A Rat in a maze that has only one path to the goal learns to choose that path after many trials. Bureaucrats, too, are sometimes caught in a maze, but they cannot afford a trial run.

There may be no time for hesitations and stoppages. This is why past performance is so important; this is why past experience is so essential. Necessity is said to be the mother of invention, but if precedents have already been formed, if a guide has already been constructed, invention is no longer a necessity.

- Raul Hilberg in *The Destruction of The European Jews Vol. I*, p.6

-

The Holocaust has been the subject of much academic interest and research. The subject is studied by academics with the hope that a better understanding of it can assist the prevention of these catastrophes in the future. However, those wishing to prevent genocide are not the only ones who study it. A clear understanding of how genocides are initiated and carried out can also help regime leaders understand when genocide is a viable option, as well as offer functional insight into how to initiate it. For example, those planning the elimination of Jews from European society also studied genocide. They studied the Armenian genocide. Further, evidence suggests that the Holocaust has been studied by those wishing to perpetrate genocide, specifically the Hutu extremist regime in Rwanda.¹

Daniel Goldhagen states, “We must acknowledge that only one or a few people initiate a mass annihilation or elimination.”² For Goldhagen, genocide is a strategic political act which follows a cognitive decision making and planning processes. Ervin Staub points out that most people are indoctrinated in a prohibition against murder from the earliest stages of life.³ Despite this, political leaders are able to overcome this prohibition and then organize and implement policies that include mass murder. Where are these leaders getting their ideas from, and how are they learning to plan and implement genocide? Goldhagen states, “Modernity has bestowed upon the nation-state an increased communicative and learning capacity. Particularly starting with the second part of the twentieth century, and continuously accelerating, political leaders learn quickly of other’s policies and measures, and their successes and failures.”⁴ If this is true, then what connections can be drawn between the decisions of the intellectual architects of genocide,

¹ See Dallaire (2003), Coloroso (2007), Keane (1995), and Goldhagen (2009)

² Daniel J. Goldhagen, Worse than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity (New York: Public Affairs, 2009) 69

³ Ervin Staub. The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

⁴ Goldhagen., 276

and the actions that other leaders choose to embark upon? How are leaders learning that: i) genocide is an option, and ii) how to implement that option? Moreover, how are citizens being taught to overcome their inhibitions and to participate in genocide?

Goldhagen maintains that political leaders are the decisive actors setting eliminationist policies and mass annihilations in motion.⁵ Further, according to Goldhagen, “The most virulent hatred...does not result in systematic slaughter unless political leaders mobilize and organize those who hate into a program of killing.”⁶ For Goldhagen, genocide follows cognitive and strategic decisions on the part of political leaders who have political motivations and seek political ends.⁷ Thus, it is important to examine the learning process of the leaders specifically. In order to examine how leaders of genocidal regimes are learning to plan and perpetrate genocide I will analyze the data through the lens of Social Learning Theory (SLT).

According to SLT, people learn through modeling and imitation. The basic premise of SLT is that the unit of investigation for the study of personality is the interaction of the individual with his or her environment.⁸ If people observe positive, desired outcomes in a behaviour, they are more likely to model, imitate, and adopt the behaviour themselves. Considering that the leadership environment for regimes is both domestic and international, it is appropriate to assess what leaders are learning in international circumstances with SLT, and how

⁵ Goldhagen, 77

⁶ Ibid. 69

⁷ Goldhagen is also known for his debate with Christopher Browning, author of *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland (1992)*. Browning holds that the men of Unit 101 killed out of a basic obedience to authority and peer pressure, not blood-lust or primal hatred. Goldhagen argues that this is false, and he wrote *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust (1996)* in response. However, this debate is one about the accountability of the public for their participation in genocide. This thesis is about how genocide is learned. While the results of this thesis may be relevant to the debate of accountability, the accountability debate is not relevant to this thesis. In simple terms, how one is taught to commit genocide may affect the accountability they hold for one's participation, but one's accountability for genocide will not have an impact on how they have learned to commit it.

⁸ Julian B. Rotter, *The Development and Applications of Social Learning Theory* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982) 317

they transfer that knowledge domestically. In other words, most scholars will accept that genocide has a pattern. However, it is not enough to say it has a pattern. One must recognize that genocide has a pattern precisely because it is a learned pattern and a learned behaviour, and most importantly, a learned political response to a political problem.

The research question being investigated in this thesis is: does the knowledge of the actions of previous genocidal regimes inform and assist leaders in the planning and perpetration of genocide?⁹ If so, how are the genocidal leaders learning and how does the information they gather shape the outcome for their society? My thesis will consider genocide using an “outside in” approach by focusing on the outside factors that define the environment in which genocide develops. The investigation presupposes that genocides are planned, and that the knowledge of how to initiate genocide is not intuitive.

While the genocide perpetrated against the Armenians by the Turks is included in this study as a genocide that modeled genocide for the Nazi leaders and the Hutu extremists, using the definition that I have adopted of genocide, there are no earlier genocides that could have acted as a model for the Turkish regime. There is, however, evidence to suggest that the Turks did learn the methods they employed through a multiplicity of models in their environment, the most notable being the Russian Empire, the British, and the Germans. Helen Fein notes that in the late 1800’s the Ottoman Sultan Abdul Hamid organized killing squads made up of Kurdish Tribesmen for the purpose of large scale pogroms on the Armenian population. These killing squads, Fein claims, were modeled after the Russian Cossacks who perpetrated the “Black Hundreds” pogroms against the Russian Jewish population.¹⁰ Dr. Lepsius, a German missionary advocating the cause of the Armenians in the court trial of Soghomon Tehlirian, the man who

⁹ Throughout this thesis I use the term regime to refer to a collective of government leaders in a given state.

¹⁰ Fein, 12

murdered Talaat Bey, testified, “The Turks have said that the idea of concentration camps was taken from the British treatment of the Boers in South Africa.”¹¹ Morgenthau reports, “*Ta’alim el aleman*, “the teaching of the Germans” is the simple Turk’s explanation to anyone who asks him about the originators of these [genocidal] measures [against the Armenians].”¹²

Given the evidence a study could be completed on the learning of the genocidal regime the Young Turks. However, as this study is focused on if genocidal leaders are learning specifically from other genocidal leaders, I consider the question, ‘did the Young Turks learn to commit genocide from the actions and policies of other nations?’ to be outside the parameters of this study.

I have chosen the case study method as the most appropriate methodology for this study. Wilbur Schramm describes a case study as an attempt to “illuminate a decision or a set or set of decisions: why they were taken, how they were implemented, and with what result.”¹³ Robert K. Yin expands on Schramm’s description by offering a two-pronged definition. First, Yin states that a case study is “an empirical enquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.”¹⁴ Next, Yin defines a case study as a method of inquiry that:

cope with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as one result relies on multiple sources of evidence, with the data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and as another result benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis.¹⁵

¹¹ Testimony reproduced in Boijian, 284. Dr. Lepsius based his testimony on documents he received from the archives of the Imperial Embassies and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, especially from reports of German Ambassadors and Consuls in Turkey during the genocide.

¹² Morgenthau, 405

¹³ W. Schramm, “*Notes on Case Studies of Instructional Media Projects*” Working Paper for the Academy For Educational Development, (Washington D.C: December, 1971)

¹⁴ Robert, K. Yin, Case Study Research Design and Methods, 3rd Ed. (London: Sage Publications, 2003) 13

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 14

Thus, a case study is used when a researcher desires to cover contextual conditions because the researcher believes that these conditions are highly pertinent to the phenomenon being studied.¹⁶ Further, the case study is a research strategy that covers the logic of design, data collection techniques, and specific approaches to data analysis which will be discussed further in the presentation of the thesis methodology.¹⁷ Therefore, a case study framework is most appropriate for my research topic to examine, identify, and highlight opportunities and instances of learning about genocide, along with outcomes as a direct result of that learning.

Theoretical Background

The word “*Genocide*” was coined in 1943 by Raphael Lemkin, a Polish Jewish scholar who served as a League of Nations specialist and a member of the International Bureau for Unification of Criminal Law.¹⁸ “*Genocide*” is derived from the Greek *genos*, meaning race, kin, or tribe, and the Latin word *cide*, meaning to cut or kill.¹⁹ Lemkin wanted the systematic destruction of a group targeted for its national, ethnic, racial, or religious makeup, declared an international crime.²⁰ In his 1933 *Madrid Proposal*, Lemkin argued that the extermination of human groups, such as the slaughter of the Armenians by the Young Turks, a nationalist group from the Ottoman Empire which had gained control over the Ottoman civil and military administration by 1913, threatened the interests of the entire international community.²¹ In his 1944 book *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government,*

¹⁶ Ibid., 13

¹⁷ Ibid., 14

¹⁸ Barbra Coloroso, Extraordinary Evil: A Brief History of Genocide (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2007) 2

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ His original concepts defined two separate things – Vandalism & Barbarity. Vandalism would cover the first 4 stages of eliminationism as defined by Goldhagen, while barbarity is reserved for the annihilation of a target group. He also deeply opposed the UN Human Rights bill because he felt it overshadowed the UNGC. His comment was: “To be unequal is not the same as to be dead.”

²¹ Ibid., 3

Proposals for Redress, Lemkin states, “to treat genocide as a crime that only concerns an individual nation makes no sense because by its very nature the author is either the state itself or powerful groups backed by the state...by its legal, moral, and human nature, genocide must be regarded as an international crime.”²²

The United Nations was first conceived during World War Two in response to the failure of the League of Nations. The United Nations officially came into existence on 24 October 1945.²³ On December 11, 1946, the General Assembly of the UN passed an initial resolution that described genocide as “a denial of the right of existence of entire human groups.”²⁴ The General Assembly affirmed that “genocide is a crime under international law which the civilized world condemns, for the commission of which principals and accomplices-whether private individuals, public officials, or statesmen, and whether the crime is committed on religious, racial, political or any other grounds - are punishable.”²⁵ Two years later, in December 1948, The United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 260 (III) A: *The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide* (UNCG), in which genocide was defined as;

Acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: killing members of the group; causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life, calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; [and] forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.²⁶

²² Ibid.

²³ <http://www.un.org/aboutun/unhistory/> - accessed 6/03/11

²⁴ Ibid., 4

²⁵ Ibid., 5

²⁶ Ibid.

The Convention came into force in January 1951, and has been ratified by more than 137 nations, the United States, however, did not ratify the Convention until 1988, five years after China ratified it in 1983.²⁷

While the initial resolution passed by the General Assembly of the UN in 1946 included political groups, political groups were dropped from the finalised resolution. Much of the UN debate that ensued revolved around the inclusion of political groups. A number of the countries, most notably the Soviet Union, demanded the exclusion of political groups due to fear that with this inclusion they themselves might be accused of genocide because of their treatment of those they deemed to be “enemies of the people.”²⁸ Other arguments for the exclusion of political groups included: they did not fit the etymology of the word; they were mutable categories; and, they lacked the necessary characteristics for identification.²⁹ Lemkin recognized that the inclusion of political groups would split the legal committee and had the potential of sinking the law. Therefore, he also lobbied for the exclusion of political groups from the law.

The International Criminal Court (ICC) came into being in July 1, 2002,³⁰ after the creation of ad hoc tribunals to prosecute suspects in the Rwandan Genocide and War Crime suspects from the former Yugoslavia highlighted the need for a permanent body to respond to these types of crimes.³¹ The ICC’s definition of genocide has the UNGC’s definition as its base, adding specifications and elements to clarify what the crime means in practice. According to Article 6 of the ICC Statute, this crime involves:

²⁷ Ibid., 7.

²⁸ Alexander Laban Hinton, “*The Dark Side of Modernity: Towards an Anthropology of Genocide*” in Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002) c.p.p. 86

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ <http://www.icc-cpi.int/Menus/ICC/About+the+Court/> - accessed December 1, 2009

³¹ After a great deal of debate there were seven countries that voted against the treaty that created the ICC- China, Iraq, Israel, Libya, Qatar, United States, and Yemen.

any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: Killing members of the group; Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.³²

However, despite the existence of this internationally recognized legal definition, there is no general accepted academic definition of genocide. Some scholars have pointed out that the legal definition of genocide adopted in the UNGC and the ICC can be problematic to academic inquiry. For one, the definition can be seen as too broad as it includes very different kinds of behaviour, such as murder, mental damage, preventing births, and removing children from a group.³³ The legal definition is also viewed by some as being too narrow because it does not include the intent to destroy political, economic, and other non-indelible groups.³⁴ Finally, the legal definition of genocide has been criticized for its requirement of the existence of intent in order to qualify as genocide.³⁵ Intent is very difficult to prove and leaves a large grey area in defining what exactly constitutes intent.

Manus Midlarsky is an example of an academic who criticizes the UNGC as being too broad. He defines genocide as “the state-sponsored systematic mass murder of civilians denoted by a particular ethno-religious identity, with the purpose of eradicating that group from a given territory.”³⁶ For Midlarsky, genocide is a response to: loss, such as the loss of territory, international prestige, and financial wellbeing; imprudent realpolitik; and unnecessary risk minimization leading to altruistic punishment. If one of these factors is absent genocide will not

³² http://www.icc-cpi.int/NR/rdonlyres/9CAEE830-38CF-41D6-AB0B-68E5F9082543/0/Element_of_Crimes_English.pdf - accessed November 30, 2009

³³ <http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/GENOCIDE.ENCY.HTM> - accessed November 30, 2009

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ See Goldhagen, 26-29

³⁶ Manus Midlarsky. *The Killing Trap: Genocide in Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005) 22

occur. In the theory offered by Midlarsky there are two critical elements of genocide. The systematic mass murder must be part of a state policy with exterminatory intent, and, non-combatants from a particular ethno-religious group must be targeted by this policy.³⁷ Genocide goes beyond extermination of some members of the community to aim at the complete annihilation of the target group. Midlarsky excludes the mass executions of Bosnians in the former Yugoslavia, between 1992 and 1995, from his definition of genocide because there was not a state policy of exterminating the Bosnians. He argues that if there had been then the men and boys would not have been separated from the women and girls resulting in a much higher death count.³⁸ According to Midlarsky, for genocide to be feasible two conditions must be met: first, the vulnerability of the target group must first be established by the planning regime; and, second, the regime must be able to establish a real or purported connection of the target group with threats to the state in order to justify the killing.³⁹

Midlarsky separates politicide from genocide. Politicide killings range over virtually all sectors of the population and are motivated by an ideology he refers to as “revolutionary zeal.”⁴⁰ In a politicide, the mass murders have a detailed ideological base, which he argues is not present in the Armenian, Jewish and Rwandan genocides. In a politicide, people are killed for what they believe - which is different from the regime - and not for whom they were born as. For example, victims are targeted as capitalists or communists but not as Tutsis, Jews, or Armenians. According to this definition of genocide and politicide, the mass murders of groups in the former Soviet Union and Cambodia fall into the category of politicide, and not genocide.

³⁷ Ibid.,

³⁸ Ibid., 28-29

³⁹ Ibid., 43

⁴⁰ Ibid., 310

While I accept Midlarsky's definition of genocide and of politicide, I reject Midlarsky's claim that genocide does not have an ideological base. In all three genocides named by him, an important ideology was at work. The genocidal leaders of the Young Turks, the Nazis, and Hutu Power were all steeped in a racial ideology that promoted the elevation of their race through the marginalization and eventual elimination of the sub-standard race of the target group. They then wrapped this ideology into a utopian package which was then politicized and legalized, and finally sold to the public through the engagement of propaganda outlets such as newspapers and the radio.

Daniel Goldhagen is an example of an academic who rejects the officially recognized UN definition of genocide given above on the grounds that it is too narrow. Goldhagen problematizes the definition of genocide because it excludes non-lethal forms of eliminationist assaults, as well as assaults that are deemed too small in fatalities. Goldhagen, therefore, sees genocide as the final phase of a five stage continuum that he has defined as eliminationism. In Goldhagen's eliminationism, stage one is identified as *transformation*, which is the destruction of a group's political, social, religious or cultural identities in order to neuter its members' [perceived] noxious qualities.⁴¹ The second stage is *repression*, which includes keeping the target group within territorial reach through such strategies as political and legal segregation. Stage three is *expulsion*. Expulsion is visible in the deportation of the target group from local regions or beyond the state's borders. Goldhagen describes stage four as *the prevention of reproduction* which is inclusive of forced sterilization and rape. The final stage is *extermination*, which is the "final solution" and follows the belief that the threat of target population is so great that it must

⁴¹ Goldhagen, 14-18

be completely wiped out “root and branch.” Extermination occurs when perpetrators act on the call for society’s or the world’s transformation.⁴²

Goldhagen has taken an interesting and unique approach by placing genocide within the context of this continuum. Genocide is always preceded by preliminary stages. Also, this point of view offers a theoretical framework from within which one can examine discriminatory and violent measures that stop short of the extermination of a target group. However, for the purpose of this thesis I will be focusing specifically on the political policy of complete extermination of a specified group who are targeted based on an identifying factor about which they had no option. This study will focus on cases in which a group of people were targeted for annihilation based on who they were, and not based on a choice that they were able to make. With this approach I limit the scope of this study to three genocides: first, the genocide of the Armenians by the Young Turks of 1915 to 1918; second, the Holocaust, which was the genocide of the Jews by the Nazi regime from 1939-1945; and finally, the genocide of the Tutsis by the Hutu regime in Rwanda in 1994.

For this thesis I will use Midlarsky’s definition and define genocide as “the state-sponsored systematic mass murder of civilians denoted by a particular ethno-religious identity, with the *purpose* of eradicating that group from a given territory.”⁴³ (Italics mine)

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Manus Midlarsky. The Killing Trap: Genocide in Twentieth Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005) 22. I have chosen not to do include the persecution of homosexuals, mentally handicapped, and Roma based on my strict definition of genocide. While Roma, handicapped, and homosexuals were included in Hitler’s killings, they were not targeted as a group in their entirety. Hitler did not have a policy of creating a Europe rid of Roma, and homosexuals could hide their homosexuality. One of Hitler’s earlier leading men, Ernst Rohm, was a well known gay. Hitler defended him, stating “what he does in his own house is his own business.” Rohm was later put to death, but for a betrayal, not for being gay. Handicapped people, or as they referred to, the “useless eaters,” were mostly used to test out gassing and killing methods while learning to perfect the methods later seen in the camps. However, the Vatican publically protested this and the policy of killing all handicapped people was abandoned.

Purpose is a very significant element of the definition of genocide I have adopted from Midlarsky. In order for there to be a purpose behind an action, there must first be a problem, followed by a decision on how best to solve that problem - the Armenian question, the Jewish question, the Tutsi problem. How did the leaders come up with the final solution? In his analysis of aggression based on Social Learning Theory, Bandura states, "Examination of the origins of aggression must consider not only the behaviour of free-lancing aggressors, but also that of professionals who are authorized to use aggression as a means of social control or who are officially trained for mass destruction in the service of national policies."⁴⁴ Further, according to his explanation of SLT, Bandura explains, "Virtually all learning phenomena resulting from direct experience occur on a vicarious basis by observing other people's behaviour and its consequences for them. The capacity to learn by observation enables people to acquire large, integrated patterns of behaviour without having to form them gradually by tedious trial and error."⁴⁵

The above definition of genocide will enable a useful examination of genocide through the lens of SLT. Social Learning Theory is based on the work of Canadian psychologist Albert Bandura who originated this explanation of behaviour.⁴⁶ Bandura believed the sole behavioural modifiers of reward and punishment in classical operant conditioning were inadequate as a

⁴⁴ Bandura, Albert. Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1973) 61

⁴⁵ Bandura, Albert. Social Learning Theory (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1977) 12

⁴⁶ "In 2002, a psychologist named Steven Haggbloom and his colleagues published a paper in which they attempted to rank the 100 most eminent psychologists of the twentieth century. They based their ranking on six different variables: citations in journals, mentions in introductory psychology textbooks, a survey of American Psychological Society members, election as president of the American Psychological Association (APA) or receipt of the APA Distinguished Scientific Contributions Award, membership in the National Academy of Sciences, and use of the psychologist's surname to identify a particular theory or school of psychology. Bandura ranked number four, right behind B.F. Skinner, Jean Piaget, and Sigmund Freud." - <http://www.enotes.com/psychology-theories/bandura-albert> - accessed 9/03/11

framework, and that many human behaviours were learnt from other humans.⁴⁷ Bandura began to analyze means of treating unduly aggressive children by identifying sources of violence in their lives. In 1961 Bandura conducted a controversial experiment known as the *Bobo doll experiment*, to study patterns of behaviour associated with aggression.⁴⁸ Bandura hoped that the experiment would prove that aggression can be explained, at least in part, with social learning theory, and that similar behaviours were learned by individuals shaping their own behaviour after the actions of models.⁴⁹

Social learning theory assumes that people are shaped by their environment, and that people learn by observing others. SLT explains human behaviour in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioural, and environmental influences.⁵⁰ Social learning theory outlines four requirements for people to learn and model behaviour: first, attention - the observer must pay attention to the modeled behaviour; second, is retention - the observer must remember what she or he observed; third, reproduction – the observer must have the ability to reproduce the

⁴⁷ <http://www.muskingum.edu/~psych/psycweb/history/bandura.htm> - accessed 8/03/11

⁴⁸ The Bobo doll experiment was conducted by Albert Bandura in 1961 to study the patterns of behaviour associated with aggression. The experiment involved 36 boys and 36 girls from the Stanford University Nursery School ranged between the ages of 3 and 6. The children were split into 3 groups of 24. One group was put into an aggressive model scenario with half of that group observing a same-sex adult model and half observing a different-sex adult model. Another group was exposed to a non-aggressive adult model and the final group would be used as a control group and would not be exposed to any adult model at all. During the aggressive model scenario, the model would begin by playing with the toys for approximately one minute. Then the adult began to show aggression towards the Bobo doll, such as hitting the doll. After a period of about 10 minutes, the experimenter came back into the room, dismissed the adult model, and took the child into another playroom. The non-aggressive adult model simply played with the small toys for the entire 10 minute-period. In this situation, the Bobo doll was completely ignored by the model then the child was taken out of the room. Bandura found that the children exposed to the aggressive model were more likely to act in physically aggressive ways than those who were not exposed to the aggressive model.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Bandura (1977), 16-17

behaviour; and, fourth, motivation – the observer must have good reason to want to adopt the behaviour.⁵¹ Bandura based his findings on a series of lab based research and clinical studies.⁵²

Lab and clinical studies lead to the conclusion that learning occurs on the basis of three interrelated processes: One, the highest level of observational learning is achieved by first organizing and rehearsing the modeled behavior symbolically and then enacting it overtly. If observers imagine themselves imitating the behaviour, then they are more likely to recall how to model the behaviour successfully. In this view, coding modeled behavior into words, labels or images, such as writing or film, results in better retention than simply observing. Two, individuals are more likely to adopt a modeled behavior if it results in outcomes they value. This principal places an emphasis on positive and negative reinforcements for behaviour. And, three, individuals are more likely to adopt a modeled behavior if the model is similar to the observer and has admired status and the behavior has functional value.⁵³

To summarize, there are two roles in SLT- the model and the observer. In the first stage of social learning, the observer pays attention to the behaviour of the model. The observer then forms a memory of this behaviour. At an appropriate time the observer is able to engage the memory of the behaviour and imitate it. SLT emphasizes the importance of motivation in behaviour imitation.⁵⁴ Observers will imitate behaviour only if they are motivated to do so. Motivation is affected by several key factors such as belief in positive or negative consequences of the behaviour. Observers form their assumptions regarding the consequences of the behaviour based on

⁵¹ <http://tip.psychology.org/bandura.html> - accessed 8/03/11

⁵² Bandura bases his findings on his own research, as well as the research of others that was completed with patients in the wards of mental facilities, as well as lab studies in which subjects were brought into laboratories with the specified purpose of participation in the study.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Formal formulas for SLT can be found in, Rotter, 302

observed consequences of the model's behaviour. Further, the model does not need to be within the physical environment of the observer. Bandura explains, "Through verbal and imagined symbols people process and preserve experiences in representational forms that serve as guides for future behaviour."⁵⁵ Thus, the written word and film can also serve as models in SLT.

Another important aspect of SLT is the recognition of adaptability of modeled behaviours and expected outcomes in similar but different situations. Julian Rotter explains:

It is hypothesized in social learning theory that when a person perceives two situations as similar, then his or her expectancies for a particular kind of reinforcement, or class of reinforcements, will generalize from one situation to another...Expectancies in each situation are determined not only by specific experiences in that situation, but also, to some varying extent, by experiences in other situations which the individual perceives as similar.⁵⁶

Bandura further explains this aspect of SLT:

When exposed to diverse models, observers rarely pattern their behaviour exclusively after a single source, nor do they adopt all the attributes even of preferred models. Rather, observers combine aspects of various models into new amalgams that differ from the individual sources. Different observers adopt different combinations of characteristics.⁵⁷

Thus, SLT can be used not just to examine decisions and actions that mimic exactly the decisions and actions of previous genocidal leaders, but also allow for adaptation of the model's actions to the imitator's specific situation. This adaptation is seen in the speed of the Rwandan genocide. Samantha Powers comments, "the Rwandan genocide would prove to be the fastest, most efficient killing spree of the twentieth century."⁵⁸ In order to achieve this speed, the Rwandan genocidaires needed to adapt the previous methods used by genocidal leaders to meet their own recognized goals.

⁵⁵ Bandura (1977), 13

⁵⁶ Ibid., 304

⁵⁷ Bandura (1977), 48

⁵⁸ Samantha Powers, A Problem From Hell: America and the Age of Genocide (New York, Perennial, 2002) 334

Karen E. Hart and William Allan Kritsonis criticized SLT for favouring the nurture side of the nature versus nurture debate.⁵⁹ Hart et al point out that the ninety-six children used in the Bobo doll experiment all came from the nursery school at Stanford University in the early 1960's. These children would mostly have been from white middle class families with intelligent parents. Hart et al point to the selection bias and claim that the children in the study would have mostly enjoyed a natural intellect. While SLT assumes the innate ability of people from all backgrounds to learn, it fails to address that people may differ in that innate ability, and this issue was not tested in the laboratory studies by Bandura.

Current SLT theoreticians have responded to the criticisms by testing the theory to show how cognitive elements work in creating expectancies about outcomes, and how these serve as incentives and reinforcements for committing modeled acts.⁶⁰ SLT as it is currently applied in studies is able to successfully account for the cognitive processes that occur by the observer when ingesting the message by controlling the variants of the studies and, thus, better isolating causal factors of the outcomes. Since SLT focuses solely on learning methods it is appropriate for this thesis as my aim is to examine the learning process of genocidal leaders, by examining how genocidal leaders imitate other genocide models and, then, in turn, model the behaviour they wish the public to imitate in fulfilling their genocidal policy.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Karen E. Hart and William Allan Kritsonis, "*Critical Analysis of an Original Writing on Social Learning Theory: Imitation of Film Mediated Models By Albert Bandura, Dorethea Ross, and Sheila A. Ross*". In *National Forum of Applied Education Research Journal* vol.20 (3) 2006 p.p.1-7

⁶⁰ M, Hogben. And D. Byrne "*Using Social Learning Theory to Explain Individual Differences in Human Sexuality*" in *The Journal of Sex Research* (1998) 35(1) p.p. 58-71

⁶¹ Other theorists that have successfully applied SLT to recent research include; K. Ayal and A.M. Ruben., "*Viewer Aggression and Homphily: Identification and Parasocial Relationships with Television Characters*", in *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* (2003) 47(1) p.p. 77-88; and M. Rich, E.R. Woods, E. Goodman, S.J. Emans, and R.H. DuRant. "*Aggressors or Victims: Gender and Race in Music Video Violence*" in *Pediatrics* (1998) 101(4) p.p. 669- 674

While SLT will be employed to analyze the learning process of the regime leaders, Raul Hilberg's theory on the *Destruction process* offers valuable insight into the step by step process of genocide, which he defines as an administrative process, with an administrative pattern, and a administrative objective with organized and goal directed tasks. Each step in the process allows for the administrative continuity for the next step.⁶² A preliminary requirement of genocide is activities undertaken by community leaders which are designed to create the climate in which the destruction of [a specific group] can take place.⁶³ Though Hilberg is specifically referring to the case of the Jews, I will generalize his theory to include the two other cases – the Armenian and Rwandan cases - included in this study. I will then proceed to show that the similarities in administrative policies and processes from one genocide to the next stems in part from genocidal leaders learning from previous ones.

Hilberg describes four stages of the destruction process: definition, expropriation, concentration and annihilation. In the definition phase the target group is identified as the enemy and defined. In the expropriation phase victims experience the deprivation of their professions and the ability to make a living, as well as their access to education and other societal benefits. This phase is also inclusive of decrees against mixed marriages. Expropriation is often done through legislation, decrees, special taxations and regulations.⁶⁴ Hilberg explains that, while expropriation is not necessary for the destruction of the target group, it is often employed for the preservation of the economy. In the concentration stage the target population is concentrated in

⁶² Raul Hilberg. The Destruction of the European Jews Vol. I, 3rd Ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003) 50

⁶³ Hilberg, 50

⁶⁴ Ibid., 79. Further, Hilberg explains that the Destruction process is an organized undertaking with organized and goal directed tasks. Each step in the process allows for the administrative continuity for the next step. For more information on the Destruction process read Hilberg The Destruction of the European Jews Vol. I, 3rd Ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003) 50

one area. The Armenians were concentrated in railway cars, caves, and camps in the desert. The Jews were concentrated in ghettos, and labour and death camps in Europe. The Tutsis were concentrated in schools and churches in Rwanda. Concentration is the transition stage. It is about the preparation for the final phase – annihilation. Annihilation, Hilberg points out, is followed by confiscation of the personal effects of the victim group.⁶⁵ Hilberg's theory is useful for this thesis from the standpoint that these four phases are not accidental, but deliberate and planned by genocidal leaders. The three genocides examined in this thesis followed this pattern. The transfer of information can be seen through Hilberg's theory in table 1.1.

Like Hilberg, Irving Staub's theory also offers a practical tool to chart genocide as it develops. However, Staub focuses mainly on the psychological factors of individuals in a society as they are being prepared to engage in genocide.⁶⁶ For ease, I have distinguished Staub's theory into four categories: Cultural preconditions, psychological conditions, provocation, and the role of bystanders. Cultural preconditions comprise military strength and international power of the state, a population's orientation to authority, the institutionalized devaluation of a group, nationalistic ideology, and the living conditions of the population.⁶⁷ Psychological conditions refer to the overarching state of mind of individuals within the dominant group.⁶⁸ The third category addresses the belief that the target group is provoking a violent response from the dominant group by resisting repression and violence. Provocation may be perceived when the target group agitates through public protest and organization. Any defensive action of the sub-

⁶⁵ Raul Hilberg. The Destruction of the European Jews Vol. III, 3rd Ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003) 1065

⁶⁶There has already been much research on the psychology of genocidaires, and societies that engage in genocide, inclusive of Steven K. Baum's *The Psychology of Genocide: Perpetrators, Bystanders, and Rescuers*, and Donald G. Dutton's *The Psychology of Genocide, Massacres, and Extreme Violence: Why "normal" people come to commit atrocities*

⁶⁷ Staub, 173-181

⁶⁸ Ibid., 38-43

group is used as justification for violent reaction ranging from small scale pogroms to complete annihilation of the target group.⁶⁹ Finally, bystanders play an important role in the development and occurrence of genocide and, thus, will be examined in detail in the last chapter of my thesis. According to Staub, bystanders fail to recognize, or deny, the importance of their behaviour.⁷⁰ The bystanders support, opposition, or indifference will greatly shape the course of events.⁷¹ A lack of protest from bystanders will act to confirm the perpetrators' faith in their actions.⁷²

Staub's theory will be employed to assist in the identification of the societal factors that make genocidal policies a viable option for regime leaders. Staub's theory will show if, and how, the response of international organizations encouraged the genocidal policy of the leaders by ignoring instances of violence, threats of extermination, and intelligence on the creation of plans to proceed with genocide, thereby acting as reinforcement for the behaviour and bringing momentum to the genocidal process. Inaction on the part of international institutions is tantamount to bystander support.

To date there has been significant academic research on genocide that uses an inside view.⁷³ This research has focused on the perpetrators, the victims and their history together, as well as the effects of the socio-political environment, while considering war as a catalyst. Many

⁶⁹ Ibid., 178

⁷⁰ Ibid., 87

⁷¹ Ibid., 20

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ See; African Rights, Death, Despair and Defiance (London: African Rights, 1995); Christopher C. Taylor, Sacrifice as Terror: The Rwandan Genocide of 1994, (New York: Berg, 1999) ; Gourevitch, Philip We Wish to Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed with Our Families: Stories From Rwanda, (New York: Picador, 1998); Jones, Bruce, D. Peacemaking in Rwanda: The Dynamics of Failure (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.); and, Straus, Scott. The Order of Genocide: Race Power, and War in Rwanda (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), among many others.

studies and investigations attempt to determine the warning signs and causes of genocide.⁷⁴ However, the passing of information from one genocide to the next, and the effect that has had, has been often implied without an in-depth analysis of the impact this has on the genocidal process. My thesis will consider genocide using an “outside in” approach by focusing on the outside factors that determine the environment in which genocide develops. The investigation seeks to demonstrate that genocides are planned, and that the knowledge of how to initiate genocide is not intuitive.

Genocide is a process. How do genocidaires learn the steps that must be taken, and the stages that must be achieved in order to realize that process? Do genocidaires accidentally stumble upon these steps through trial and error? Is genocide a mere case of unfortunate coincidences or happenstance? Or, is genocide conceived as a viable solution to a problem, thought through, thoroughly planned, and then step by step, stage by stage, implemented? Do genocidal leaders learn to commit genocide through the modeling and imitation of previous genocides? Is aggression contagion through media a factor in generating broad public support for genocidal policies and practices?

If it is true that genocidal leaders are learning from previous genocides, then genocide, even when perfectly contained within a state, is a threat to international peace and security because one genocide sets the stage for the next genocide. Moreover, the previous actions of outside forces affect whether or not genocide will occur in a state, and how it will occur. In each of the three cases of genocide discussed in this thesis, the international community responded

⁷⁴ See, Staub, Ervin. The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); and, Redekop, Vern Neufeld From Violence to Blessing: How an Understanding of Deep-Rooted Conflict Can Open Paths to Reconciliation (Ottawa: Novalis, 2002), among others.

ineffectively. My goal for the thesis is to identify if regime leaders learn genocide by imitating the models demonstrated to them by previous genocidal regime leaders. I intend to achieve this using a case study approach with a qualitative methodology. A clear understanding of the role of the social learning process of genocide leaders in past genocides will provide a framework for recognizing a genocidal process while it is in the learning stages, as well as interrupting the teaching process that occurs between the leaders and the population. New models can be offered. It is my goal in this thesis to present a better understanding of how the world can, and ought to, respond prior to genocide and in the aftermath of genocide in order to prevent future genocides.

Research Design

The case study is a methodology based on in-depth investigation that examines a phenomenon within its real-life context as opposed to clinical research done within a lab. In the course of this research the case study analysis offers insight into the decision making process, and allows me to cross reference and pull out the common themes and features of the genocides. Once those common themes and features are identified I can recognize if there are examples of modeling and imitation and other features of SLT. In the process of this research I will be amassing data collected from the case studies of the three genocides being examined, and then situating the data on the theoretical framework of SLT. This methodology will be useful to test my hypothesis that knowledge of the actions of previous genocides inform and assist leaders in the planning and perpetration of genocide. The analysis of the cases studied through SLT will seek to determine if there was information learned about other genocidal campaigns and if so, if it had an effect on the development of the genocidal process. I will then draw correlations to the knowledge obtained by the intellectual architects of the Jewish and Rwandan genocides, and the actions those leaders choose to take in light of that knowledge. In other words, the focus of the

case studies will be the political leaders who held power in a state prior to and throughout genocide. The goal of the comparison will be to see if there are any commonalities, patterns of action, themes in justification and distinguishing features of the genocide, as well as to highlight the conditions, processes, facilitators, inhibitors and key factors of the international involvement.

The first genocide, the genocide of the Armenians by the Young Turks must, by all accounts, except those considered on humanitarian grounds, be considered a complete success. The Young Turks, officially called the *Committee of Union and Progress*, seized power in the Ottoman Empire in a 1909 revolution from the monarchy of Ottoman Sultan. Mehmed Talaat, also known as Talaat Pasha, was the Minister of Interior Affairs. Talaat, as minister of the interior, holds much of the responsibility for the deportation of the Armenians from the empire's eastern provinces to Syria. Enver Bey, was a Turkish military officer and a leader of the Young Turk revolution. He was the main leader of the Ottoman Empire in both Balkan Wars and World War I. He introduced a military dictatorship that came to be called the Three Pashas - Enver Pasha, Talaat Pasha, and Cemal Pasha. However, according to the American Ambassador Henry Morgenthau, the Ambassador for the United States stationed in Turkey in 1915, Cemal was merely a figure head with no real power or authority.⁷⁵ At the time of the Armenian genocide Enver was the Minister of War. Morgenthau places the blame for the genocidal policy against the Armenians with Talaat and Enver.

After admitting to Morgenthau that over three quarters of the Armenians had been “already disposed of”, Talaat Pasha explained, “The hatred between the Turks and the Armenians is now so intense that we have to finish with them. If we don’t, they will plan their

⁷⁵ Henry Morgenthau. Ambassador Morgenthau’s Story (Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1919)

revenge.”⁷⁶ Talaat concluded by stating to Morgenthau, “I have asked you to come here so as to let you know that our Armenian policy is absolutely fixed and that nothing can change it.”⁷⁷ After World War I Turkey’s borders were initially reduced, but within four years were given back to her fully intact. No land was given to the few surviving Armenians to make a home of their own outside the governance of the Turks. Through its own program Turkey had been able to clear out over 90% of the Armenians. Most of the survivors fled through the Russian borders. Turkey was not required to give any compensation to the surviving Armenians, either for loss of their land, or of their families. Finally, there were no international consequences for the genocide. The International community did not impose any punishment on the state for the genocidal activities of its leaders or its people. Dickran Boyajian charges that once the war was over, the Armenians were quickly forgotten and abandoned by the world.⁷⁸ This abandonment of the Armenians was famously noted by Hitler in a speech to his Military commanders. In encouraging a ruthless approach towards the Jews, Poles and Slavs, Hitler stated, “Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians? The world believes in success only.”⁷⁹ The Armenian genocide is the first mass extermination to have been thoroughly documented by international agents in the country inclusive of the American ambassador Morgenthau who opposed the action, but was visibly helpless to prevent it, as well as German consuls who reported back to Germany with much interest what was happening in the country.⁸⁰

⁷⁶ Ibid. See chapters 24, 25 and 26

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Dickran Boyajian, Armenia: The Case for a Forgotten Genocide (Westwood: Educational Book Crafters, 1972)

⁷⁹ As quoted in Boyajian, p. 311

⁸⁰ The Armenian genocide was documented as it occurred through dispatches from the many German consuls, Vice-consuls and military personnel, telegrams, letters and eyewitness accounts from the many American and Canadian missionaries in the country, as well as the accounts given by Henry Morgenthau.

The Holocaust is the best known and most comprehensively studied genocide of the twentieth century.⁸¹ Aairy Neave, author of the Neave report describes the final solution for the Jews as both deliberate, and carefully planned.⁸² Konrad Heiden notes in his introduction to *Mein Kampf* that before the outbreak of the Second World War Germany had the largest reading public of any country in the world.⁸³ Further, the Holocaust is the first genocide to which the international community through the newly created United Nations (UN) had to officially respond. In its response to the Holocaust, the UN created the 1948 UNCG. Thus, the overall effectiveness of the UN response and how that response informed future genocides is worthy of examination.

The case of Rwanda is significant because, despite initial appearances, this was a very well planned and efficient genocide that occurred following an internationally compelled peace agreement, the Arusha Accords, under the very watch of the UN. With a mission force on the ground, the UN was fully present in the days leading up to, and throughout, the genocide of the Tutsis and moderate Hutus by the Hutu extremists. Despite the UN presence in Rwanda, the regime leaders carried out their genocide with utmost confidence that there would be no interference from outside. Further, they were correct in this assumption.

An abundant literature and scholarship exist on the three genocides covered in this thesis. In choosing secondary material to be included in my research I focused mainly on those sources

⁸¹ One can peruse most library data bases to find hundreds of volumes written on the holocaust. However, books on other genocides will be found to a much smaller degree. In addition, the Nazi regime left aa abunbant amount of documents that assist scholars in the research of this genocide

⁸² Airey Neave. Nuremberg: A Personal Record of the Trial of the Major War Criminals in 1945-6 (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978) 326. This book is an autobiographical account of Aairy Neave's experiences dealing with the defendants during the Nuremberg Trials where he was assigned to the British War Crimes Team at Nuremberg

⁸³ Konrad Heiden, "*Introduction*" in Adolf Hitler. Mein Kampf. Trans. Ralph Manheim (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1943) xii

that were most commonly cited by other academics. In addition to examining the most prominent and current literature on the three genocides', I have examined archival documents at the *United States Holocaust Memorial Museum* in Washington, DC.⁸⁴ Moreover, every opportunity to read primary resources, such as autobiographies of genocidal leaders and other important figures has been taken advantage of. The transcripts from the Nuremberg trial records recording the testimony of key Nazi figures has also been carefully read.⁸⁵ While proving conclusively that the leaders of these genocides specifically studied previous genocides is not possible in this thesis due to time and resource constraints, this thesis will seek to demonstrate, through utilization of the resources available, that the evidence clearly suggests that genocidal leaders did learn from each other. A series of interviews with leaders of the Rwandan genocide who are currently serving out prison sentences in Africa would be beneficial in furthering this research at the PhD level.

The next chapter of this thesis focuses on the learning and teachings of the leading politicians of the three genocides. What did the Young Turks base their strategy on when planning the genocide of the Armenians? What did the Nazi leadership know about the Armenian genocide by the Young Turks? Is there evidence to suggest that the Hutu leaders imitated the Holocaust? In this section I pay particular attention to the inter-connection between genocides at the international and inter-governmental level.

While Chapter Two focused on how political leaders teach genocide and learn genocide, Chapter Three will examine the societal teaching of genocide. What incentives were used? What social verification techniques were employed? This section includes the use of laws and decrees

⁸⁴ Trip to Washington, D.C. took place from 28 November, 2010, – 1 December, 2010

⁸⁵ Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal vol. 1-22 (Nuremberg, Germany, 1947)

to legitimize violence and marginalize the target segment of the population. Bandura states, “There is considerable evidence that supports the theory that hurtful aggression can be enhanced, sustained and eliminated simply by altering the consequences.”⁸⁶ In the genocides discussed, laws and decrees were used to alter the consequences of violence and enable public participation in that violence. Further, Chapter Three will consider the role of the media and the use of propaganda, not just to teach and condition citizens to commit genocide, but also to prevent outside interference. Bandura explains, “Since large audiences in widely dispersed areas can be reached simultaneously through symbolic modelling, the aggression contagion potential of media presentations is greater than that of direct behavioural modelling.”⁸⁷ Thus, if media is an important teaching tool, it is worthy of examination within the context of this thesis.

The final chapter of this thesis will discuss the very important role of bystanders within the framework of Social Learning Theory. How did the genocidal leaders know that the international community would turn a blind eye to the atrocity occurring within their borders? What did the League of Nations reaction to the genocide of the Armenians by the Young Turks in 1915 tell the Nazi regime as it planned the Holocaust? In the same way, what did the reaction of the UN to both the Holocaust and its aftermath tell the Habyarimana regime in Rwanda as it planned the Rwandan genocide of 1994? How did they know how to respond to international inquiries into the situation so as to prevent intervention? The case study analysis through the lens of SLT will show leaders of that the Hutu extremists were shown how to respond by the Turks and the Nazis, and that they knew that there would be no intervention based on the modeled examples of the Armenian genocide and the Holocaust.

⁸⁶ Bandura, (1973) 136

⁸⁷ Ibid., 73. While here Bandura is referring to the effect media can have on human aggression, I am placing this generalized understanding of the effect media can have on human aggression within the context of genocide.

Chapter Two:

Modeling Leadership in Genocide

“War is a dreadful disorder in which the culprits of genocide can plot incognito.”

- **Alphonse Hitiyaremye, a Rwandan Genocidaire**

In Jean Hatzfeld, *Machete Season: The Killers of Rwanda speak* (2003)

“Well-educated people, leading professionals of one society after the next, together with those looking up to them, have closed ranks in a community of murderous consent.”

Daniel Goldhagen

In Worse Than War: Genocide Eliminationism, and the ongoing Assault on Humanity
(2010) p. 400

In a 1915 dispatch from Turkey to Germany vice consul Max Erwin von Scheubner-Richter, who later acted as one of the founding members of the Nazi party, wrote, “Only a violent eradication policy, a violent annihilation of the entire people, could enable the Turkish government thereby to achieve the desired goal: The ‘solution’ of the Armenian question.”¹ On 31 July, 1941, Nazi leader Herman Goring sent an order to the head of the security service, Reinhard Heydrich charging him with the organization of the final solution to the Jewish question.² Philip Gourevitch claims that in 1994 the term “final solution” was frequently used by proponents of Hutu power.³ As this study will demonstrate there are many key similarities in the phrasing, planning, execution and justification for genocides.

In the story of his experience in Turkey during the worst phase of the Armenian genocide, United States Ambassador Henry Morgenthau informs us of the most common justifications for the Turkish policy towards the Armenians. “The Armenians brought this fate upon themselves;” “They had a fair warning of what would happen to them;” “We were fighting for our national existence;” “We have no time to separate the innocent from the guilty;” and “The only thing we have on our mind is to win the war.”⁴ Morgenthau comments in 1919, “These phrases somehow have a familiar ring, do they not?”⁵ Indeed they do! And why they sound so familiar, ninety-two years, and two more genocides after Morgenthau made the observation and asked the question, is the reason for this study.

¹Turkei 183/139 A28 584 10 August, 1915. Reproduced in Dadrian, 80

² Neave, 67

³ Gourevitch., 94

⁴ Morgenthau, 364

⁵ At this time Morgenthau was referring specifically to how Germany handled the people of conquered areas in war, or as he phrased it, “the German attitude towards the subject of his peoples” (p.365). Morgenthau points out that Germany used these exact justifications to explain their policy towards Belgium, France, and Austria “for the past four years.” We can infer from Morgenthau’s next sentence: “to what degree this movement of populations has taken place we shall not know until the end of the war,” that Morgenthau is referring to the four years preceding 1915. P.365

Goldhagen explains that to initiate an eliminationist assault, political leaders must first mobilize or create institutions for expulsions and killing, devise procedures for selecting and apprehending victims and find people to do the work of mass murder.⁶ Goldhagen states, “The most virulent hatred...does not result in systematic slaughter unless political leaders mobilize and organize those who hate into a program of killing.”⁷ Thus, political leaders are responsible for developing a genocidal policy and then setting that policy in motion. Where could these politicians have gotten such a wild idea?

Rotter informs us that in SLT the unit of investigation for the study of personality is the interaction of the individual with his or her environment.⁸ Therefore, in order for the Nazi and Hutu extremist leaders to know how to engage this use of language, such as the “final solution,” or employ these justifications, there must have been something, or someone in these leaders’ environments to inform them, or model this for them.

Bandura tells us, “Behaviour is learned symbolically through central processing of response information before it is performed.”⁹ According to Bandura in order for people to learn from a model when the model is not present to provide direction, the information modeled in the response patterns must be represented in memory in symbolic form.¹⁰ “Through the medium of symbols, transitory modeling experiences can be maintained in permanent memory.”¹¹ There are two representational systems – imaginal and verbal. Imaginal is inclusive of the written word,

⁶ Goldhagen, 31. Also see note 7 on p.3 for reference to Goldhagen and Browning debate regarding accountability of perpetrators.

⁷ Ibid., 69

⁸ Rotter, 317

⁹ Bandura (1977), 35

¹⁰ Ibid., 25

¹¹ Bandura (1977), 25

picture symbols, film, and other visual cues.¹² In Bandura's model, "observers, who code modeled activities into words, concise labels, or vivid imagery, learn and retain behaviour better than those who simply observe."¹³ An example of this would be directions on how to build an IKEA shelf. A person buys the shelf, and then, following the written directions, is able to put the shelf together without having the benefit of visually witnessing it being done. The written directions act as the model which the observer must imitate. The observer is able to transfer the written word into an imagined visual image and then imitate it. In SLT the verbal representation system is described as the verbal coding of modeled events. Actions can be described without being witnessed and then used to direct behaviour. The example Bandura gives is verbal driving directions. Information on how to model a behaviour that guides the observer from A to B is given verbally. The imitator is then able to follow the directions and successfully move from A to B without having physically witnessed the model driving the route. Bandura explains that use of this type of model is as important as physical models.¹⁴

People guide their actions based on previous understanding of the consequences to the actions rather than relying on direct results to tell them what they ought to do.¹⁵ For example, people allow their behaviour to be guided by the understanding that playing on the highway is dangerous, rather than playing on the highway, getting seriously hurt or killed, and then coming to the conclusion that playing on the highway is a bad idea. Further, by observing different outcomes people are able to develop hypothesis about which responses are most appropriate in which circumstance. Following the previous example, one may observe someone playing on the highway at 3 AM when there are no cars on the highway and not get hurt, but later observe

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., 26

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid., 35

someone playing on the highway during the day and get hit by a vehicle. The modeled behaviour informs the observer that playing on the highway at night is safe, but playing on the highway during the day is not. In this understanding of the learning process, information gathered serves as a guide for future action. Accordingly, section one of this chapter will examine the symbolic learning of the “final solution” through examples of learning opportunities and clear cases of imitation.

Section two of this chapter will consider the role of motivation in mass murder. In SLT motivation is considered a key component in encouraging or discouraging certain courses of action. Bandura explains, “In the social learning analysis of motivation, incentives also constitute important impellers of action. A great deal of aggression is prompted by its anticipated benefits. Here the instigator is the pull of expected success, rather than the push of aversive treatment.”¹⁶

While the three genocides have many significant similarities in structure and process, there are also important differences, such as the increased use of propaganda by the Nazis and the Hutu extremists, and the failure to exploit the Tutsis for slave labour before killing them. How can these be accounted for if genocide is considered a copy cat crime? To address this, the third section will examine the role of adaptation and innovation in genocidal techniques and process.

While Bandura is being used as the main SLT theorist, Julian Rotter also offered some important contributions to the understanding of Social Learning Theory. Rotter explains,

It is hypothesized in social learning theory that when a person perceives two situations as similar, then his or her expectancies for a particular kind of reinforcement, or class of reinforcements, will generalize from one situation to another...Expectancies in each situation are determined not only by specific

¹⁶ Ibid., 57

experiences in that situation, but also, to some varying extent, by experiences in other situations which the individual perceives as similar.¹⁷

Therefore, in order to help shed light on the role of innovation in genocide planning, Rotter will be used together with Bandura to examine the data.

The final section will discuss what Bandura calls “the neutralization of condemnation.” How do genocidal leaders remove inhibitions, support the genocidal workers, negate outside condemnation, and justify the actions? Was there a script used by all three genocidal leaders? Through examples of Turkish, German, and Rwandan statements, claims, and actions it will be shown that, indeed, the Turks wrote the script, and the Germans and Rwandans followed it almost verbatim.

Symbolic Learning and the Final Solution

According to SLT, most behaviour is learned observationally, either directly or symbolically, through modeling. The observer of the model forms an idea of how new behaviours are performed, and then this information acts as a guide for action. Thus, people learn from example what to do, and when to do it.¹⁸ In this conceptualization of learning, who one associates with, what one reads, and what is happening in one’s environment, all act to educate a person in what one should do in a given situation or when faced with a particular problem, and how one should do it.

In June 1921 Hitler was in Berlin when the trial of Soghomon Tehlirian, an Armenian who lost his family during the genocide, was taking place in that city. Tehlirian was acquitted of

¹⁷ Julian B. Rotter. The Development and Applications of Social Learning Theory (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982) 304

¹⁸ Bandura (1977), 22

the murder of Talaat Bey, one of the chief architects of the Armenian genocide. The story was sensational and received extensive press attention because a known murderer was acquitted on the basis of the suffering imposed on his people and his family by Talaat and the regime he helped lead.¹⁹ Hilmar Kaiser points out that given the press coverage it is impossible that Hitler would have been unaware of the massacres of the Armenians that led the Berlin citizens who made up the jury to acquit Tehlirian.²⁰ However, news coverage was not Hitler's only insight into the Armenian genocide. Hitler had firsthand accounts from key men in his realm of influence who would have had an in depth knowledge and personal experiences of that genocide. Max Erwin von Scheubner-Richter, a German official in Turkey during the Armenian genocide, was one of the most important influences on Hitler in the early days of his political career.

Scheubner entered Hitler's life in 1921 and worked as Hitler's advisor and a key Nazi party strategist. He was considered so important to Hitler that he has often been referred to as "Hitler's man."²¹ However, in 1915 Scheubner worked as German diplomatic personnel. Holding the position of vice-consul in Erzurum, Turkey, Scheubner witnessed first hand the process of genocide, and personally experienced the impotence of outsiders to intervene. In one of the many comprehensive reports Scheubner submitted to German authorities, he recognized the extermination of the Armenians as part of a national strategy with the goal of creating a pan-Turkish empire. He commented that Turkish leaders took advantage of the war as a suitable moment to implement this plan, and those instances of Armenian resistance had been

¹⁹ Samantha Powers reports that Soghomon Tehlirian assassinated Talaat in broad daylight in Berlin in front of many witnesses with a gun shot in the back of his neck. In Powers, 1 & 17

²⁰ Hilmar Kaiser, "*Historical Introduction*," in Leverkuehn, Paul. *A German Officer During the Armenian Genocide*. trans. Lean, Alasdair (London: Gomidas Institute, 2008) xi

²¹ Kershaw (1999),199

exaggerated and then used as justification for the Armenian slaughter.²² Scheubner explained, “The partisans of Ittihad are unabashedly conceding that their ultimate aim is the total annihilation of the Armenians of Turkey.”²³ As well as Scheubner, Franz von Papen served in Turkey in 1915 as the Chief of Staff for the 4th Turkish Army. He later served Hitler as his vice-Chancellor in 1933, and throughout World War II (WWII) he acted as the Ambassador to Turkey for the Third Reich. Also, as an impressionable teenager Rudolph Hoess was a member of the German forces in Turkey. In 1940 he became commandant of Auschwitz, and, later, in 1944 he became the deputy inspector of all Nazi concentration camps.²⁴

Although the Hutu extremists did not have any direct link to perpetrators of the Holocaust or the Armenian genocide, they did have access to many books and other Nazi paraphernalia that would act as educating models. Bandura explains, “After modeled activities have been transformed into images and readily utilizable verbal symbols, these memory codes serve as a guide for performance.”²⁵ Gourevitch informs us that a movie version of *Mein Kampf*, which would be an imaginal representational system, was found in the wreckage of President Habyarimana’s palace. Barbara Coloroso adds that the Hutu extremists studied *Mein Kampf*. Coloroso clarifies that when the palace in Kigali was seized they found an entire room filled with Hitler memorabilia.²⁶ Bandura states, “With regard to the characteristics of models, those who have high status, competence, and power are more effective in prompting others to behave

²² AA-PA, Turkei 183/45, A 33457, Scheubner-Richter to Bethmann Hollweg, Munchen, Dec. 4, 1916. As found in Kaiser, cx

²³ K170, No. 4674, 28 July. 1915, quoted in Dadrian, 80

²⁴ Coloroso, 23

²⁵ Bandura (1977), 26

²⁶ Coloroso clarified this in an email dated 24/02/11

similarly than are models of lower standing.”²⁷ Hitler was obviously someone whom President Habyarimana and his inner circle admired.

Now we have established that the models existed and that detailed information was available to the genocidal leaders on how to proceed with genocide. However, was the example followed, and the behaviour imitated? Many examples suggest that the answer to that question is a resounding, ‘Yes.’ Goldhagen explains that to have a successful genocide, leaders must identify people to carry out the program. Leaders need to put recruitment procedures in place and then organize the perpetrators within institutions, which are either pre-existing or newly created, and, finally, leaders need to organize access to the victims for the perpetrators.²⁸

All three genocides created special killing organizations to do the work of the genocide, initiated a recruitment program, and organized the participants into the organizations.²⁹ The Turks established the Special Organization, and by 1913 it had an elaborate administrative structure. Kaiser explains that the organization consisted chiefly of clandestine units formed by irregulars. Recruitment for the Special Organization took place amongst pardoned prisoners, or prisoners released for the purpose of joining it, Kurdish and other tribesmen, and other volunteers.³⁰ Members of the Special Organization began attacking Armenian villagers as early as autumn, 1914. Once the process of deportations of the Armenians got fully underway, these bands of killers would wait on the roads and in the hills and then ambush the defenceless Armenians as they were paraded past them, robbing, raping, and murdering them. In Nazi Europe, the *Einsatzgruppen* were roving killing units with its leadership made up from the SS,

²⁷ Bandura (1977), 88

²⁸ Goldhagen, 90

²⁹ A table of the common features shared by the genocidal Regimes, viewed from within the context of Hilberg’s theory of the “Destruction Process” can be found in table 1.1

³⁰ Kaiser, xxxi

the criminal police, the regular German police order, and the Gestapo. With an organizational structure that looked much like a military structure, these roving killing units were responsible for all political security tasks within the operational and rear areas of the army units. Specifically, they were charged with clearing the area of Jews, communists, and other undesirables.³¹ In Rwanda the activities of the *Interahamwe* and their important role has been well documented.³² The *Interahamwe* was initially passed off as a civil-guard style militia to fight the Rwandan Patriotic Front should the Rwandan civil war resume. However, it quickly became clear that the civilians were being organized and trained in units to carry out a much more sinister purpose. Jean-Pierre, General Romeo Dallaire's informant from inside the Hutu extremist camp, told Dallaire that he was horrified to learn that he had been drawn into a plan to create a series of highly efficient death squads.³³

Following Goldhagen's theory, once the killing organizations had been established, access to the victims needed to be organized. In the Armenian, Jewish, and Rwandan genocides this started with the creation of lists to identify the victims. This is visible in the Armenian case with a telegram sent on from the Governor of the Adana region of Turkey sent to the police commissioner on 17 April, 1915 requesting lists of names of all the Armenians who had been arrested, who were yet to be arrested, and who were to be deported.³⁴ Evidence of the creation of lists for the perpetration of the Holocaust is visible in a letter to the Secretary of State from the United States (US) Embassy in Berlin dated 12 October, 1939. The letter reports,

³¹ John Mendelsohn., Ed. The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes, Vol. 10 (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1982) 13, from an affidavit of Otto Ohlendorf dated 24 April, 1947

³² See Dallaire, Gourevitch, Powers, Goldhagen, Coloroso, Hatzfeld, and Midlarsky among others.

³³ Dallaire, 142

³⁴ Boyjian, 320

Considerable uneasiness has been created in the Jewish circles by an order of the police directing the Reich association of the Jews in Germany to complete as quickly as possible a compilation of detailed personal data upon Jews living in the old Reich...It is thought to be of some significance that the police ordered that in various communities the Jews be listed in the alphabetical order of the streets in which they live, thus enabling the police to find them with the least possible delay.³⁵

Dallaire writes in his account of the Rwandan genocide that the informant Jean-Pierre told them that he, and others like him, had been ordered to make lists of Tutsis in their communes. Jean-Pierre expressed his suspicion that the lists were being made with the intention that the Tutsis could be easily rounded up and exterminated when the time came.³⁶ Indeed, that turned out to be correct. The genocidaire Ignace Rukiramacumu told Jean Hatzfeld that when the order to kill came, the authorities began with lists of important figures that had to be killed first, such as teachers and shopkeepers. The list expanded from there.³⁷ The morning after the downing of President Habyarimana's plane, the United Nation Mission in Rwanda (UNAMIR) headquarters started receiving many reports that the Gendarmerie and the Interahamwe were going house to house with lists of names followed by screaming and shots.³⁸

Once the target population was identified, easy access to them was established through gathering and deportation processes. As a witness to the deportations going on from Erzurum, Scheubner recognized them for what they were – a form of mass slaughter. He wrote, “One cannot rule out that the [Armenian] deportees will be murdered en route.”³⁹ Morgenthau reports that in some villages and towns, placards were posted ordering the whole Armenian population to present itself in a public place at an appointed time. The Turkish government asserted to

³⁵ Mendelsohn,, 83

³⁶ Dallaire, 142

³⁷ Hatzfeld, 179

³⁸ Dallaire, 142

³⁹ K168, No.2843, 9 May. 1915, quoted in Dadrian, 80

Morgenthau that the Armenians were being deported to “new homes.”⁴⁰ Morgenthau notes, “The treatment that was given to the convoys clearly shows that extermination was the real purpose of [Ismail] Enver [the war minister], and Talaat.”⁴¹ However, Morgenthau notes that this behaviour - organized mass murder- was new and not Turkish in its origin. “They have understood the uses of murder, but not murder as a fine art.”⁴² Morgenthau goes on to claim that the Turks got this idea of mass murder through deportation, from Germany. “Anyone who reads the literature of Pan-Germany constantly meets it.”⁴³ According to Morgenthau, deportation of resident populations was a common “state policy” of Germany when they occupied foreign territories. He offers the examples of Germany ousting the French from certain parts of France, of Belgians being deported from Belgium, Poles from Poland, and Slavs from Russia.⁴⁴ Morgenthau holds that because Germany was a key ally to Turkey, and had a lot of influence on Turkey at that time; Germany must have suggested the deportation tactic to the Turks.

It has been well documented that, like the Armenians, the Jews were also deported from their homes to ghettos, and ultimately from the ghettos to death camps or to killing sites in which the *einsatzgruppen* would shoot them in mass killing frenzies.⁴⁵ Goldhagen describes how the *einsatzgruppen* would typically round up the Jews of an area in the city square or at its outskirts, bringing the victims to ditches or ravines, and then shooting them in wave after wave. The Jews would show up to the meeting point, often in response to placards notifying them of this requirement.⁴⁶ Due to the incredible speed of the Rwandan genocide, Tutsis from surrounding communes were regularly gathered together in local schools, soccer fields, or even churches

⁴⁰ Morgenthau, 308

⁴¹ Ibid., 318

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid., 366

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ See Goldhagen, Breitman, Coloroso, Hilberg, and Midlarsky, among others

⁴⁶ Goldhagen, 112

where it was traditional for Rwandans to seek sanctuary. Once a large enough group was gathered, the *Interahamwe* ‘*Those that Fight Together*’, and, with local Hutus, would descend on the frightened Tutsis with machetes, clubs, and grenades.

Another commonality amongst the three genocides is the use of war as both a cover for the genocide - to give the world something else to focus its attention on – as well as a excuse to engage in the killing. In an interview, a German Armenian advocate, Dr. Lepsius, told Morgenthau, “Enver told me in so many words that [the Turks] at last had an opportunity to rid themselves of the Armenians and they proposed to use it.”⁴⁷ In a 15 April, 1915, general release letter to governors, mayors, and other town authorities, Talaat and Enver clearly state, “Taking advantage of the freedom which the war has granted us, [the Turkish government] has decided to end that [Armenian] question once and for all, by deporting the Armenians to the deserts of Arabia, exterminating that spurious element, in accordance with the secret order given us.”⁴⁸ In his own memoirs Talaat claims, “any abuses were fairly typical if ‘regrettable’ features of war.”⁴⁹ In the military tribunal case against Ohlendorf and his co-defendants from the *Einsatzgruppen* leadership, the prosecution sums up one of their defence strategies as claiming that the killing of all Jews, inclusive of women and children, was a necessary and proper component of warfare.⁵⁰ Breitman observes, “During the invasion of Poland the *einsatzgruppen* had liquidated thousands of prominent Poles and Jews under the cover of war.”⁵¹ The former Minister of Justice for the Hutu regime, Mbonampeka, who was known to make frequent anti-Tutsi statements on the radio explained, “This was not a conventional war. The enemies were

⁴⁷ Morgenthau

⁴⁸ Boyajian, 319

⁴⁹ As quoted in Coloroso, 36

⁵⁰ Mendelsohn, 16

⁵¹ Breitman, 67

everywhere. The Tutsis were not killed as Tutsis, only as sympathizers of the RPF.”⁵² According to the Turks, the Germans, and the Hutus, the genocide was simply a by-product of war. However, Coloroso notes that war is not a cause of genocide but, rather, a tool of the genocidaires.⁵³ Thus, the use of war in genocide, while not a causal factor, had a demonstrated functional value to the perpetrators.

Bandura explains that the functional value of behaviours displayed by different models is highly influential in determining which models people will observe and which ones they will disregard. An observer’s ability to process the information observed affects how much they will benefit from the observed experience.⁵⁴ The observer must have access to the information and must be guided in its purpose. For example, Scheubner had a clear understanding of what the purpose of the Armenian deportations was, he witnessed how it was implemented, and he was aware of the goals behind it. In September, 1923, Scheubner created for the Nazi party the ‘Action Program for the National Revolution’.⁵⁵ After a meeting with Scheubner on 6 November, 1923, Hitler decided to go ahead with the November Putsch in Munich. During this failed revolution Scheubner and Hitler marched through the streets of Munich with their arms linked tightly together. Scheubner was shot dead when there was an outburst of gunfire and Hitler fell to the ground with him, dislocating his left shoulder.⁵⁶ Scheubner is one of those to whom Hitler dedicated his book, *Mein Kampf*, and, according to Hitler, the only irreplaceable man who was killed that November day.⁵⁷

⁵² Gourevitch, 98

⁵³ Coloroso, 36

⁵⁴ Bandura (1977), 25

⁵⁵ Kershaw (1999), 200

⁵⁶ Ibid., 211

⁵⁷ Jorge Vartparonian, ‘Forward,’ in Leverkuehn, Paul. A German Officer During the Armenian Genocide. trans. Lean, Alasdair (London: Gomidas Institute, 2008)

Still, it is not enough to simply observe behaviour, and how it is done. In SLT outcomes play a vital role in whether or not the behaviour will be modeled. Bandura points out, “Observed outcomes can alter behaviour in their own right in much the same way as directly experienced consequences. As a general rule, seeing behaviour succeed for others increases the tendency to behave in similar ways, while seeing behaviour punished decreases the tendency.”⁵⁸ To address this aspect of social learning and genocide, in the next section we are going to consider the role of motivation as a learning tool in mass murder.

The Role of Motivation in Mass Murder: Looting and Living Space

Bandura explains, “Among the countless responses acquired observationally, those behaviours that seem to be effective for others are favoured over behaviours that are seen to have negative consequences.”⁵⁹ However, observers do not need to witness benefits of the behaviour directly in order to be affected by the benefits the model enjoys. As a result of vicarious reinforcement, observers will increase behaviour that they have seen reinforced for others. Bandura adds, “Observed positive consequences are especially likely to foster adoption of behaviours that have unpleasant aspects and hence, require incentives if they are to be performed.”⁶⁰ Conversely, observing others engaged in enjoyable activities that are ordinarily inhibited by social prohibition, and seeing it go unpunished increases the likelihood of the observer imitating the conduct to the same degree as if they had witnessed the actor being rewarded.⁶¹ Bandura bases this finding on a clinical study in which groups of children observed a

⁵⁸ Bandura (1977), 117

⁵⁹ Bandura (1977), 29

⁶⁰ Ibid., 119

⁶¹ Bandura bases this claim on studies found in Bandura, A. “*Influence of Models’ Reinforcement Contingencies on the Acquisition of Imitative Responses.*” in, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (1965) 1. p.p. 589-595; Walters, R.H., & Parke, R.D. “*Influence of Response Consequences to a Social Model on Resistance to Deviation*” in Journal of Experimental Child Psychology (1964) 1. p.p. 269-280; Walters, R.H. Parke, R.D. & Cane, V.A.

film-mediated model either rewarded, punished, or left without consequences for his action.⁶² Witnessing the reward of unpleasant behaviour increases the likelihood of the behaviour being modeled, and witnessing the failed punishment of socially unacceptable, but enjoyable, behaviour equally increases the likelihood of the behaviour being modeled.

One of the cultural preconditions that Irving Staub recognizes as being essential for a people to engage in genocide is difficult life conditions, inclusive of economic suffering, political instability or violence, and war.⁶³ While all these aspects were are apparent in the three genocides, for the purpose of this discussion on learning through motivation I focus on the issue of economic suffering. While there are many examples of killing for financial gains, for the purpose of this chapter which is looking at modeled examples influencing political decisions, I consider the example of the political decision to solve the problem of over crowding as it is representative of a political problem. Examples of profit as a motivation for killing at a more local level will be discussed in the Chapter Three.

In the three genocides the issue of living space was a going concern.⁶⁴ As seen by the map in table 1.2, before World War I (WWI), Turkey had been steadily losing European territory until its war with Bulgaria between 1911 and 1913 when it lost Greece and it was, in essence,

“Timing of Punishment and the Observation of Consequences to Others as Determinants of Response Inhibition,” in *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* (1965) 2. p.p. 10-30

⁶² In this study Bandura (1965) explains that children in the model-punished condition performed significantly fewer matches than children in both the model-rewarded and no consequences groups. Children in all three treatment conditions were then offered attractive reinforcers contingent on their reproducing the models aggressive responses. Bandura explains that the introduction of the positive incentives completely wiped out the previously observed response differences, revealing an equivalent amount of learning in the model-rewarded, model-punishment, and no consequences group.

⁶³ Staub, 14

⁶⁴ Hitler spoke at length about the need for German expansion of “lebensraum” – “living-space.” Here I am referring to Hitler’s specific conceptualization of the problem, which is the need to increase the area of living and land space for the dominant group. This understanding of the problem of living space was faced by all three genocidal leaders.

purged from Europe.⁶⁵ As a result of the Turkish war with Bulgaria, Turkey lost 83 percent of its European territories, which were of great economic significance, and 69 percent of its population that was living in European territories, were killed or fled to Turkey. As a result the Ottoman Empire was no longer considered 'European'. On the other hand, Bulgaria enlarged its territories by 29 percent, Greece by 68 percent, Montenegro by 62 percent, and Romania by 5 percent. This loss of territory resulted in a large influx of Muslim refugees from outside Turkey's borders. This new influx was compounded by a previous influx of over one million Muslim refugees fleeing to Turkey from Russia as a result of the war of 1877 to 1878.⁶⁶ Despite the movement of large numbers of Greeks returning to Greece as a result of this war, the influx of Muslim refugees created stress on the land and caused tensions between the newly arrived Muslims and the Armenian Christians living in the areas Muslim refugees moved to.⁶⁷ The need to make room for these newly arrived Muslims was a focus of the Turkish authorities and, according to a dispatch at the time from Hitler's man Scheubner, the goal of the program of extermination of the Armenians was to make space for Muslim settlers who had fled from war. Scheubner witnessed bands of Muslims and Kurds moving into the villages and houses of the deported Armenians.⁶⁸ Very often these would be bands of the very people who participated in the attack on the convoy of Armenians. Further, the influx of Armenian wealth into the Turkish coffers was a great welcome to the cash strapped government. Kaiser explains, "The bankrupt government needed Armenians' wealth for financing its demographic program and also the war effort."⁶⁹ To oversee this in a smooth

⁶⁵While Turkey still technically may have some territory in Europe, it is not accepted as a European nation and has had its application for membership in the EU stalled.

⁶⁶ <http://www.turkeyswar.com/prelude/balkanwars3.htm> - accessed 8/03/11

⁶⁷ Ibid., 174

⁶⁸ Kaiser, xlvii

⁶⁹ Ibid., lxxviii

manner special “Liquidation Commissions” were formed to register all Armenian property and transfer it to the state or individual Muslim settlers, and businessmen.⁷⁰

In Hitler’s book, *Mein Kampf*, he complains about the high population density and lack of living space for Germans. In his explanation of a solution to what he deems to be the most important problem facing Germans, he openly ties together the two key elements of his political ideology – the destruction of the Jews, and the acquisition of “lebensraum”- living space.⁷¹ The destruction of “Jewish Bolshevism” would result in the acquisition of the much needed German living space. Staub points out that this promise of material well-being in the form of increased living space was one of the main reasons for his popular appeal among the German public.⁷² In the legal process of removing Jews from society, Jews were forced to sell their businesses and property at greatly reduced prices. In his now infamous August, 1939 speech to his Generals, Hitler not only linked the acquisition of land to genocide, but he also linked the action of the Turks against the Armenians with impunity:

I have ordered my death-head units to exterminate without mercy men, women, and children of the Polish race. Only in this way shall we be able to acquire the living space we need. After all, who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?⁷³

A 1991 census from Rwanda paints a bleak picture for those squeezed into the small state. Once reserves and national parks were factored in, Rwanda had a population density of 406 people per square kilometre, the highest population density in mainland Africa.⁷⁴ Rural dwellers

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Hitler (1943), 741-743

⁷² Staub, 98

⁷³ Vartparonian, xiii

⁷⁴ Tor Sellstrom & Lennart Wohlgemuth, Historical Perspective: Some Explanatory Factors, Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda (Uppsala, Sweden: The Nordic Africa Institute, 1996), 16

who counted on the land for survival and prosperity made up 94.6 percent of the population.⁷⁵ Only four percent of Rwandans lived wholly on a cash economy.⁷⁶ For the rural population, more available land directly translated to a better quality of living, while less available land meant increased poverty and even starvation. Under these circumstances competition for land equated to competition for survival. The genocidaire Elie Mizinge tells Hatzfeld in one of his interviews that the farmers greeted rumours of an impending genocide positively, welcoming the opportunity to “free up fields.”⁷⁷ A common refrain amongst all the genocidaires interviewed by Hatzfeld was that the Hutus did not like the Tutsis because there was not enough land. Local authorities consistently profited from the massacres by acquiring Tutsi land and possessions.

In his analysis of aggression through SLT, Bandura states, “In the social learning analysis, defensive aggression is sustained to a greater extent by anticipated consequences than by its instantaneous effect.”⁷⁸ A positive solution to the issue of living space was a major reward, and was thereby, a motivational factor of mass murder. The Turks correctly anticipated the positive resolution of their perceived living space problem through genocide. What is more, in the peace treaties after WWI, Turkey was not made to give up any of this land or compensate surviving Armenians.⁷⁹ This success would have made an impression on Hitler, who in turn employed the same method with reason to believe he could expect the same result. While initially successful, Hitler lost his gains of living space because he lost an international war. While one might think this failure would have the result of acting as an inhibitor for Hutu extremists, it did not. Why it might not is a matter of speculation. However, part of a learning

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 17

⁷⁷ Hatzfeld, 179

⁷⁸ Bandura (1972), 201

⁷⁹ The border of Turkey after WWI under the Treaty of Sevres, and then the Treaty of Lausanne can be seen in figure 1.3

process is recognizing where models went wrong, and improving on it. SLT holds that actions are anticipatory and anticipatory thought encourages foresight in behaviour. If someone planning genocide can anticipate problems, then they can attempt to negate those problems. Innovation in the genocidal process explains the “new and improved” genocide and will be discussed in the next section.

Innovation and Social Learning Theory: The New and Improved Genocide

While the Armenian genocide, from the point of view of the perpetrators, can be held up as a resounding success, the case of the Jewish genocide is not so clear. Although Hilberg notes that the Nazi run killing centers worked quickly and efficiently in the process of mechanized killing, the Germans were not able to achieve the same 90% mortality rate of the target population that the Turks had been able to achieve. The higher number of Jews left alive in Europe resulted in Germany being required to pay compensation, and some of the perpetrators of the crime were hanged as a outcome of the Nuremberg trials. Two things would have changed that outcome for Germany. First, had Germany been able to completely eradicate Europe of its Jews, then there would not have been anyone alive to witness the horror of the Holocaust, make claims on Germany for compensation, or damn conspirators with their testimony and evidence at Nuremberg. Second, had Germany simply won the war they would have been able to achieve their goal of the annihilation of the Jewish people in Europe and, possibly, expanded the destructive policies. Bandura explains:

When better options are lacking and the prohibited behaviour holds some prospect of success, witnessing the failure of others will more likely cause people to refine the disallowed behaviour to improve its chances of success than to be deterred from performing it by the observed reprimands.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Bandura (1977), 121

Both the Turks and the Germans took the opportunity to exploit their victims for forced labour. Before the deportations of the Armenians began in earnest, the Armenian men who belonged in the military were disarmed, segregated into special labour units, and after they had worked, were murdered. Most notably, Armenians were used as forced labour to carry supplies to the front lines, build roads and to work on the Bagdad Railway before being disposed of. It was of concern to Germany that this endeavour not be interrupted by the actions against the Armenians. Morgenthau describes Armenians being forced to work as pack animals: “Army supplies of all kinds were loaded onto their backs and, stumbling under the burdens and driven by the whips and bayonets of the Turks, they were forced to drag their weary bodies into the mountains of the Caucasus.”⁸¹

In his trial at Nuremberg Hans Frank tells the court that forced labour was introduced by him in one of the first decrees he developed for the Nazi state.⁸² Before being exported to concentration camps Jews were used to clear streets of snow, maintain the roads, and dig anti-tank ditches, among other things. By 1941 industrial enterprises set up shop inside the gates of concentration camps in order to extract as much labour from the Jews as possible before their eventual deaths. However, despite the profitable potential of free labour, the use of Tutsis as slave labourers is noticeably absent from the Rwandan genocide. The answer as to why that might be is found in the breathtaking speed in which the Hutu genocidaires conducted their genocide. While, the Armenian genocide and the Holocaust occurred over a period of years, the Hutus had only months. Figures estimate that approximately 1,400,000 Armenians were killed

⁸¹ Morgenthau, 302

⁸² Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal vol. 12 (Nuremberg, Germany, 1947)
15

due to Turkish policy between 1915 and 1918.⁸³ In Europe an estimated 6,000,000 Jews were murdered as a result of the Nazi extermination policy. And yet in a matter of one hundred days the Hutus were able to kill between 800,000 and 1,000,000 Tutsis. Gourevitch points out that this is three times the speed of the Holocaust stating, “It was the most efficient mass killing since the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.”⁸⁴ Further, not only were the Hutus able to implement genocide at an extremely rapid rate, they did it on a shoe string budget and without the technical advantages of Nazi Germany. The genocidaire Jean-Baptiste Murangira tells how on the first day of the genocide the Burgomaster, along with all the authorities in the commune, gathered all the Hutu men together and lectured them in advance, threatening anyone who bungled the job. “The only regulation was to keep going till the end, maintain a satisfactory pace, spare no one, and loot what we found.”⁸⁵

Bandura explains, “Through a process of abstract modeling, observers derive the principles underlying specific performances for generating behaviour that goes beyond what they have seen or heard.”⁸⁶ If the Holocaust’s biggest flaw, from a perpetrator’s point of view, was that it failed to exterminate all the Jews, thereby leaving the genocidaires vulnerable to prosecution, the best solution would be to make sure there were no survivors. Fortunately for the Tutsis who managed to survive by hiding through the genocide, lightning fast was not fast enough. Even at this speed the Hutus were unable to kill all their Tutsi neighbours before the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) took control of the country and ended the genocide. Like the

⁸³ Coloroso, xii , Estimates on numbers killed in genocides are not exact because of the nature of the crime. Holocaust estimates can range from 5 to 8 million; however 6 million is the generally accepted number. In the case of Armenians the range is usually between 1, 400 ,000 – 1, 500, 000

⁸⁴ Gourevitch, 3

⁸⁵ Hatzfeld, 15

⁸⁶ Bandura (1977), 40 – Bandura bases this claim on a study in which observers were tested under conditions where they could behave stylistically similar to the model’s disposition, but were unable to imitate it exactly because they were required to apply what they had learned to new or unfamiliar situations.

Nazis, the Hutus left witnesses alive who were able to denounce them in court trials. This failure was not lost on the genocidaires themselves. Elie tells Hatzfeld, “In prison and on the hills everyone is obviously sorry. But most of the killers are sorry they didn’t finish the job. They accuse themselves of negligence rather than wickedness.”⁸⁷ Bandura explains, “By attending to the pattern of successes and failures of others, observers generally learn faster than do the performers themselves. This is especially true if the tasks depend more heavily on conceptual than on manual skills.”⁸⁸

Innovative learning allows the observer to project beyond the observed behaviours. In this way models not only teach specific lessons, but also generalizable ones. “From observing the behaviour of others one can learn general strategies that provide guides for actions that go well beyond the specific modeled examples.”⁸⁹ Thus, the consideration for the observer is not only “what did he do?” but also, “What would he do were he in my situation?”

As noted earlier, knowledge that the positive outcome is a result of a specific behaviour will increase its likelihood of reoccurring. The greater the knowledge is, the stronger the reinforcement can be. However, positive reinforcement is not enough to guarantee a behaviour. People will resist accepting innovations that violate their social and moral conventions. Bandura explains that to circumvent resistance social influence must be utilized to lead people to behave in otherwise personally devalued ways. SLT holds that this is achieved through diffusion strategies that circumvent negative self-sanction.⁹⁰ How this is achieved at the domestic societal

⁸⁷ Hatzfeld, 163

⁸⁸ Bandura (1972), 122

⁸⁹ Ibid.,85

⁹⁰ Ibid., 53

level is the topic of Chapter Three; however the neutralization of condemnation at the national level is the topic of the next section of this chapter.

The Neutralization of Condemnation

In his analysis of aggression through SLT, Bandura explains that people will engage in those behaviours that allow them to experience self-satisfaction and feelings of self-worth. Conversely, people will refrain from engaging in those behaviours that result in self-criticism or other self-devaluative consequences.⁹¹ Most individuals are educated in a general prohibition against cold-blooded murder, including political leaders. Hitler was a vegetarian because he did not agree with the need to kill animals for sustenance. At the peak of the Jewish genocide Goebbels recorded that Hitler found meat eating barbaric.⁹² So how do the leaders justify genocide to themselves? How do they overcome that risk of self-condemnation? And, finally, are they copying each other in the means of achieving a sense of inner peace while at the same time engaging in the murder of whole societies?

One of the first methods of removing the risk of self-condemnation in social learning that Bandura discusses is the slighting of aggression through an advantageous comparison of one's aggressive actions with more hideous deeds of others. Bandura explains, "Justification of aggression by comparison to outrageous acts is one of the more effective methods for making violence acceptable because it redefines behaviour in positive terms rather than relying on

⁹¹ Bandura bases this claim on a comparative study found in Bandura, A. & Walters, R.H. Adolescent Aggression (New York: Ronald Press, 1959). He adds "Studies of subgroups in which aggression is rewarded as emulative behaviour similarly report a high incidence of self-reward for inhumane actions. In the Nazi regime, under which horrific massacres were politically sanctioned, commandants of extermination camps felt tremendous pride when they surpassed the kill rates of other crematoria." Bandura (1973), 207 Eichmann who confessed the death lists were his favorite reading before sleep is given as an example of this behaviour. Bandura (1973) 207

⁹² Goebbels mentions this in his 1939-1941 diaries in which he recounts a dinner conversation with Hitler.

disguises of purpose or personal responsibility.”⁹³ In each of the three genocides at hand, initial organized assaults on the target populations were framed as reprisal killings in response to hideous assaults carried out by the victim groups or their representatives. On 20 April, 1915, Scheubner received news that the Armenians in Van had blown up the Ottoman Bank, and attacked the Turkish troops there, with the Turks claiming that they had sustained many Turkish casualties at the hands of the Armenian rebels.⁹⁴ The Turks used this opportunity to claim that the Armenian’s were waiting to betray them to their enemies - the Russians - who Turkey was at war with. In a conversation with Morgenthau, Talaat exclaimed, “These people refused to disarm when we told them to. They opposed us at Van and at Zeitoun, and they helped the Russians. There is only one way in which we can defend ourselves against them in the future, and that is to deport them.”⁹⁵ Boyajian describes the Turkish claims surrounding the “uprising” as “a widely visible pretext to shroud the execution of the plan already in place by making it appear as a military necessity.”⁹⁶ Scheubner took it upon himself to investigate this attack by the Armenians only to discover that the Armenians did not attack, but barricaded themselves into their communes to defend themselves against attack.⁹⁷ This tactic was extremely successful for the Turkish genocidaires; there was a widespread belief in Turkey of an Armenian “conspiracy.”⁹⁸

⁹³ Bandura (1972), 211

⁹⁴ Kaiser reports that, while it is true the Turks lost 18 men, the Turks greatly exaggerated the amount of Turks killed at Van. P. xxxix-xl

⁹⁵ Morgenthau, 335

⁹⁶ Boyajian, 107

⁹⁷ Kaiser, xxxix

⁹⁸ In a conversation with Scheubner, the German Ambassador Wangenheim repeated allegations of the Armenian conspiracy, Kaiser, xli

Moreover, to this day Turkey has evaded international recognition of the genocide claiming that it was a civil war.⁹⁹

The claim of victimization of the genocidal leaders by the target group was repeated by the Germans when they claimed an attack by the representatives of Jewry with the assassination of German legation counsellor von Rath. Nazi leader Julius Streicher recounted for the Nuremberg Tribunal the speech given by Joseph Goebbels at a dinner function on 9 November, 1938, attended by Storm Troopers (SA) and *Schutzstaffel* (SS) leaders as well as Hitler. At the dinner party Goebbels announced the murder of von Rath and blamed it on “all Jewry.” Goebbels ended his speech exclaiming, “something should be done.” Streicher reports that after this Goebbels ordered the burning of the synagogues and the smashing of the windows of Jewish places of business.¹⁰⁰ This planned response to the murder of von Rath by the Jews is now known as *Kristallnacht*. It was a lightening rod for persecution against the Jewish aggressors. In his final statement to the courts Streicher defended his attacks on the Jews in his paper *Dur Sturmer* by minimizing the action in light of the Jews own actions in a Jewish paper from Switzerland. “If I or other authors mentioned a destruction or extermination of Jewry in some articles of my weekly paper, the *Sturmer*, then these were strong statements in reply to provoking expressions of opinion by Jewish authors in which the extermination of the German people was demanded.” According to Streicher, the mass murder of the Jews was simply “reprisal killings” brought about by the course of war. In an affidavit signed by Erwin Bingel in 1945, Himmler announced to a group from the SS and the regular army that six SS officers had been found in the

⁹⁹Most notably, the U.S refused to recognize the genocide in response to Turkish pressure under the Bush administration, and more recently, under the Obama administration. See <http://asbarez.com/79790/obama-refuses-to-recognize-armenian-genocide/> - accessed 04/05/11.

¹⁰⁰ Trial of the Major War Criminals, Vol. 12. 327

Weniza forest naked and hanging upside down from the trees with their entrails hanging out. Himmler claimed it was the Jews who did it and demanded revenge.¹⁰¹

The lesson of the use of a single incident of “attack” by the target population was not to be lost on the Hutus. On April 6, 1994 Rwanda President Habyarimana’s plane was shot down over the airport of Kigali. The genocide began immediately following Habyarimana’s death. At that time the killing of the Tutsis was framed as merely “reprisal killings.” However, it is widely speculated that Hutu extremists were responsible for this act.¹⁰² Gourevitch points out that regardless of who killed Habyarimana, the Hutu extremists were primed to exploit his death instantaneously.¹⁰³ Thus, in the Armenian, Jewish, and Rwandan genocide, aggression by the perpetrators of genocide was successfully redefined in terms of self-defence, or revenge for atrocities committed by the victims themselves. I call the redefinition successful because, despite that some people dissented and sought to assist the target population, it was accepted by the majority, and negated negative judgement by the citizens onto the regime. Indeed, in each case the accusations of attack lobbied against the victim groups had the direct impact of building popular support for the perpetrators in their persecution of the target population.

A close relation of this form of neutralization of condemnation is the attribution of responsibility to the victims. In this behaviour aggressors portray themselves as essentially good persons forced into the actions by villainous opponents. The victims are condemned for bringing the suffering upon themselves, either by their character defects or by their witless provocative

¹⁰¹ Richard Breitman. The Architect of Genocide : Himmler and the Final Solution 1st ed. (New York : Knopf , 1991) 174-175

¹⁰² Alan J. Kuperman. “*The Other Lesson of Rwanda: Mediators Sometimes Do More Damage Than Good*” SAIS Review, Vol.16 No.16 (The John Hopkins University Press, 1996) 222

¹⁰³ Gourevitch, 115

behaviour.¹⁰⁴ This is clearly evidence in the genocides discussed. When the deportations of Armenians from Constantinople began Morgenthau asked Talaat about them. Talaat explained that the government was acting in self-defence, as the Armenians were conspiring with the Russians against Turkey.¹⁰⁵ Talaat expanded on that claim in further meetings with Morgenthau when he asserted, “[The Armenians] have enriched themselves at the expense of the Turks,” and that “[The Armenians] are determined to domineer over us.”¹⁰⁶ This justification was accepted by the German Ambassador Wangenheim who expressed to Morgenthau, “The Armenians have shown themselves to be enemies of the Turks. It is quite apparent that the two peoples can never live together in the same country.” Even at that point some Germans were connecting the Armenian problem of Turkey to the Jewish problem of Germany, because Wangenheim went on to suggest that some of those Armenians should be moved to the United States, and Germany would be happy to send some to Poland in exchange for the Polish Jews which were to be sent to Turkey.¹⁰⁷ Wangenheim obviously believed the justification from the Turks, because in a 15 June, 1915, telegram to Scheubner the German Ambassador argues that the Armenians brought this fate upon themselves.¹⁰⁸

From early on Hitler offered up the Jewish population as scapegoats for the economic crisis that ravaged Germany. Helen Fein comments that those members of the public who failed to see the Jews as the embodiment of evil, nevertheless, had “learned” to see that the “Jewish problem” was caused by the Jews themselves. Fein argues that this learned viewpoint acted to

¹⁰⁴ Bandura (19720, 214

¹⁰⁵ Morgenthau, 327

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 337

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 374. “The Americans should move some of them to the United States, and we Germans will send some to Poland and in their place send Jewish Poles to the Armenian provinces- that is- if they promise to drop their Zionist schemes.”

¹⁰⁸ Kaiser, li

inhibit the redefinition of the situation as immoral and allowed the public to then comfortably avoid the costs of involvement.¹⁰⁹

Hitler likened the Jews to a dangerous “bacillus” that threatened all of humanity. Moreover, Hitler blamed the Jews with having started the war and causing the bombing of German civilian populations.¹¹⁰ A 28 June, 1944 letter from the commander of the Security Police and the Intelligence Agency (SD) of the District of Radom to the branch at Tomassov contains the following order: “The security situation in the government general has deteriorated so much during the recent months that the most radical means and the most severe measures must now be employed against these alien assassins and saboteurs.”¹¹¹ Field Marshal Walter von Reichenau argued that Jews instigated partisan warfare in the Soviet areas to justify “retaliation” against them.¹¹² *Einsatzcommando* units regularly linked all such things as looting, and public discord back to the Jews and then described all killings of Jews as “reprisals against Jewish partisans.”¹¹³ In his questioning at Nuremberg Nazi leader Frank was asked if he personally participated in the annihilation of the Jews, to which he responded, “We have fought against Jewry for years.”¹¹⁴ Thus, the genocide against the Jews was not “annihilation” but, rather, a “fight.” When questioned about the destruction of the Warsaw ghetto Frank told the Tribunal that this action had been taken to quell a Jewish revolt, although he added, “reports that were made on it never seemed to be authentic.”¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁹ Fein, 92

¹¹⁰ Trial of the Major War Criminals, Vol. 22. 386

¹¹¹ Trial of the Major War Criminals, Vol. 12. 10

¹¹² Breitman, 175

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 173

¹¹⁴ Trial of the Major War Criminals, Vol. 12. 10

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 19

As the Turks claimed that the Armenians were out to dominate Turkey, and the Germans claimed that world Jewry was bent on the destruction of Germany, so the Hutu extremists of Rwanda repeated this exact claim. As early as 1991 the Hutu leaders had grasped the usefulness of this employment of popular anger. According to Gourevitch, in January of that year the Rwandan armed forces faked an attack on one of its own bases in the Northwest of the Country. The RPF was blamed for the attack and a local mayor immediately organized massacres of the Tutsis in his commune, having many buried on his own property.¹¹⁶ Local leaders at meetings portrayed Tutsis as devils, an evil that needed to be wiped out. In her autobiography, survivor of the genocide Immaculee Ilibagiza, recounts how the Hutus accused the Tutsis of digging large holes in the floors of their houses to hide the bodies of all the Hutus they were going to kill.¹¹⁷ Throughout the genocide the Rwandan government portrayed the programs as “spontaneous,” “popular acts of anger,” and “self protection” on the part of the Hutus.

It is one thing to kill the members of the adult populations for their evil deeds and the overarching threat they represent to society, but how does one neutralize the self-condemnation that comes from killing women and children? As it turns out, the portrayal of the victims as a threat also extends down to the children. The justification of the Turks for killing Armenian children exactly matches the justifications used by the Germans, which exactly matches the justification used by the Hutus. In an interview that Talaat gave to a German newspaper the Berliner Tageblatt he responded to questions regarding the suffering and killing of innocent Armenian women and children by stating: “We have been reproached for making no distinction between innocent Armenians and the guilty; but that was utterly impossible, in view of the fact

¹¹⁶ Gourevitch, 90

¹¹⁷ Immaculee Ilibagiza, Left to Tell: Discovering God Amidst the Rwandan Holocaust (Carlsbad: Hayhouse, 2006)

that those who were innocent today might be guilty tomorrow.”¹¹⁸ In response to questions about the policy to kill women and children equally with the men, *einsatzgruppen* leader Olendorf stated: “I believe it is very simple to explain if one starts from the fact that this order did not only try to achieve security but also a permanent security because for that reason the children were people who would grow up and surely, being children of parents who had been killed, they would constitute a danger no smaller than the kids.”¹¹⁹ When it came time to implement the notorious massacre at Babi Yar the killing squads were specifically instructed to target women and children equally as the men because they were viewed as “possible avengers of the future.”¹²⁰ The former Minister of Justice for the Hutu regime, Mbonampeka, explained in an 1995 interview with Gourevitch that even women and children were killed as RPF supporters and possible avengers of the future.¹²¹

Bandura explains:

A second major function of modeling influences is to *strengthen* or to *weaken inhibitions* of responses that already exist in the observers’ repertoires. The effects that modeling exerts on behavioural restraints are largely determined by observing the consequences engendered by the models’ responses. Seeing the behaviour of models punished generally suppresses similar responsiveness in observers. On the other hand, seeing models engage in threatening or disapproved activities without experiencing any adverse consequences reduces the observers’ restraints towards behaving in a like manner.¹²²

Hitler knew about the attacks at Van and the villainization of the Armenians because Scheubner saw it, heard it, and experienced it. Scheubner recognized what the claims against the Armenians were, and why they were employed. *Kristallnacht* was a well known event. Anyone paying

¹¹⁸ Morgenthau, 336

¹¹⁹ Mendelsohn, 16

¹²⁰ Kersaw (2000), 468

¹²¹ Gourevitch, 98

¹²² Bandura (1972), 128-129

close attention to the Holocaust will know about this event. Further, the villainization of Jewry is something that has managed to stay alive long after the death of the Nazi party. The Hutu extremist leaders idolized Hitler. Repeatedly, one is confronted with evidence of the attacks on civilian populations during genocide as being framed as a “fight,” or “reprisals,” and even “self protection.”

Bandura states, “The personal values of observers can be developed, and pre-existing ones altered, by the way in which modelled conduct is reinforced.”¹²³ Considering once again the important role of outcomes in the potentiality of the observer imitating the actions of the model, it is safe to conclude that the knowledge of the positive outcomes will have served as a factor of reinforcement. Now that we have established that the leaders had access to important information on the planning, and process of genocide, we will take the next chapter to consider how genocidal leaders taught the citizens of their societies to commit genocide from the social learning theory perspective.

¹²³ Bandura (1977) 126

Chapter Three: Teaching Genocide

“I am a survivor of a concentration camp. My eyes saw what no man should witness: Gas chambers built by learned engineers, children poisoned by educated physicians, infants killed by trained nurses, women and babies shot and buried by High School and College Graduates. So I am suspicious of education.”

- **Chaim Ginott, 1972**

As quoted in Barbara Coloroso,
Extraordinary Evil: A Brief History of Genocide (2007) p. ix

“When a process cuts into every phase of human life, it must ultimately feed upon the resources of the entire organized community.”

- **Raul Hilberg**

The Destruction of The European Jews, vol.III (2003) p. 1061

As previously explained, according to social learning analysis people guide their actions by their previous understandings of appropriate behaviour and expected outcomes. Especially when the consequences are high, such as choices involving life and death, examples set by others help one to choose the most appropriate course of action. In most societies there is an understood prohibition against murder. In order for genocide to occur, this prohibition must be overcome. Citizens must be conditioned to accept the annihilation of a segment of their population, and they must be taught their role in that annihilation, as everyone in a society where genocide occurs has a role. If regime leaders fail to impart a clear understanding of what behaviour will be deemed appropriate when the killing begins, then people will guide their behaviour on previous knowledge, including the generalized prohibition of murder.

Bandura holds that modeling plays a key role in the spreading of new ideas and social practices both within the society and from one society to another.¹ In the preceding chapter it was shown that genocidal leaders learned how to commit genocide by following the example set by previous genocides. This chapter demonstrates that genocidal leaders use that same learning process in order to engage their citizens in the genocidal process. According to SLT, human beings are given few inborn habits, but have vast potentialities for learning. Bandura points out that because we humans are thinking creatures, we are more prone to social manipulations than other animals. He explains, “Information-processing capacities render human behaviour more subject to social and cognitive control. Rather than responding instinctively to releasing sign stimuli humans regulate their behaviour in accordance with judgments of anticipated consequences for prospective actions.”²

¹ Bandura (1977), 50

² Ibid., 20

There are three key factors to educate a population in genocidal ideology. The first can be found in attention and retention processes - attainment of the public's attention, and then attainment of their agreement. In accordance, the first section of this chapter will look at symbolic learning and the societal teaching of genocide. One of the most important tools at a regime leader's disposal to influence the belief systems and thought processes of society are the use of media and propaganda. Therefore, this section focuses on the employment of propaganda to teach citizens the importance of the destruction of a target group. The second key factor is motivational. How did the leaders induce the public to act? Thus, section two of this chapter considers the motivational factors of the genocide at the societal level. What tools did the regime leaders use to engage the society in the slaughter? Of what benefit was mass murder to the public at large? The third key factor is the ability to overcome disapproval. Therefore, the final section of this chapter will discuss the methods employed by regime leaders to neutralize citizen's self-condemnation. If killing defenceless civilians and young children is instinctually repulsive to the majority of people then how did the leaders convince the people that this action was indeed acceptable? This section specifically looks at the employment of racial ideology and legislation, and pseudo-legal decrees as enablers of the public participation in genocide. This will follow with a look at the dehumanization process and graduated desensitization. There is a story which claims that if one were to throw a frog into a pan of boiling water, it would jump out. However, if one was to put a frog in cool water and then gradually warm it up to boiling, the frog would not jump out of the pan. Can it be seen in Turkey, Germany, and Rwanda that citizens were gradually warmed up to the idea of the annihilation of a segment of their population? As will be shown, the evidence demonstrates that regime leaders learned this process of graduated

desensitization from previous genocidal models. To reveal how leaders used that information to shape the outcome for their own societies is the purpose of this chapter.

Symbolic Learning: The Utility of Propaganda in Genocide

On any given day every person is exposed to a number of potential models, and a number of potential influences. However, how much one is going to be influenced by a model's behaviour or specific event is dependent on a number of factors. The status of the model and the observational abilities of the observer are two important aspects that play into whether or not a behaviour will be imitated. According to Bandura, attentional processes are the cognitive processes that "determine what is selectively observed in the profusion of modeling influences to which one is exposed and what is extracted from such exposures."³ Who is doing the modeling and how the modeled behaviour is being presented to the observer have a deep impact on whether or not the observer will accept the behaviour as appropriate and imitate the behaviour. In this line of reasoning, the role of an authoritative figure in the perpetration of genocide is an important one. Bandura explains:

Malevolent authorities, as well as those of good will who extenuate morally reprehensible practices, can, given proper conditions, get otherwise considerate people to behave inhumanly. In other words, it requires appropriate social influences rather than monstrous people to produce heinous deeds.⁴

Hitler understood this aspect of learning very well, and the Hutu extremist leaders learnt about it in his book, *Mein Kampf*. Hitler recognized that in order to ensure that what the leader wanted to be observed was observed, there needed to be an excellent employment of propaganda. Further, in order to guarantee what was extracted from the observation was what the leader needed the public to extract, repetition was paramount. Hitler saw propaganda as a tool that

³ Ibid., 24

⁴ Bandura (1973), 177

called the masses attention to certain facts, processes and necessities, to “convince the masses that the facts are real, the processes are necessary, and the necessity is correct.”⁵ Hitler added that propaganda, to be effective, must be adjusted to be understood by those with the most limited intellectual capacity. “The more modest [the propaganda’s] ballast, the more exclusively it takes into consideration the emotions of the masses, the more effective it will be.”⁶ Hitler teaches that propaganda must be limited to a very few points, it must harp on those points with easy to remember slogans, and it must be applied on “a tremendous scale.”⁷ Hitler’s strategy is supported by Bandura’s theory. Bandura explains⁸ that people can learn equal amounts of behavioural demonstrations through pictorial representations and verbal descriptions as they do directly, provided; the representations convey the same amount of response information; the representations are effective in commanding attention; and, the learners are capable of processing the information transmitted by these alternative modes of modeling.⁹ Thus, through Bandura’s explanation of aggression with SLT, it is clear that Hitler was preaching an effective employment of propaganda methods.

The use of propaganda to educate citizens is a point of departure for the Armenian genocide, the Holocaust and the Rwandan genocide. While the Turks did not use the power of propaganda to condition their citizens in a genocidal ideology to its full potential, they did employ one of the most active communications networks at that time in Turkey by utilizing the

⁵ Hitler (1942), 179-180

⁶ Ibid., 180

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Bandura bases this finding on comparative studies found in Bandura, A. and Mischel, W. “*Modification of Self imposed Delay of Reward through exposure to live and Symbolic Models*” in Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (1965) 2, p.p. 698-705; Bandura, A. Ross, D. and Ross, S.A. “*Imitation of Film Mediated Aggressive Models*” in Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, (1963) 66, p.p. 3-11; Prentice, N. M. “*The Influence Of Live and Symbolic Modeling on Promoting Moral Judgments’ of Adolescent Juvenile Delinquents*” in Journal of Abnormal Psychology (1972)

⁹ Bandura (1973), 73

voice of religious leaders. In the Armenian genocide religious leaders actively engaged in teaching the role, used their public voice to incite mobs, and preached hatred of the Christian Armenians to the Muslim population.¹⁰ Further, at the start of WWI, Turkish writers claimed that invading Russian Armenian troops were joined by Turkish Armenians causing the loss of thousands of Turkish soldiers. Estimates released throughout Turkey of Turkish soldiers killed by the Armenian betrayal ranged from 40,000 to 150,000.¹¹ Turkish writers at that time also regularly wrote that Armenians threatened Turkey through sabotage, defections, spying, and mass uprisings. However, the scale of writing against the Armenians in Turkey pales in comparison to what was later seen coming out of Germany and Rwanda. That the Turks did not use the full power of the propaganda machine, and the Germans and Rwandan did, does not, however, mean that social learning did not occur for Hitler from Turkey's example. According to Bandura, models do not only teach specific lessons, but generalizable ones.¹² In this innovative process observers extract common features demonstrated in the modeled behaviour and responses, and then, using that information the observer formulates a general principal for fashioning similar models of behaviour.¹³ Further, the observer is able to synthesize the modeled behaviour with other modeled behaviours that bear resemblance, and then utilize this new information as a guide to future action that go beyond the specific modeled examples.¹⁴ Hitler recognized the generalizable principal found in the example set by the British in their use of propaganda in WWI that demonized the German enemy and incited the British soldiers in the

¹⁰ Franklin, H. Littell, "Halting a succession of evil" in Journal of Ecumenical Studies v. 34 (Spring 1997) p. 171-89

¹¹ Staub, 179

¹² Bandura (1973), 85

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

fight against them.¹⁵ Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf* that propaganda was both a frightful weapon in the hands of an expert, and a means to an end.¹⁶ The lesson for the Hutu leaders was clear - the purpose of propaganda was to convince the masses of the truth of an ideology and the necessity of action. Hitler explains:

In general the art of all truly great national leaders at all times consists among other things primarily in not dividing the attention of the people, but in concentrating it upon a single foe. The more unified the application of a people's will to fight, the greater will be the magnetic attraction of the movement, and the mightier will be the impetus of the thrust.¹⁷

Bandura explains the usefulness of media in promotion of aggression, "Since large audiences in widely dispersed areas can be reached simultaneously through symbolic modeling, the aggression contagion potential of media representations is greater than that of direct modeling."¹⁸

Hitler was able to disseminate his ideas about propaganda to his underlings in the Nazi hierarchy who made full use of propaganda to educate their citizens. Nazi leader Streicher admits in his testimony at Nuremberg:

After the seizure of power [by the Nazis], the daily press was coordinated, and now the party found itself in control of some three thousand daily newspapers, numerous weekly journals, and all types of periodicals; and orders were given by the Fuhrer that every newspaper should provide enlightening articles on the Jewish question. The anti-Semitic enlightenment was, therefore, after the seizure of power, carried out on a very large scale in the daily press as well as in weekly journals, periodicals, and books.¹⁹

The Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels also worked on the production of anti-Semitic films to educate the public on the Jewish problem. He writes on 15 December, 1939, "Study scripts

¹⁵ Hitler references the successful use of propaganda by the British, see *Mein Kampf* (1942) 177-185

¹⁶ Hitler (1943), 179

¹⁷ Ibid., 118

¹⁸ Bandura (1973), 73

¹⁹ [Trials of War Major Criminals vol.12](#), 319

for the press and for the Jud Suss film turned out well. The Jud Suss film, especially, has been rewritten marvellously well by Harlan. This will be *the* anti-Semitic film...²⁰ (Italics original)

Bandura explains the importance of symbolic modeling through visual media, “It has been shown²¹ that both children and adults acquire attitudes, emotional responses, and new styles of conduct through filmed and televised modeling.”²² On 6 November, 1939, Goebbels wanted to increase the exposure to propaganda, of Hitler Youth - an organization that every Aryan youth was required to join - and so writes, “The film hours will now be staged twice monthly for the Hitler Youth, to cement their political direction.”²³ Finally, Goebbels recognized the need to get the attention of the population on the radio. If they will not listen, then they will not be exposed to the lesson, and the propaganda will have no value. On 22 May, 1941 Goebbels writes in his journal, “I am in the process of trying out light music for the radio. It is very hard to decide how far one can, or should, go. It must be real popular music, but not obvious rubbish. I choose middle way...”²⁴

On 3 January, 1940, Goebbels - recognized by his own party as the expert on Propaganda - reiterates the lesson Hitler taught so well in *Mein Kampf*, through his complaints about his own staff:

[Fritzache] fails to properly understand the value of repetition in propaganda. One must constantly be repeating the same thing in different forms. The public is very conservative. It must be thoroughly saturated with our views by constant repetition, until the message sticks. Only then can one be sure of success.²⁵

²⁰ Goebbels (1982), 67

²¹ Bandura bases this claim based on studies found in: Bandura, Albert. *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1973); Liebert, R.M., Neale, J.M. & Davidson, E.S. “The Early Window: Effects of Television on Children and Youth” (New York: Pergamon Press, 1973).

²² Bandura (1977), 39

²³ Goebbels (1982), 40

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 378

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 84

Bandura explains that from a social learning perspective the expression of psychological aggression is partly from emotional arousal, and partly from reinforcement influences.²⁶ Repetition is constant reinforcement of the message being continuously repeated, and the modeled example of the Nazis for the Hutu extremist was that propaganda meant repetition - constant repetition.

Hitler learned how the use of propaganda would benefit his genocidal cause by observing the use of the public voice of religious leaders in Turkey and the exceptional use of it by the British military in WWI. He then, increased the use of propaganda, enhanced it and exploited it to a greater degree. The Hutus imitated Hitler's lesson, enhanced the value of the propaganda, perfected it for their ends, and exploited it to a greater degree still. Whereas, Hitler used his propaganda to educate the masses on the inhuman nature of the Jew, and the necessity of removing the Jew from society, the Hutu used propaganda tools to demand the end of Tutsis, to instigate the genocide, and then to direct the killing process. *Kangura* ("Wake it Up") was a Hutu extremist newspaper run by an editor named Hassan Ngeze who was hired by the President of Rwanda's wife, Madame Agathe Habyarimana, and several leaders of the Hutu elite. Ngeze is described by Gourevitch as "the salesman of fear," "the original high-profile archetype of the Rwandan Hutu genocidaire," and Gourevitch adds, "His imitators and disciples were soon legion."²⁷ Ngeze ran regular anti-Tutsi articles and cartoons calling for the destruction of the "Tutsi race," as well as publishing the well-versed *Hutu Ten Commandments*, which are discussed in more detail later in the chapter.

²⁶ Bandura (1973), 125

²⁷ Gourevitch, 87

In addition to the newspaper, the Hutu extremists harnessed the use of the radio to broadcast their genocidal message throughout the country. In 1994, since the radio was the most powerful communication network in the Rwanda it was indispensable as a propaganda tool. The Hutu extremist radio station, *Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines* (RTLM) broadcast from 8 July 1993, to 31 July, 1994, and it has been credited with having played a significant role during the Rwandan genocide. Dallaire describes the RTLM as a hard-line radio station that, like the Nazi radio station, used popular African rock music allied with racist, anti-Tutsi hype to build its following.²⁸ From the moment of the downing of Habyarimana's plane, Dallaire reports that the radio station incited the population to rise up and kill their Tutsi neighbours. It went further, naming political targets as well as offering their current locations so that the Hutu population could "do their work."²⁹ Dallaire states, "In Rwanda the radio station was akin to the voice of God, and if the radio called for violence, many Rwandans would respond, believing that they were sanctioned to commit these actions."³⁰ In SLT, modeling serves as a major vehicle for transmitting new styles of behaviour. Magazines, newspapers, television and radios inform populations of new practices and their likely benefits or risks. Thus, early adopters come from those who have greater exposure to media outlets than others. Then early adopters disseminate further through local contact via existing networks of interpersonal communication.³¹ Bandura explains that the restraints on aggressive behaviour can be affected by the degree of justification given the violence in the new stories. The greater the violence justified on the airwaves, the more likely it is to be socially acceptable, and the more likely it is to be mimicked by listeners.³² The

²⁸ Dallaire, 101

²⁹ Ibid., 254-261 & 272

³⁰ Ibid., 272

³¹ Bandura (1977) 51

³² Bandura (1973), 284

second factor affecting the degree someone will integrate and mimic new behaviour is motivational factors. This is addressed in the proceeding section.

The Role of Motivation in Mass Murder: The Utopian Dream

In SLT the motivational function is apparent when the desire for future consequences motivates current behaviour. Bandura explains, “Because anticipatory incentives increase the likelihood of the kind of behaviour that is ultimately reinforced time and time again, this type of function has great utility.”³³ There were two motivational functions in play in the Armenian, Jewish, and Rwandan genocides. The first motivational factor was rooted in an ideology that produced the desire for the creation of a utopian society. The second motivational factor was the anticipation of the improvement of status combined with financial reward.

As seen in the map shown in figure 1.5, the Ottoman Empire had been in decline for years when the Armenian genocide was committed. Moreover, poverty, hunger, disease and an influx of Muslim refugees from surrounding territories made life difficult for the citizens of Turkey.³⁴ The Young Turks came into power with the intention of restoring the glory of the Ottoman Empire. Staub explains that an ideology of Pan-Turkism became dominant at this time. This Pan-Turkish ideology had the aim of enhancing the power of the Ottoman Empire and purifying the nation, making it Turkish in language, customs, and religion.³⁵ Morgenthau suggests that the mass murder of the Armenians in Turkey was the result of a state policy to make Turkey racially pure, “Making Turkey exclusively a country for the Turks.”³⁶ Littell points out, “In the pan-Turkic or pan-Turanian creed, which had such fatal consequences for the

³³ Bandura (1977), 18

³⁴ Staub, 174

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Morgenthau, 322-323

Armenians, the dream of ‘ethnic cleansing’ was basic.”³⁷ A strong nationalistic sentiment, combined with difficult life conditions would make a solution to the Armenian problem and the creation of the utopian Pan-Turkic society appealing. Even though the measure is radical, the actions become viewed as beneficial and necessary.

Hitler believed in the creation of a Pan-Germanic supreme society. In order to realize this utopia, Hitler utilized hard propaganda methods to teach the German masses of their racial supremacy and of the life and death threat posed by the inferior races. Hitler explains, “Where the destiny and existence of the people are at stake, all obligations towards beauty ceases.”³⁸ Further, Heather Pringle explains that Hitler’s promotion of greatness of Germany’s ancestors - the ancient Aryans - laid the foundations for the head of the SS, Heinrich Himmler, to focus attention on the creation of a new world order of a supreme blond hair, blue- eyed race. To this end, Himmler founded the *Ahnenerbe*, a scientific society with the primary goal of engaging in research to prove the supremacy of the Nordic race.³⁹ The active recognition of the supremacy of the Aryan-German peoples would be beneficial to a society that was emerging from great hardships and a collective low self-esteem after WWI.

The radio station and the newspapers in Rwanda advocated the Hutu extremist ideology. Gourevitch describes a cartoon in the newspaper *Kangura*, depicting Ngeze on a couch being psychoanalysed. In the picture Ngeze tells the doctor “I’m sick doctor!!” The doctor responds, “What is your sickness?!” Ngeze answers, “The Tutsis...Tutsis...Tutsis!!!!!!”⁴⁰ Goldhagen explains, “The perpetrators see the imminent eliminationist onslaught as a rational means to

³⁷ Littell,

³⁸ Hitler (1942), 178-179

³⁹ Heather Pringle. The Master Plan: Himmler’s Scholars and the Holocaust (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2006) 24

⁴⁰ Gourevitch, 87

solve severe problems, restore order to the world, and straighten a badly twisted society.”⁴¹ However, a major problem that faced the populations in the three countries where the genocides occurred was economic hardship. Turkey was near bankrupt, and had large refugee portions of the population without homes; Germany was under the financial heel of the Treaty of Versailles; and Rwanda was in economic crisis following the collapse of world coffee prices and a prolonged civil war. The destruction of large portions of the population would offer a solution to political pressures to provide for their citizens through financial and property gain to the killers, as well as motivate the people to kill.

In Turkey, both Morgenthau and Scheubner repeatedly relate the robbery and extortion of the Armenian caravans as they were being herded to their deaths.⁴² It began with the targets being blackmailed to hand over “protection” money to the gendarmes accompanying the caravan, followed by the ravages of the Kurdish tribes and Special Organization units before the eventual murder of the Armenian victims. Victims often even had the clothes off their backs stolen and were left in a state of complete nudity. Scheubner observed that Ottoman soldiers and Muslim neighbours and refugees did not always wait for the Armenians to depart their villages before plundering the Armenians belongings and moving into their houses.⁴³ A letter dated 28 February, 1915 to delegate Jemal Bey of Adana instructs:

All properties left behind [by the exterminated Armenian people] will, for the time being, be seized and kept in a manner deemed best by the government, with the understanding that they will be sold later for the expansion of the organization of the Jemiyet [the central Committee of the Young Turks] and for (other) patriotic purposes.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Goldhagen, 97

⁴² Examples of this can be found in Morgenthau, p.310,314, 316, 319 & Kaiser, xlvii,liv, lv

⁴³ Kaiser xlvii

⁴⁴ Boyjijian, 316

Morgenthau even relates that Talaat at one time requested that he provide a list of Armenians holding life insurance policies with U.S. companies. Talaat said to Morgenthau, “They are practically all dead now and have left no heirs to collect the money. It of course all escheats to the state. The Government is the beneficiary now.” Morgenthau refused this request.⁴⁵

Bandura specifically points out the use of benefits to motivate the Nazi officers went beyond simple financial gain, but included promotions which came with the added bonus of increased social status:

In the Nazi structure of reinforcement, where enslavement and execution of designated racial groups were viewed as meritorious acts of patriotism, promotions in concentration camps were made partly on skill in performing mass murders. Camp commandants proudly compared execution rates like industrious production figures.⁴⁶

In Germany, a fully organized process of disenfranchising the Jews before extermination, and thereby profiting from them, was instituted. Neave gives an example of how it was done in Holland by the *Reichskommissar* Dr. Artur Seyss-Inquart. Initially, he removed the Jews from all forms of political and professional life. Then, he liquidated the companies of the prosperous Jewish middle-class. Finally, all Jewish assets were blocked and they were forced to surrender all property to the government, including jewellery.⁴⁷ Besides the enrichment of the state coffers, Neave recounts numerous tales of the Nazi leaders’ personal enrichment. Seyss-Inquart is among them.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Morgenthau, 339

⁴⁶ Bandura (1973), 192

⁴⁷ Neave, 166

⁴⁸ More examples of this can be found in Neave, 112, 135, 137, 142

The Hutu extremists did not have an official process in place to enrich the state. However, individual Hutus understood that looting was the reward of killing. Genocidaire, Alphonse Hitiyaremye tells Hatzfeld, “On days of large scale operations, the Interahamwe and the soldiers from neighbouring villages took priority in the looting. They heaped up new radios, fat cows, comfortable chairs, top quality sheet metal. We locals shared what they left behind.”⁴⁹ Alphonse goes on to explain that many people grew rich from the slaughter of Tutsis, “so rich they didn’t stop to count up.”⁵⁰ Pancrace Hakizamungili adds, “After work we would tally up the profit. The money the Tutsis had tried to take with them under their clothes into death.”⁵¹ The Hutus had learned from the Nazis, who had learned from the Turks to anticipate profit from destruction of a segments of one’s own population. Bandura explains, “Anticipatory capacities enable humans to be motivated by perspective consequences.”⁵² However, the third factor affecting the ability of the leaders to teach their citizens the ideology of genocide, and ensure their participation is the ability of the leaders to overcome the natural prohibition of murder. Therefore, the neutralization of condemnation is the topic discussed next.

The Neutralization of Condemnation

Bandura informs, “In the course of socialization, most individuals adopt, through example and precept, negative sanctions against cruel actions. As a result, they are restrained from injurious aggression by anticipated self-criticism.” He adds, “There is no more devastating punishment than self-contempt.”⁵³ When social pressures impel people to act inhumanly then

⁴⁹ Hatzfeld, 82

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid., 83

⁵² Bandura (1977), 18

⁵³ Bandura (1973), 210

they must engage the use of what Bandura calls “self-deception machines”⁵⁴ to participate without self-condemnation.⁵⁵ Genocidal leaders will actively engage these methods in order to help their citizens overcome self-reproach and participate in the role the regime requires. Further, these methods work to isolate the target populations so that there are no social uprisings in their defence. Of the common methods employed by leaders to neutralize threat of condemnation, Bandura lists two that were employed for the conditioning of their populations, first by the Turks, followed by the Germans, and then copied by the Hutus. The first is the justification of aggression in terms of higher principals, and the second is the dehumanization of the target group. This section discusses how these methods were employed successfully by the three regimes to condition their citizens for the genocidal policy.

Justification of aggression in terms of higher principles means to interpret aggression through the lens of higher values. In this way aggression is framed from within the context of noble aims. Political leaders wishing to engage their citizens in a genocidal policy must convince the public that the policy has noble aims, and is justified. While it may be unpleasant, the annihilation of the target population is necessary. As the Young Turks recognized, one of the most justifiable and noble aims that a regime can employ is the survival of the dominant group. In a letter dated 25 March, 1915 to delegate Jemal Bey of Adana, the necessity of the genocidal action is laid bare:

As it has been stated in our letter dated February 18, 1915 the Jemiyet has decided to destroy from their foundation and to annihilate various opposing forces that have obstructed our ways for years, and to that effect it is obliged, unfortunately, to resort to bloody means. Rest assured that we are also affected

⁵⁴ Bandura bases this claim on studies found in Hicks, D.J. “Girls attitudes Toward Modeled Behaviours and the Content of Imitative Private Play” in *Child Development* (1971) 42, p.p. 139-147; Mackay, C. *Extraordinary popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds* (Boston: Page, 1932); Kensington, K. “Student Activism, Moral Development, and Morality” in *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* (1970) 40, p.p. 577-592

⁵⁵ Ibid.

by the thought of these horrible means; but Jemiyet finds no other way to secure its eternal existence.⁵⁶

Another order is reproduced by Boyajian that points out that the war has given the Turks a long awaited opportunity, now is the time to “save our country from that dangerous element.”⁵⁷ The killings, Staub explains, were sold to the public as a means of achieving their nationalistic desires, securing the future of the Turkey, and realizing the “higher” needs of the Turkish people.⁵⁸ Kaiser reports that Scheubner, who was later an advisor to Hitler, was informed of the claims that there was an Armenian conspiracy against the Turks, and also that he openly complained to the German ambassador that they were false – the Turkish authorities were not responding to an Armenian threat, but instead claiming one to justify the persecution of the Armenians.⁵⁹

Taking the foundations of this method of neutralization of self-condemnation given to him by the Turks, Hitler was able to build upon it. In Nazi-led Germany, the public was subjected to this technique of neutralization to a greater degree than the Turkish population because of Hitler’s exceptional use of propaganda. In an excerpt of *Dur Sturmer* read at his trial, published some time between 1933 and 1939,⁶⁰ Streicher had written that despite the creation of the Nuremberg laws, the battle against world Jewry continues, “and we shall only get through this battle victoriously if every member of the German people knows that his very existence is at stake.”⁶¹ On 30 January, 1942, Hitler addressed a packed sportspalast and exclaimed to the excited crowd that Germany was at war with world Jewry. The German people were in a fight

⁵⁶ Boyajian, 316

⁵⁷ Ibid., 317

⁵⁸ Staub, 183

⁵⁹ Kaiser, xlii, xlvi, & l

⁶⁰ Prosecution lawyer, Lt. Col. Griffith-Jones does not make the date of the publication clear. He only offers the exhibit number as well as letting us know the period of time he is questioning Streicher about.

⁶¹ The Trial of Major War Criminals Vol. 12, 350

for their very existence, “We are clear that war can only end either with the extermination of the Aryan peoples or the disappearance of Jewry from Europe.”⁶² In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler demonstrated his knowledge of the lesson passed down from Turkey, a lesson he passed down to the Hutu genocidaires: “Truly incisive and sometimes almost unbearable obligations and burdens can only be made generally effective if, in addition to compulsion, the realization of necessity is transmitted to the individual.”⁶³ Hitler preached that the people must be focused on the problem at hand, “as though life and death actually depended on its solution.”⁶⁴

Hutu extremist media outlets incessantly relayed to Hutus population the problem of the Tutsis. The Hutus came to recognize this problem as a clear case of kill or be killed. Gourevitch points out the innovative use of the national radio, “to prepare the ground for slaughter, and the ratcheting up the suggestive message of us against them to the categorically compelling kill or be killed.”⁶⁵ During the genocide a RTLM broadcaster gloated, “You cockroaches must know you are made of flesh. We won’t let you kill [us]. We will kill you.”⁶⁶ *The Hutu Ten Commandments* published by Ngeze in Kangura, and often repeated on the radio, also informs the Hutus. Commandment number four states, “Every Muhutu should know that every Matutsi is dishonest in business. His only aim is the supremacy of his ethnic group.”⁶⁷ Commandment nine instructs the Hutus to have solidarity with their Hutu brothers, being concerned with their fate.

Bandura explains, “Aggressive behaviour is thereby extensively regulated by anticipated consequences derived from informative social cues.”⁶⁸ Legal and quasi-legal creeds will act as

⁶² Kershaw (2000), 494

⁶³ Hitler (1943), 249

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Gourevitch, 94

⁶⁶ Ibid., 114

⁶⁷ Coloroso, 118-119

⁶⁸ Bandura (1973), 120

social cues. They allow observers to anticipate both positive and negative consequences to actions, and offer a implied legitimacy to those actions that the creeds promote. On 27 May, 1915, the Turkisk government passed Provisional law allowing for the “deportation” of persons suspected of treason or espionage. Since all Armenians were considered suspect by virtue of their Armenian heritage, all Armenians could be deported completely in accordance with the laws of the land.⁶⁹ Although not officially legal, the Hutu commandments took on an aura of a quasi-legal document from the time of its publication in December, 1990. Not only did this Hutu creed borrow the language from the Turks, who created their own Ten Commandments, *The Ten Commandments of the Committee of Union and Progress*, but the Hutu commandments are clearly modeled on the Nuremburg Laws. Compare below the *Laws for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour* which were passed on September 15, 1935:

Section 1

- a) Marriages between Jews and citizens of German or kindred blood are forbidden. Marriages concluded in defiance of this law are void, even if, for the purpose of evading this law, they were concluded abroad.
- b) Proceedings for annulment may be initiated only by the state Attorney

Section 2

Extramarital sexual intercourse between Jews and subjects of the state of Germany or related blood is forbidden.

Section 3

Jews will not be permitted to employ female citizens under the age of 45, of German or kindred blood, as domestic workers⁷⁰

The Hutu Ten Commandments:

1. Every Hutu should know that a Tutsi woman, whoever she is, works for the interest of her Tutsi ethnic group. As a result, we shall consider a traitor any Hutu who

- Marries a Tutsi woman

⁶⁹ Boyjijian, 150

⁷⁰ Coloroso, 116

- Befriends a Tutsi woman
- Employs a Tutsi woman as a secretary or a concubine.⁷¹

In three short sentences the Hutu extremists were able to imitate, in the exact same order, the Nuremberg laws for the Protection of German Blood. Other laws were passed at Nuremberg that went further to disenfranchise the Jews and, eventually, declare them stateless. The most quoted of the Hutu commandments was the eighth which told the Hutus to “stop having mercy on the Tutsis.”⁷² While laws and creeds deprived the target group of their place in the community, labels worked to deprive them of their human identity. Once the target group is seen as being outside the realm of society, then the stage is set for another process of neutralization of self-condemnation – that is, the dehumanization of the victims.

According to Bandura, “Social practices that divide people into in-group and out-group members produce human estrangement conducive to dehumanization.”⁷³ Bandura explains that target groups are often dispossessed of their humanness, by attributing sub-human or bestial characteristics to them.⁷⁴ “After victims have been so devalued, they can be cruelly attacked without much risk of self-punishment.”⁷⁵ The Turks often labelled the Armenians cattle. Dr. Lepsius referred to the Armenians as a “herd.”⁷⁶ Scheubner described his encounter a caravan of Armenians moving between Monsul and Aleppo. According to Scheubner, the Armenians were in such a deplorable state they could hardly be labelled “human” any longer.⁷⁷ Hitler, through his use of propaganda, was able to increase the effectiveness of this dehumanization. Hitler repeatedly referred to the Jews as bacillus. The label of vermin became so widely accepted in

⁷¹ Ibid., 118

⁷² Gourevitch, 87

⁷³ Bandura (1973), 213

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Boyjajian, 107

⁷⁷ Kaiser, cx

Nazi Europe that later, when telling his father's story throughout the Holocaust in cartoon format, Art Spiegelman⁷⁸ drew all the Jews as mice.⁷⁹ A pamphlet circulated by the German Armed Forces in 1944, titled *The Jew as a World Parasite*, states, "The parasite among all mankind is the Jew. He can infest the individual as a single parasite, whole nations as a parasite, and mankind as a world parasite."⁸⁰ Streicher wrote in a September 1939 edition of *Dur Sturmer* that the aim of the paper was to make, "even the last German join wholeheartedly the ranks of those whose aim is to crush the head of the Pan-Judah, that snake."⁸¹ Snake was also a label applied to the Tutsis. In an interview with a Tutsi survivor Goldhagen is told:

Hutu thought of Tutsi as animals because they were even calling them snakes. They were saying that when you want to kill snakes you hit them on the head...They called us snakes most of the times because snakes is a very dangerous animal and poisonous.⁸²

However, the most common term for the Tutsis was "cockroach," as the genocidaire Aldabert Munzigura explains, "Before the killings we called them cockroaches. But during the killing it was more suitable to call them snakes, because of their attitude, or zeros, or dogs, because in our country we don't like dogs; in any case, they were less-than-nothings."⁸³ Munzigura later adds, "'Cockroaches,' 'snakes' – it was the radios that taught us these words. The evil – mindedness of the radios was too well calculated for us to oppose it."⁸⁴ Leopard

⁷⁸ Spiegelman was born in Stockholm, Sweden to Polish-Jewish Holocaust refugees. Spiegelman grew up in New York and graduated from the High School of Art and Design in Manhattan. In 1986, he released the first volume of *Maus* (*Maus I: A Survivor's Tale*, also known as *Maus I: My Father Bleeds History*) The second volume, *Maus II: And Here My Troubles Began* followed in 1991. For his work on *Maus* Spiegelman received a special Pulitzer Prize in 1992.

⁷⁹ Art Spiegelman. *Maus: A Survivor's Tale* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1997)

⁸⁰ Mendelsohn, Vol. 4

⁸¹ Neave, 87

⁸² Goldhagen, 353

⁸³ Hatzfeld, 132

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 220

agrees, “We no longer considered the Tutsis as humans or even creatures of God.”⁸⁵ Fein notes, “A doctrine that assumes people do not belong to a common species knows no limits inhibiting the magnitude of permissible crime.”⁸⁶

Bandura explains that in order to turn ordinary socialized individuals into comfortable killers, certain things must be achieved. Importantly, the moral value of the killing needs to be changed from negative to positive so that people can engage in it freely, and this is done through indoctrination.⁸⁷ Turkey was able to use the religious voice to indoctrinate their citizens. Hitler improved this method through the manipulation and mastery of propaganda. Then, through his book *Mein Kampf*, Hitler taught the Hutus how to direct the masses, manipulate their attention, and direct their passions through the use of propaganda. Bandura continues, “One must fight for his country to defend its survival, to preserve world peace, to save humanity from enslavement by cruel oppressors, and for national honour.”⁸⁸ The regime leaders of Turkey, Germany, and Rwanda were able to convince their citizens that the state was fighting for its life and the survival of its people. In order to save themselves from the enslavement of Armenians, Jews, or Tutsis, drastic action was necessary, and everyone must do their part. Finally, Bandura informs that the force of the moral appeal is strengthened by portraying the targets as sub-humans.⁸⁹ The three of the genocides discussed employed this method effectively and with devastating consequences. Cattle were herded to their deaths, vermin were exterminated, and the cockroaches were crushed. No one was “murdered.”

⁸⁵ Ibid., 144

⁸⁶ Fein, 30

⁸⁷ Bandura (1973), 99

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

At the beginning of this chapter I stated that everybody in a society where genocide occurs has a role. This includes the global society. What is its role? The next chapter looks at the role of bystanders in genocide. Do the actions and responses of the international bystanders to genocide, inform genocidal regime leaders and shape the outcome in those societies?



This picture depicts a Rwandan school house used as a genocide site, located in a village off a dirt road. The chalkboard shows lists of names of genocidaires underneath the titles that each person held. This demonstrates that even down to the lowest level, the genocide was organized. Further, the cashier's checks attached to each name show that the genocidaires were keeping track of "productivity." It can be inferred that the reason to keep track of individual productivity is that either financial, or social benefits, were tied to higher kill rates. The use of titles implies that there was an organizational ladder in place and, therefore, individual genocidaires could work towards promotion. Thus, this picture exhibits organization in the genocidal process, and motivational factors for individual perpetrators.

Chapter Four: Response Consequences and Genocide: The Role of Bystanders

The power of choosing between good and evil is within the reach of us all.

- **Origen** (C. 185-254 C.E.)

We must take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormenter, never the tormented.

- **Elie Wiesel**

From his Nobel Peace Prize Acceptance Speech, (1986)

In Barbara Coloroso's examination of genocide through the lens of the bully cycle, she notes, "There could be no genocide without a Talaat, a Hitler, a Hutu Power - the bullies, the genocidaires. But equally they could not have pulled off what they did without the complicity of the bystanders."¹ Goldhagen explains that in either overt or subtle ways, bystanders either help or hinder the perpetrators.² Was there complicity of bystanders in the three genocides of the twentieth century? Did the actions or lack of actions on the part of the international community in previous genocides inform regime leaders organizing genocide in their own state? Specifically, did the response of other states during the Armenian genocide hinder or enable the Young Turks? Did the response of other independent states and of the League of Nations to the extermination of the Armenians tell the Nazis what to expect, and assist them in choosing the best method to circumvent international interference in the initiation of their Jewish policy? And, how did the international response, inclusive of the United Nations, to the Holocaust inform the Rwandan genocidal leaders? The Roman Catholic Church was also a large international body with influence in Germany during the Nazi era. What was its role? How did the Catholic Church respond to the Holocaust, and how did its response to the Holocaust inform the Hutu extremists in the deeply Catholic Rwanda?

Bandura explains, "In the social learning view of interaction... behaviour, other personal factors, and environmental factors all operate as interlocking determinants of each other."³ The environment of a state includes other nations and international organizations. National interests at the international level will have a direct influence on state policy. Therefore, the response of international actors to a specific state policy can not only influence the outcome of state policy,

¹ Coloroso, 81

² Goldhagen, 130

³ Bandura (1977), 10

but will also serve as a model to other states considering the same policy. However, in the case of modeled response to genocide, it is not just the genocidal state that participates in modeled approaches. As will be apparent, the international actors themselves imitate bystander responses to other genocides.

According to Rotter there are three major determinants of behaviour in SLT: First, expectancy - what can the observer expect to achieve through imitation of a specific action? Second, the psychological situation – what life conditions and belief systems promote or discourage imitation of an observed behaviour? And, third, the value of the reinforcement - will there be positive or negative consequence for the action?⁴ The previous chapters have addressed the role of expectancy – how genocidal leaders knew what they could achieve through the imitation of policies and approaches to perceived problems and the psychological situation, and how regime leaders imbedded a ideology of supremacy combined with a perceived threat. In this chapter I examine the third determinant of behaviour – reinforcement. The first section looks at the informative function of the actions and responses of other states to the genocidal policy. What were the responses, and what actions did other nations, and international religious organizations offer in the face of genocide, and how did the genocidal leaders respond to them? The successes of genocidal leaders in negating outside interference serve as a model to future regimes. Does the evidence suggest that this model was imitated? The second section of this chapter examines the influence of response consequences. What international consequences can regime leaders expect after the implementation of genocide? Were genocidal leaders punished? It is my purpose in this chapter to examine how the responses of international bystanders informed genocidal leaders in the planning and perpetration of genocide through the lens of SLT.

⁴ Rotter, 305

The Informative Function and Bystanders

Bandura points out that by observing different outcomes people are able to develop hypotheses about which responses are most appropriate in which circumstance. In the SLT explanation of behaviour, awareness of positive or negative reinforcement factors will typically result in rapid changes in behaviour. In this way modeled outcomes serves as a guide for future action.⁵ Witnessing the success or failures of others will act as a motivator or inhibitor to action. While another's failure may discourage similar action, witnessing successful achievement of a goal through the implementation of a process will embolden an observer. Bandura explains, "Observers are initially reluctant to embark on new undertakings until they see the advantages gained by early adopters. Modeled benefits accelerate diffusion by weakening the restraints of the more cautious potential adopters."⁶ This information can be applied to the three genocides at hand. The Young Turks, the Nazis, and the Hutu extremists all responded to, and acted in anticipation of, expected international reinforcers – both positive and negative in nature.

During the Armenian genocide there was no large international body, such as the League of Nations or the United Nations. Nevertheless, the influence of some nations and the lack of influence of others, specifically the United States and Germany, were much noted. In 1914, Morgenthau believed that the Americans held a good amount of sway over the Turks, "Turkey desired the good opinion of the United States, and hoped, after the war, to find support among American financiers."⁷ All the same, Morgenthau admits that the more important ally of Turkey was Germany. According to Morgenthau, Turkey was in such financial straits that without support from an outside source the regime would not survive. Morgenthau suggests that because

⁵ Bandura (1977), 17

⁶ Ibid., 51

⁷ Morgenthau, 131

of the outbreak of WWI and Germany's need for allies, "Talaat and his associates needed Germany almost as badly as Germany needed Talaat."⁸

Once the genocide of the Armenians began in earnest the power of the American embassy to change the policy course of the Young Turks seemed to vanish, and the desire of the Germans to stop the genocide was non-existent. Morgenthau reports that he continually spoke with Talaat and Enver in hopes of convincing them to alter their Armenian policy. Repeatedly he was told that the policy was firm and unchangeable and, further, what the Turks did with the Armenians was not the business of the United States.⁹ At one point the American Ambassador was told by Talaat, "It is no use for you to argue, we have already disposed of three quarters of the Armenians; there are none left at all in Bitlis, Van, and Erzeroum."¹⁰ Morgenthau points out that Enver deeply resented any suggestion that the Armenians should be assisted or comforted by outsiders. When offers of aid for the Armenians came from the United States Enver turned it down unapologetically. "For Americans to do this would encourage all Armenians and make further trouble."¹¹

The genocide being perpetrated against the Armenians did not go unnoticed by the British, French, and Russian governments. They issued a joint public warning on 24 May, 1915, to the Turkish government indicating that they regarded the persecutions and "mass murders" of the Armenians as a "crime against humanity and civilization," for which all members of the Ottoman government would be held accountable.¹² In the face of such a strongly worded warning the Turks needed to consult with their German allies to seek their guidance before

⁸ Ibid., 25

⁹ Morgenthau, examples can be found on p. 330, 333, 334, 338, and 344

¹⁰ Ibid., 338

¹¹ Ibid. 347

¹² Trumpener, 209

rebutting. The response came loud and clear: the Turks were exercising their sovereign right to self-defence in the face of an Armenian threat, and the Armenian leaders themselves must take full responsibility for the resulting massacres against their people.¹³ As will be shown, this is a refrain that was repeated in response to international criticism against the genocidal policies implemented by the Nazis and the Hutu extremists.

The most controversial bystander role in the Armenian genocide is that of the Germans - the later perpetrators of the Holocaust. As Turkey's closest ally, they had the most influence. On 15 April, 1915, the Armenians made a request to the German Ambassador Wangenheim for formal protection from the Turks. Trumpener explains that Wangenheim refused them because Germany needed to keep Turkey as an ally in their war effort.¹⁴ Part of the request made to the Germans was for Germany to assign consuls to the Eastern Vilayets. In a report to Germany Wangenheim explains that he feared that assigning additional consuls would not only negatively impact Germany's relationship with Turkey, but would also, "turn the authorities all the more against the Armenians and, thus, produce the very opposite."¹⁵ Later, as will be shown, the Roman Catholic Church also employed this very same justification to defend its measured response to the Holocaust.

When Scheubner attempted to interfere on the Armenians behalf, he was frequently reminded of the political interests of Germany, along with the official German and Turkish justification that the Armenians had brought this fate upon themselves.¹⁶ Morgenthau, recognizing the role of Germany sought out Wangenheim himself to attempt to get Wangenheim to rein in his allies. Morgenthau reports that Wangenheim's antipathy towards the plight of the

¹³ Ibid., 210

¹⁴ Trumpener 206

¹⁵ Dispatch No. 228 to Germany, April, 1915, as copied in Trumpener, 206

¹⁶ Kaiser, xli, l, li,

Armenians was immediately apparent. “He began denouncing [the Armenians] in unmeasured terms; like Talaat and Enver, he affected to regard the Van episode as an unprovoked rebellion, and, in his eyes, as in theirs, the Armenians were simply traitorous vermin.”¹⁷ Morgenthau warned Germany that this episode would reflect badly on them in the eyes of the world. He added, “I do not claim that Germany is responsible for these massacres in the sense that she instigated them. But she is responsible in the sense that she had the power to stop them and did not use it.”¹⁸ Apologists for Germany’s role in the Armenian genocide do point out that Germany did file official protests with the Turkish government.¹⁹ However, Morgenthau notes that the official protest was filed with a figure head of the government who had no real power. Morgenthau refers to this as merely “a paper protest” done for the sake of optics with no real positive intention behind it.²⁰ Germany’s real efforts were directed to finding “proof” that a “wide scale subversive movement” had existed among the Armenians.²¹

As already noted, the Germans also claimed that a wide scale subversive movement existed amongst the Jews. Germany claimed it was in the fight for its very existence. Germany was indeed at war. With the attention of allied nations of the United Kingdom, France, Canada, Australia, Russia, and the United States, on their own survival, and no real power in a position to oppose the Germans, it can be argued that there was no influential voice to sway their decision regarding the Jews. However, the process of the Jewish genocide began before the war broke out. Fein reports that the British Press consistently covered and denounced anti-Jewish measures. Yet the allies did not protest the disenfranchisement of the Jews between 1933 and 1939, preferring

¹⁷ Morgenthau, 370

¹⁸ Ibid., 381

¹⁹ Trumpener, 217 & 233

²⁰ Morgenthau, 381

²¹ Trumpener, 217

to regard it as an “internal affair.”²² Nations were focused on their own goals of reducing the risk of another world war. If this came at the expense of the Jews, then so be it. Anti-Semitism inside the nations of the bystanders also played a role. Most allies had, at that time, quotas in place to limit the number of Jews that could emigrate, thus trapping the Jews in Europe as well as sending Germany the message that they did not want the Jews any more than the Germans did. Official protests against the German policies implemented against the Jews were not made until after the outbreak of war.²³ By then the Jews were little more than a propaganda tool useful to demonize the Germans. Even when opportunities arose to assist the Jews through bombing raids on the railway tracks that delivered the Jews to the death camps, the allies refused.²⁴ Fein writes, “Allied policy during World War II showed persisting indifference to the ongoing extermination of European Jewry, notwithstanding rhetorical denunciations from December 1942 onward, threatening post war punishment for war crimes.”²⁵ Of course, the Germans had heard these types of threats before. As mentioned above, when the allies made the same threats to the Turks, the Germans assisted in the rebuttal. And, the Germans witnessed what came of these threats of punishment – nothing. Hilberg comments, “In its gravest hour Jewry stood alone, and the realization of that desertion came as a shock to Jewish leaders all over the world.”²⁶

Another important international bystander of note during the Holocaust is the Catholic Church. Germany had a very high Catholic population; more than twenty million Germans, including Hitler, were Catholic at the outbreak of World War II, representing just over 25% of

²² Fein., 192

²³ Fein, 184

²⁴ Hilberg, Vol. III, 1216

²⁵ Fein, 193

²⁶ Hilbergm Vol. III, 1129

the population.²⁷ In 1942 a group of Jews sent a desperate and imploring letter to Pope Pius XII to inform him of the planned deportation of 90,000 Jews from Slovakia.²⁸ The letter ended with “We place all our hope and confidence in your Holiness, as the safest refuge of all the persecuted.”²⁹ In August 1942, a letter from a member of the Swiss Rescue Committee reports 20,000 Jews were deported from Paris in cattle cars. The letter pleads with the Vatican to influence Roman Catholic countries to open their doors to the orphaned Jewish children.³⁰ In October 1942, eyewitnesses from Axis countries gave the Vatican accurate information on the existence and purpose of death camps.³¹ Then, in October 1943, 1000 Roman Jews were shipped to Auschwitz from “under the windows of the Pope.”³²

Susan Zuccotti believes that the Germans feared a Vatican condemnation of the round up of the Roman Jews.³³ They were concerned that an overt public Vatican disapproval could lead to public disorder and unleash an Italian resistance.³⁴ As it happens, the Nazis had nothing to fear. On October 28, 1943, Zuccotti reports that the German Ambassador to the Pope, Ernst von Weizsacker, made the statement that he was pleased that the Pope had “not allowed himself to be drawn into any demonstrative censure” of the deportation of the Roman Jews.³⁵ Madigan reports that to respond to criticism that the Vatican did not do enough to help the Jews, the Vatican claimed that it condemned wartime offences, and that to be more specific would “only

²⁷ Randolph L. Braham, The Vatican and the Holocaust: The Catholic Church and the Jews During the Nazi Era (Boulder: Columbia University Press, 2000), 32

²⁸ Kevin Madigan “*What We Knew About the Holocaust, and When*” Commentary, October 2001; 112(3) 43

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., 47

³¹ Ibid., 48

³² Ibid.

³³ Susan Zuccotti, Under His Very Window: The Vatican and the Holocaust in Italy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000) 156-157

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Madigan, 48

make matters worse.”³⁶ Doing so the Vatican imitated the actions of the German Ambassador who refrained to reproach the Turks for their Armenian policy on the grounds that it would not help but, instead, “turn the authorities all the more against the Armenians and, thus, produce the very opposite,”³⁷

If the Hutu extremists were paying any attention to the lessons found in the Armenian genocide and the Holocaust, it would have been apparent to them that the self-interest or lack of interest, in countries would prevent their interference in Rwanda. And, indeed, the actions of the Hutu leadership demonstrate that they were paying attention. Like the Nazis, and the Turks before them, the Rwandans presented their target group as enemy sympathizers and threats to national security. Despite many early warnings of the impending genocide, inclusive of hard intelligence describing a plan to implement it,³⁸ the international community did absolutely nothing to try to stop it. Dallaire writes, “While most nations agreed something should be done, they all had an excuse why they should not be the ones to do it.”³⁹

However, in between the time of the Holocaust, and the time of the Rwandan genocide, the world had changed. International norms had emerged, and the United Nations had developed and grown. The Hutu extremists were faced with an international peacekeeping force, a situation that was not faced by the Turks or the Nazis. In order to initiate the genocide the Hutu extremists needed to ensure that the peacekeeping force would not interfere. There were no modeled examples of this in Turkey, or WWII Europe to demonstrate how this might be achieved. Despite the lack of modeled examples in the previous genocides to guide the Hutu extremists, they seemed to know exactly what to do. Rotter informs how this can be explained through SLT. “By

³⁶ Madigan, 49

³⁷ Dispatch No. 228 to Germany, April, 1915, as copied in Trumpener, 206

³⁸ Dallaire had information by a man he code named Jean-Pierre. See Dallaire, 141-144, 149-151, & 161

³⁹ Dallaire, 516

cognitive means, human beings are not only able to learn extremely complex methods of solving contemporary problems, but also to recreate the past and to create, through imagination, events which have not actually occurred.”⁴⁰ Bandura describes an experiment in which participants were tested under conditions where they could behave in a way stylistically similar to the model, but could not mimic the models specific response because they needed to apply it to a situation that was unfamiliar. This resulted in participants extracting common attributes exemplified in diverse modeled responses and formulating rules for generating behaviour with similar structural characteristics.⁴¹

The model that the Hutu extremists needed was found in Somalia. In early October, 1993, a UN mission led by the United States in Somalia came into an armed confrontation between Somali clans and UN forces, leading to the deaths of eighteen American soldiers. The American public reacted very strongly to the televised spectacle of the body of an army pilot dragged through the streets of Somalia. The direct result of the murder of these white UN soldiers was the withdrawal of the United States and the collapse of the UN mission. After the downing of President Habyarimana’s plane, one of the first actions of the genocidaires was to capture, and brutally murder ten white UN peacekeepers from Belgium. Dallaire observes, “The extremists had taken their cue from the grim farces of Bosnia and Somalia – they knew western nations did not have the stomach or the will to sustain casualties in peace support operations.”⁴² Further, Dallaire had intelligence in advance of the genocide that the Hutu extremists planned to murder white UN peacekeepers in order to make the soldiers leave.⁴³

⁴⁰ Rotter, 306

⁴¹ Bandura (1977), 41

⁴² Dallaire, 240

⁴³ Ibid., 141-144

As in Nazi Europe, an important international bystander in the Rwandan genocide was the Catholic Church. In 1994, Rwanda was the most Christian country in Africa.⁴⁴ A 1991 census lists the population as being 89.8% Christian, of which 62.6% were Catholic.⁴⁵ In the days leading up to the genocide the Catholic clergy demonstrated awareness of the threat that their congregants faced. In February and May 1990, Roman Catholic leaders inside Rwanda published a pastoral letter that indirectly and vaguely denounced corruption and called for respect of Human Rights.⁴⁶ However, when Human Rights groups formed to protest the sweeping arrests of Tutsis and Hutu moderates after the RPF invasion, the Catholic hierarchy refused to support them and instead released a Pastoral letter offering strong support of the Habyarimana regime.⁴⁷ Once the genocide began, the Catholic Church released statements, but did not act. In May 1994, a group of Roman Catholic leaders in Rwanda signed a joint letter calling for an end to the killing and violence.⁴⁸ However, what this letter did not say left a stronger impact than what it did say. The letter did not condemn the massacres, and did not use the label ‘genocide’ to describe what was happening in Rwanda.⁴⁹ Timothy Longman points out that these omissions accepted the Hutu extremist’s portrayal of the genocide as justified defensive action within the context of war.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ Matthias Bjornlund, Eric Markusen, Peter Steenberg, Rafiki Ubaldo, “*The Christian Churches and the Construction of a Genocidal Mentality in Rwanda*” in Genocide in Rwanda: Complicity of the Churches, edited by Carol Rittner, John K. Roth, & Wendy Whitworth (St. Paul: Paragon House, 2004) 141

⁴⁵ Carol Rittner “*Chronology*” in Genocide in Rwanda: Complicity of the Churches, edited by Carol Rittner, John K. Roth, & Wendy Whitworth (St. Paul: Paragon House, 2004) 8

⁴⁶ Timothy Longman “*Christian Churches and the Genocide in Rwanda*” in, In God’s Name: Genocide and Religion in the Twentieth Century, edited by Omer Bartov & Phyllis Mack (New York: Berghahn Books, 2001)

151

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 157

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

On April 10th, four days after the downing of Habyarimana's plane, the Papal Nuncio, Archbishop Giuseppe Bertello, fled Rwanda.⁵¹ On April 27th, Pope John Paul spoke of Rwanda during his general audience, inviting all positions to work towards a solution to the violence.⁵² Speaking in this manner he implied that the victims of the genocide had a voice and eventually could exert some leverage at the negotiating table with the *genocidaires*. On May 15, 1994, the Pope gave a broadcast address:

Again today, I feel it is my duty to recall the violence to which the people of Rwanda are subjected. This is an out-and-out genocide for which unfortunately even Catholics are responsible. Day after day I am close to this people in agony and would like to make a fresh appeal to the consciences of all those who plan and execute massacres. They are bringing their country to the brink of the abyss. Everyone must answer for their crimes to history and, indeed, to God. Enough bloodshed! God expects a moral renewal from *all Rwandans*, with the help of friendly countries, and the courage of forgiveness and brotherhood.⁵³ (Italics added)

With the above statement, the Pope spoke out against the genocide. He articulately and clearly condemned the violence that was occurring in Rwanda, and demanded that the killing come to a stop. He failed, however, to call the Hutus by name. By specifying "all Rwandans" the Pope placed the victims into the same boat as the *genocidaires*. The Tutsis were as much responsible for their own deaths as the Hutus holding the machetes. Moreover, *genocidaires* who had believed the anti-Tutsi propaganda saw all Tutsis as RPF collaborators and, thus, legitimate enemies. The *genocidaire*, Jean-Baptiste Murangira sums up the effect this non-response had on the Hutu killers, "Deep down we knew that Christ was not on our side in this situation, but since he was not saying anything through the Priests' mouths, that suited us."⁵⁴

⁵¹ Rittner, 12

⁵² Ibid., 13

⁵³ Pope John Paul II, Rome, 15 May 1994.

⁵⁴ Hatzfeld, 145

Once the genocide began the desperate situation in Rwanda became viewed in the international press and by the UN⁵⁵ as “a civil war with unfortunate civilian killings.”⁵⁶ As in Turkey, where the focus on the ongoing war disabled Germany’s ability or desire to respond, and in the Holocaust where war aims obscured humanitarian aims, the civil war in Rwanda directed the attention of the international community away from the ongoing genocide, offering the genocidal regime cover from reproach. The UN Special Representative, Jacques Roger Booh-Booh insisted that the focus for dealing with the situation need to be placed on a ceasefire between RPF and Rwandan Governmental Forces, as well as maintaining UN neutrality. Jacques Roger Booh-Booh did not believe that the genocide needed to be addressed directly. Scott Feil comments that it was when the extremists sensed that the world was not going to address the crisis, and that the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) contingents was in self-protection mode, that the genocide moved into high gear.⁵⁷ The genocidaire Elie Mizing sums up the effect this international abandonment had on the attitudes of the Hutu killers, “All the important people turned their backs on our killings. The blue helmets, the Belgians, the white directors, the black presidents, the humanitarian people and the international cameraman, the priests and the bishops, and finally even God.”⁵⁸

Bandura points out, “People learn to evaluate their behaviour partly on the basis of how others have reacted to it.”⁵⁹ Even though the Americans and others protested the Armenian policy of the Young Turks, they did not interfere. Outside condemnation did not go any farther

⁵⁵It can be inferred that the UN viewed the genocide in this way based on the focus of the Security Council throughout the genocide. The Security Council would only address the mass murder of Tutsis from within the framework of the civil war and pointed all their efforts to resuming the peace process, with no attention on stopping the killing.

⁵⁶ Coloroso., 41

⁵⁷ Scott R. Feil, Preventing Genocide: How the Early Use of Force Might Have Succeeded in Rwanda (New York: Carnegie Commission of New York, 1998)16

⁵⁸ Hatzfeld, 145

⁵⁹ Bandura (1977), 133

than complaints without actions. The allies refused to make the plight of the Jews a focus of their war effort, and the world collectively ignored the rapid slaughter of Rwanda's Tutsi population. According to Bandura "The effectiveness of social reactions as incentives derives from their predictive value rather than inhering in the reactions themselves."⁶⁰ The response the world modeled to the destruction of the Armenians told Hitler what he could expect, provided he followed the Turkish example and portrayed the Jews in the same way – as enemies of the state. The response the world modeled when faced with the annihilation of the Jews of Europe told the Hutu extremists what to expect, provided they portrayed the Tutsis in the same way - as enemies of the state. Further, the actions of the war tribes in Somalia informed the Hutu extremists on how they could overcome a UN peacekeeping force, an obstacle not faced by the Turks and the Nazis. Successful imitation of the Somali tactics, allowed the Hutus to reap the same results – removal of the UN force. All of the above demonstrates that the actions of the international bystanders modeled impotency to prevent or stop genocide and informed genocidal leaders on how best to respond to international inquiries or condemnations. However, what example did the international bystander set for genocidal leaders once the genocide was over? This is the topic of the following section.

Learning by Response Consequences: Genocide and Punishment

Bandura points out, "Human behaviour is regulated to a large extent by anticipated consequences of prospective actions."⁶¹ In SLT, anticipatory actions are not only based on customary outcomes that correspond to prevailing social conditions of enforcement, but also "are partly inferred from observed response consequences of others, from what one reads or is told,

⁶⁰ Ibid., 101

⁶¹ Bandura (1972), 50

and from a variety of other cues that, on the basis of past experiences, are considered reliable forecasters of likely outcomes.”⁶² According to SLT, punishment will discourage an observer from imitating the actions modeled. As previously mentioned, the allies issued a warning to the Turkish regime that it would be held accountable for the murder of the Armenian population. Official public protests against the Nazi regime were released. Consequently, punishment of the Turks would have had the effect of deterring Hitler from imitating that policy. Further, the punishment of Germany should have had the effect of deterring the Hutu extremists. Yet, Hitler and the Hutu extremists were not deterred. What did the international reaction after a genocide then tell the following genocidal leaders?

Morgenthau believed that there would be strong negative repercussions for the Turks because of their Armenian policy. In a conversation with Talaat, Morgenthau warned, “You say that, if you are victorious [in WWI], you can defy the world, but you are wrong. You will have to meet public opinion everywhere, especially in the United States. Our people will never forget these massacres.”⁶³ Boyajian points out that while the genocide of the Armenians was still in progress there was wide scale demand from the United States and Western Europe for the compensation of the Armenians, combined with the assumption that an Armenian homeland,⁶⁴ either independent or under an allied mandate, would be incorporated into official peace treaties and agreements.⁶⁵ *The Treaty of Mudros*, entered into on 30 October, 1918, met these demands and provided that six Armenian vilayets and the Cilician territory be given to the Armenians. After a coup in Turkey that resulted in the downfall of the Young Turks regime, on 17 June,

⁶² Ibid., 51

⁶³ Morgenthau, 335

⁶⁴ The Armenia that exists today was part of the Russian territory and is not part of the Turkish Armenian area. The Russian Armenia had very little land and minimal resources and was not capable of supporting Turkish Armenians even in their post WWI depleted numbers. Despite the tight quarters, most Turkish Armenians left their traditional homelands and moved to the Russian side after their loss in the Treaty of Lausanne.

⁶⁵ Boyajian, 137

1919, the new government of Turkey delivered a memorandum to the Supreme Council of the 1919 Paris Peace conference, also known as the Council of Ten⁶⁶ placing the blame for Turkey's entry into WWI, and the atrocities committed against the Armenians entirely at the feet of the previous regime. Further, the memorandum demanded that the territorial integrity of Turkey be restored.⁶⁷ Despite this demand, the international *Treaty of Sevres*, signed 10 August, 1920 recognized independence for the Armenians. However, in September of that same year, Turkey attacked the newly formed Armenia and forced it to renounce the *Treaty of Sevres*. In response, on 22 November, 1920 the League of Nations voted on a resolution requesting the assistance of the United States in safeguarding the future of Armenia.⁶⁸ The Americans refused this request.

By 1923, Armenia had been abandoned by its allies, and Turkey, well and truly, had gotten away with murder. The *Treaty of Lausanne* that was signed on 24 July, 1923, annulled and replaced the *Treaty of Sevres* which had been signed by representatives of the Young Turks regime. While Turkey was compelled to cede territories south of Syria and Iraq, as well as its privileges in Libya, the borders of Turkey were fully restored, inclusive of the land that had been granted to Armenia.⁶⁹ A map showing the borders of Turkey as defined in the *Treaty of Sevres* granting a homeland to the Armenians, and the *Treaty of Lausanne* restoring Turkey's borders resulting in the loss of the Armenian homeland to Turkey can be seen in figure 1.3. Boyajian writes:

Despite the universal demand that Armenia be granted a home, as recognized in the Paris Peace Conference, President Wilson's plan for the Armenian boundaries, the terms of the Treaty of Sevres, the Allies with unspeakable weakness and callousness to the call of their consciences, acceded to the Treaty

⁶⁶ The Council of Ten, consisted of the five chief representatives of the US, France, United Kingdom, Italy and Japan, each accompanied by his foreign minister

⁶⁷ Ibid., 264

⁶⁸ Ibid., 255-256

⁶⁹ <http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/history/A0829043.html> - accessed 4/03/11

of Lausanne, thereby leaving what Arnold Toynbee [a British historian] himself called a genocide unpunished.⁷⁰

Bandura explains that in the social learning viewpoint, deterrence rests heavily on the restraining function of punishment. Following the Armenian genocide, there was no punishment, and no exemplary restraining function, a fact that would later inform the decisions of Nazi Germans and extremists Hutus.

After WWII Germany was divided into four zones - American, British, French and Soviet - which were governed by the four powers of occupation. A legal apparatus was put in place within the newly formed United Nations to bring to trial those who were guilty of Crimes against Humanity. At the infamous Nuremberg Tribunal twenty-four defendants were tried. Of that group, twelve were sentenced to death, seven received other various sentences, and three were found not guilty.⁷¹ Neave comments that these trials would serve as a record to the world of the behaviour, actions, choices and policies of the German nation under Hitler.⁷² In total approximately two hundred Nazis were tried at Nuremberg, with many more in regular courts. Many top Nazis fled to South America, and some were later captured. The *Marshal Plan* was implemented to rebuild Europe, including Germany.⁷³

Judith Miller further notes that at the onset of the cold war in 1949, Germany began to de-emphasize its past, and the Allies, needing German cooperation, let it do so.⁷⁴ However, unlike the Armenians, the Jewish people were granted their own homeland, which can be credited, in part, to the guilt of the allied nations. Nonetheless, the new homeland did not come at

⁷⁰ Ibid., 268

⁷¹ Neave, 331

⁷² Neave, 320

⁷³ Christine Richert Nugent. "*West German economic reconstruction and moral reconstitution: An examination of economic instability and its impact on 'Holocaust moments'*" in, Journal of European Studies v. 40 no. 4 (December 2010) p. 355-73

⁷⁴ Judith Miller, One. By One. By One (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990) 38

the expense of Germany, for Israel was formed in Palestine. Finally, in response to the Holocaust, the UN developed the United Nations Convention on Genocide (UNCG) to serve as a preventative tool against future similar actions, and a statement that this type of mass murder would not be tolerated in the future.

If on some level, the international response to Germany's genocide of the Jews represents a model of punishment, was it sufficient to discourage future genocides? Given that the Rwandan genocide did occur, why did the territorial loss of Germany, combined with courtroom punishment, not act as a deterrence model? Bandura explains that rewards, when immediate, exert greater influence on actions than delayed punishment.⁷⁵ Further, in some instances, depicted punishment can actually sustain adherence to aggressive methods because the punishment process can be used for its informative value. People believe that they can use the information to learn from the mistakes of others and, then, with a slight change of tactics, observers believe they will be able to gain the benefits of aggression without suffering the consequences. In this context, the record of the punishment of Germany served as an informational tool, describing exactly what process was implemented, what worked and what failed, and, thereby, implying where improvement could be made. Bandura adds, "For those various reasons, it is better not to teach violent methods than to teach them and try to inhibit their use. Affixing an ethical ending to a succession of aggressive triumphs in no way removes the enduring learning effects."⁷⁶

Fein insists that German instigation and organization of the extermination of Europe's Jews succeeded because of the lack of counter authorities *willing* to resist the Nazi plans, not

⁷⁵ Bandura (1972), 272

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 271

because counter authorities were repressed by the Germans.⁷⁷ This can be said also of both the Armenian and the Rwandan genocides. Germany was aware that there were outsiders with influence in Turkey who chose to stand idly by because of self-interest. In light of the model set by Germany, Hutu extremists in Rwanda knew that presenting the Tutsis as enemies of the state and focusing outside attention on the war occurring within Rwandan borders would hide the genocide and prevent international actors from assisting the Tutsis.

⁷⁷ Fein, 90

Conclusion

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny.

- **Martin Luther King, JR.**
Letters from Birmingham Jail

There must have been a moment at the beginning where we all could have said no. But somehow we missed it.

- **Tom Stoppard,**
in Barbara Coloroso,
Extraordinary Evil: A Brief History of Genocide (2007) 173

We need to stop proving to political leaders that we will stand by as they slaughter their own people.

- **Daniel Goldhagen**
Worse Than War Documentary (2010)

Two of the three genocidal regimes examined in this thesis were able to know details of other genocides. Further, evidence suggests that the Young Turks modeled their genocidal policies on earlier policies of the Germans, British and Russians.¹ The Turks did not have a genocide from which they might learn, but they did have the actions and policies of other governments towards target populations that did act as a model for the planned genocide against the Armenians. Hitler knew of the Turkish genocide perpetrated against the Armenians via friends, advisors, and Nazi Party colleagues. The Hutu extremist regime knew about Hitler's aims, plans, and perpetration of genocide through Hitler's own accounts, movies, and other media paraphernalia. Social Learning Theory explains that learning is achieved through modeling and imitation. Thus, because Nazi and Hutu leaders knew about other genocides, they were able learn how to plan and implement their own genocidal policy. Examining the Armenian, Jewish, and Rwandan genocides through the lens of SLT has demonstrated the following:

First, the Nazi and Hutu extremist leaders were able to learn from other genocidal leaders. The development of organized killing units, the identification, segregation, and deportation of victims en mass, or their congregation into killing centers are key examples of learning found in the comprehensive list of instances of actions, choices, and policies found in Figure 1.1. A further example of learning is that all three genocidal regimes used war as both an excuse for the killings, and as a means to hide the nature of the targets. The Turks successfully and purposefully used WWI as a cover and justification to rid itself of an "enemy population" - the Armenians. The Nazi leadership blamed WWII on "world Jewry," used WWII as a justification to exterminate the European Jews, used the war as a means to access Jews in

¹ This is explained by Morgenthau 364-368 and Fein, 12

conquered lands, and exploited the war as a tool that would prevent outside interference in the genocide. And, the Hutus pretended that the genocide was part of the war. Tutsi civilians inclusive of men, women and babies were cut down as RPF combatants. Further, the civil war in Rwanda was effectively utilized to divert the attention away from the genocide, and to the war.

Second, in order for genocide to take place, members of societies need to be conditioned and taught to commit genocide. This was achieved through extensive use of propaganda such as newspapers, radios, and film and the use of the public religious voice, such as the preaching of local religious leaders. In the Armenian genocide, religious Islamic leaders espoused the anti-Armenian propaganda to their followers; during the Holocaust religious leaders responded with silence, instead of modeling defiance against the genocidal regime; in Rwanda the religious leaders refused to condemn the massacres and, instead, set the example of holding “all Rwandans” responsible for the bloodshed occurring in Rwanda.

Third, international bystanders such as other nations and the Roman Catholic Church may verbally condemn the policy, but they will not act when given justifications for the slaughter, such as the portraying the target group as legitimate enemies of the state, and the presentation of the genocide as an unfortunate side effect of war. International organizations capable of forceful collective action, such as sanctions or military force, will officially accept the justifications of the genocide given them so as to be relieved of the responsibility and risks of action, while at the same time offering mild statements of protest against the policy.² The self-interest of individual nations will take precedence over the well-being of the target populations.

² Officially statespersons accept the justifications, while at the same time they may personally recognize that the justifications are weak, and protest the record. Although, I would say that is not true of Morgenthau specifically. In the case of Rwanda, in a recent interview Goldhagan had with Madeline Albright for his documentary, she still stubbornly refused to be moved from the position that what was

Fourth, motivation is a key element of genocide. Leaders were motivated because they saw elimination of a segment of the population as a solution to political problems such as treasury shortfalls and land shortage issues. Citizens saw the benefit of genocide in financial gain and material benefits, and the creation of a utopian society filled with people who were religiously, racially, or ethnically alike.

Fifth, by modeling the examples set by the previous genocidal leaders, the Nazi and the Hutu leaders were able to neutralize the condemnation of aggression and overcome moral inhibitions about mass murder. The neutralization of condemnation was achieved with techniques that involved: redefining the policy in positive terms, describing the regime's own aggression as a legitimate response to the perceived threat of the target group; blaming the victim group for its own troubles; using higher principles, such as racial ideology and law, to justify the disappearance of the target group; and dehumanizing the target group.

Sixth, points of failure for model genocidal leaders caused the observing genocidal leaders to refine the behaviour and improve the tactics to increase its chances of success. An observing genocidal leader is not discouraged by the negative consequences suffered by a previous genocidal leader. In Germany the negative consequences faced by the remaining leaders and the citizens could be attributed more to their loss of the war than to their policy towards the Jews during the war.³ The state of Germany was divided by the victors as a consequence of losing the war, not as a punishment for the genocide. German land was not granted to the

going on was a civil war. She claims, on camera that the US only knew nothing about the civil war, and was completely unaware of the genocide. Further, Albright holds to the position that the UN responded as best as it could considering what the UN "knew."

³ The Nuremberg trials demonstrate this clearly. The trial records show that the topic of the trials were as much, if not more, focused on the treatment of British and Soviet Prisoners of War, and the treatment of the Christian populations in conquered territories, as it was on the policy of the annihilation of the Jews.

Jewish people.⁴ The most important repercussion for Germany was the memorialisation of the genocide and the financial burden of damages paid to Jews and the newly formed state of Israel. Had no Jews survived, the Germans would have undoubtedly had an easier time of it. In Rwanda the Hutu extremists attempted to overcome the consequences the Germans experienced by employing a more rapid killing process to reduce the likelihood of Tutsis surviving the mass organized killing. To speed up the genocide the Hutu instigators did not exploit the Tutsis for labour, or involve themselves in extensive deportation processes. The Hutu extremists demonstrated innovativeness in other areas as well. In order to deal with a threat unfaced by the previous genocidal leaders, the Hutu extremists were able to model the successes of Somalia to find a viable solution for the UNAMIR presence. Thus, while there are significant similarities and structure of the three genocides, differences and innovative techniques found in the Holocaust and Rwandan genocides can be accounted for through SLT.

Implications: SLT and Genocide Applied to the Future

As an outcome of the study of the three genocides of the twentieth century through Social Learning Theory it can be concluded that genocides can occur by modeling the eliminationist policies⁵ of previous regimes when other models of genocide are unavailable, as in the case of the Armenian genocide. Further, that once a genocide has occurred future leaders not only know about it, they also learn from the example how to do it and if need be, how to overcome obstacles to the implementation of their policy, as in the case of the Holocaust and the Rwandan genocides.

⁴ There is, however, no indication that the Jewish survivors were requesting a new state be created for them in Europe. The focus of the Zionists was a new state of Israel in Palastine.

⁵ As defined by Goldhagen and explained in chapter one, according to Goldhagen there are five stages of eliminationism: transformation, repression, expulsion, prevention of reproduction, and extermination .

Contemporary regime leaders know about the Armenian genocide, the Holocaust, and the Rwandan genocide. It follows that a regime leader that has internal problems that could be solved through the annihilation of an identifiable segment of the population can access information from these other genocides and use that information to learn how to implement genocide. If direct personal links to the genocide through friends, advisors, and colleagues, are unavailable then other sources of information are easily obtainable, such as books and films.

For genocidal leaders there will be positive benefits from the genocide. More land will be available, there can be greater cash flow to the state treasury, and there will be material benefits to the dominant population. There is hope through innovative techniques that negative repercussions can be overcome. Thus, positive consequences are guaranteed, while negative consequences are not. Moreover, leaders have reason to believe that the international community will not interfere if the risk to them is too high and the benefits for them of intervening are low.

Punishing regime leaders and other individuals after the genocide will not necessarily deter future leaders because they believe they can employ innovative techniques, change tactics and, thus, change the outcome for themselves. Thus, when a regime leader views the annihilation of a segment of their population as the best option to solve serious issues the state is facing – and alternative options are lacking – the punishment of previous leaders will not convince it that genocide is the wrong policy for its nation. Punishment comes too late to act as a deterrent and prevent future genocides.

According to Bandura, response consequences are rooted in direct experience and results from positive and negative outcomes and effects of actions. “Through this process of differential reinforcement, successful forms of behaviour are eventually selected and ineffectual ones are

discarded.”⁶ Bandura explains, “By observing the different outcomes of their actions, [people] develop hypotheses about which responses are the most appropriate in which settings.”⁷ In a study with aggressive patients Bandura found that even minor punishments applied consistently as alarming behaviour occurred, combined with rewarded alternatives to that behaviour succeeded in producing enduring positive change in aggression, whereas more severe punishment applied only after the behaviour had concluded failed to deter future instances of aggression.⁸ When applied to genocide, immediate outcomes help regime leaders decide on future actions as the genocidal process unfolds. Thus, once the genocidal process is initiated it is not too late in the early stages to change its course through the application of immediate negative consequences to that action combined with rewarding alternative policies. Genocide must be responded to by the international community from the earliest stages as defined by Hilberg: expropriation, segregation and elimination. Consistent positive reinforcement of altered behaviour and consistent negative consequences to harmful behaviour will be more effective in stopping a genocide than the threat of punishment after it has occurred.

Bandura explains that collective action can be a tool of social change.⁹ Applied to genocide, the collective action of international bystanders can affect a change of policy in a state despite the protections provided by international norms such as sovereignty. A case in point is the violence that resulted from the 2008 contested reelection of President Mwai Kibaki in Kenya. As a consequence of this violence, over 1500 members of the President’s racial group, the Kikuyu, were slaughtered, and many thousands more were expelled from their homes. Goldhagen reports that within days the UN Secretary of State Kofi Annan, along with

⁶ Bandura (1977), 17

⁷ Bandura (1977), 17

⁸ Bandura (1972), 308

⁹ Ibid., 318

representatives of other African nations, flew to Nairobi and the US Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, arrived soon after.¹⁰ Goldhagen explains, “They came to mediate, to persuade, and with threats of sanctions.”¹¹ Goldhagen credits this intense international engagement with the conflict in Kenya with ending the violence. He further clarifies, “the immediate response of world leaders was a powerful statement and the kind of rapid reaction that could save many lives in the future.”¹² Goldhagen points out, however, that the racial roots of the conflict remain, and could be easily exploited by politicians in the future.

In, the Kenyan example, diplomatic pressure was both swift, and collectively applied. In order for collective action to be successful it must be effectively organized. Bandura notes that collective action fails most often when efforts are dissipated on too many different problems, are diminished because of factional disputes, or are not sustained.¹³ When consistently applied group pressure will make threats of repercussions credible. It is not enough, however, to threaten immediate consequences. Leaders need to believe that these consequences are imminent should they persist in their harmful behaviour. Threats do not need to be military in nature. Diplomatic pressure, combined with threats to the international prestige or financial well-being of the regime leaders can be effective when taken seriously. In order to be taken seriously the intervention must be graduated with small rewards or negative consequences as the behaviour occurs or the policies are fulfilled.

For the learning process leading to a new genocide to be interrupted, alternative information must be made available. Models that demonstrate policies that overcome societal hardship need to be emphasized. If genocide is not the best way to relieve state hardships, then

¹⁰ From the Daniel Goldhagen’s 2010 documentary “Worse than War”

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., 319

regime leaders will not choose it as a policy. If media outlets are employed to counteract propaganda that dehumanizes victims and promotes a kill or be killed mentality then the citizens will not be so easily conditioned. If citizens reject the genocidal propaganda that is given to them, they will not participate in the genocide. If citizens refuse to participate in the genocide, the genocide cannot occur. An immediate response from international bystanders when recognizing that a population is being conditioned to commit genocide can prevent future genocides from occurring.

In his autobiography, Henry Morgenthau recalls a visit from a German political agent who was, like him, Jewish. It was the aim of this German agent to discourage Morgenthau from continuing his verbal support of the Armenians who were being slaughtered. The German agent “advised” Morgenthau that if he did not desist in his fight to convince the Turks to change their policy towards these Christians, he would be recalled and his career would be ruined. Morgenthau responded:

Then you go back to the German embassy and tell [German Ambassador] Wangenheim to go ahead and have me recalled. If I am to suffer martyrdom, I can think of no better cause in which to be sacrificed. In fact I would welcome it, for I can think of no greater honour than to be recalled because I, a Jew, have been exerting all my powers to save the lives of hundreds of thousands of Christians.¹⁴

Genocide is contagious. This study of the learning process involved in the development, initiation, and implementation of the three genocides of the twentieth century demonstrate that Morgenthau’s statement had a much deeper meaning, and stronger implications than he could have ever realized when he wrote this in 1919. For, if he had been successful in stopping the genocide and changing the policy of the Turkish regime, there would have been no model for

¹⁴ Morgenthau, 379

Hitler to imitate. Morgenthau, by saving the Christians, may also have saved the Jews. While, we are not the ones targeted today, we may be the ones targeted tomorrow. Each and every genocide represents a threat to global security. The lesson of this study is clear. By saving others, we save ourselves.

Bibliography

Bandura, Albert. Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1973)

Bandura, Albert. Social Learning Theory (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1977)

Bjornlund, Matthias. Markusen, Eric. Steenberg, Peter. & Ubaldo, Rafiki. "*The Christian Churches and the Construction of a Genocidal Mentality in Rwanda*" in Genocide in Rwanda: Complicity of the Churches, edited by Carol Rittner, John K. Roth, & Wendy Whitworth (St. Paul: Paragon House, 2004)

Braham, Randolph L. The Vatican and the Holocaust: The Catholic Church and the Jews During the Nazi Era (Boulder: Columbia University Press, 2000)

Breitman, Richard. The Architect of Genocide : Himmler and the Final Solution 1st ed. (New York : Knopf , 1991)

Burleigh, Michael. The Third Reich: A New History (New York: Hill and Wang, 2000)

Boyajian, Dickran. Armenia: The Case for a Forgotten Genocide (Westwood: Educational Book Crafters, 1972)

Coloroso, Barbra. Extraordinary Evil: A Brief History of Genocide (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2007)

Dallaire, Gen. Romeo. Shake Hands With The Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda (Toronto: Random House Canada, 2003)

Darian, V. Documentation of the Armenian Genocide in German and Austrian Sources Charny, Israel. Ed. (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1994)

Feil, Scott R. Preventing Genocide: How the Early Use of Force Might Have Succeeded in Rwanda (New York: Carnegie Commission of New York, 1998)

Fein, Helen. Accounting for Genocide: National Responses and Jewish Victimization during the Holocaust (New York: The Free Press, 1979)

Goebbels, Joseph. The Early Goebbels Diaries: 1925-1926, Hieber, Helmut Ed. (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1963)

Goebbels, Joseph. The Goebbels Diaries: 1939-1941, Taylor, Fred Ed.& Trans. (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1982)

Goebbels, Joseph. The Goebbels Diaries: Final Entries, 1945, Trevor-Roper, Hugh. Ed. (New York : Putnam, 1978)

Goldhagen, Daniel. Worse Than War: Genocide, Eliminationism, and the Ongoing Assault on Humanity (New York: Public Affairs, 2009)

Gourevitch, Philip. We Wish To Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed With Our Families: Stories From Rwanda (New York: Picador, 1998)

Hatzfeld, Jean. Machete Season: The Killers in Rwanda Speak (New York: Picador, 2003)

Heiden, Konrad. "*Introduction*" in Hitler, Adolf. Mein Kampf. Trans. Ralph Manheim (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1943)

Hilberg, Raul. Perpetrators Victims Bystanders: The Jewish Catastrophe 1933-1945 (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1992)

Hilberg, Raul. The Destruction of the European Jews Vol. I, 3rd Ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003)

Hilberg, Raul. The Destruction of the European Jews Vol. III, 3rd Ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003)

Hinton, Alexander Laban. “*The Dark Side of Modernity: Towards an Anthropology of Genocide*” in Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002) c.p.p. 86

Hitler, Adolf. Mein Kampf, Trans. Ralph Manheim (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1943)

Hitler, Adolf. Hitler's Second Book: The Unpublished Sequel to Mein Kampf trans. Smith Krista; Weinberg, Gerhard L., ed. (New York: Enigma Books, 2006)

Kant, Immanuel. The Metaphysics of Morals trans. Gregor, Mary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

Kaiser, Hilmar. “*Historical Introduction*,” in Leverkuehn, Paul. A German Officer During the Armenian Genocide. trans. Lean, Alasdair (London: Gomidas Institute, 2008)

Kershaw, Ian. Hitler: 1889-36: Hubris 1st American ed. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1999)

Kershaw, Ian. Hitler: 1936-45: Nemesis (London: Allen Lane, 2000)

Littell, Franklin, H. “*Halting a succession of evil*” in Journal of Ecumenical Studies v. 34 (Spring 1997) p. 171-89

Longman, Timothy. "*Christian Churches and the Genocide in Rwanda*" in, In God's Name: Genocide and Religion in the Twentieth Century. Omer Bartov & Phyllis Mack Ed. (New York: Berghahn Books, 2001)

Madigan, Kevin. "*What We Knew About the Holocaust, and When*" Commentary, October 2001; 112(3) pp 43-52

Mendelsohn, John, Ed. The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes, Vol. 1 (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1982)

Mendelsohn, John, Ed. The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes, Vol. 2 (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1982)

Mendelsohn, John, Ed. The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes, Vol. 3 (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1982)

Mendelsohn, John, Ed. The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes, Vol. 4 (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1982)

Mendelsohn, John, Ed. The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes, Vol. 6 (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1982)

Mendelsohn, John, Ed. The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes, Vol. 7 (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1982)

Mendelsohn, John, Ed. The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes, Vol. 10 (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1982)

Morganthau, Henry. Ambassador Morgenthau's Story (Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1919)

Midlarsky, Manus. The Killing Trap: Genocide in Twentieth Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005)

Miller, Judith. One, By One, By One (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990)

Neave, Airey. Nuremberg: A Personal Record of the Trial of the Major War Criminals in 1945-6 (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978)

Powers, Samantha A Problem From Hell: America and the Age of Genocide (New York, Perennial, 2002)

Pringle, Heather. The Master Plan: Himmler's Scholars and the Holocaust (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2006)

Rittner, Carol. "*Chronology*" in Genocide in Rwanda: Complicity of the Churches, edited by Carol Rittner, John K. Roth, & Wendy Whitworth (St. Paul: Paragon House, 2004)

Rotter, Julian B. The Development and Applications of Social Learning Theory (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982)

Schramm, W. "*Notes on Case Studies of Instructional Media Projects*" Working Paper for the Academy For Educational Development, (Washington D.C: December, 1971)

Sellstrom, Tor & Wohlgemuth, Lennart. Historical Perspective: Some Explanatory Factors, Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda (Uppsala, Sweden: The Nordic Africa Institute, 1996),

Staub, Ervin. The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Spiegelman, Art. Maus: A Survivor's Tale (New York: Pantheon Books, 1997)

Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal vol. 12
(Nuremberg, Germany, 1947)

Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal vol. 21
(Nuremberg, Germany, 1948)

Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal vol. 22
(Nuremberg, Germany, 1948)

Trumpener, Ulrich. Germany and the Ottoman Empire, 1914-1918 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968)

Yin, Robert, K. Case Study Research Design and Methods, 3rd Ed. (London: Sage Publications, 2003)

Vartparonian, Jorge. "*Forward*" in Leverkuehn, Paul, A German Officer During the Armenian Genocide. trans. Lean, Alasdair (London: Gomidas Institute, 2008)

Zuccotti, Susan. Under His Very Window: The Vatican and the Holocaust in Italy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000)

Common Features of the Armenian, Jewish and Rwandan Genocides as Seen According to Hilberg's Four Stages of the Destruction Process

First Stage: Definition

In this stage the enemy is defined and identified the enemy. By defining the enemy, the target is created.

Features found in all three genocides:

- 1) ***Dehumanization***: Armenians were cattle, the Jews were vermin, the Tutsis were cockroaches
- 2) ***Propaganda***: Use of propaganda to label target population with dehumanized terms and as a threat
- 3) ***Lists***: Lists of names of the target population prepared to ensure success of following stages
- 4) ***Racial Ideology***: Promotion of racial ideology that elevates the perpetrating population while denigrating the target population
- 5) ***Imposition of strict party discipline***: Original thinking strongly discouraged. Majority population expected to conform to definitions and ideology.
- 6) ***Certainty of Vulnerability of Target group***: established in advance through pogroms
- 7) ***Legal or quasi legal documents to define enemy***: The Ten Commandments of the Committee of Union and Progress, the Nuremberg Laws, The Hutu Ten Commandments

Second Stage: Expropriation

In this stage the target population is socially marginalized and deprived of their professions, ability to make a living, education, and other societal benefits.

Features found in all three genocides:

- 8) ***Legal segregation and isolation***: Target population legally marginalized and disenfranchised
- 9) ***Use of sanctions***: Promotions, success of businesses and financial gain used to encourage population to view measures positively and participation in the implementation of the genocide.
- 10) ***Confiscation of property as a stated objective of measures***
- 11) ***Robbery and pillage of target population with impunity***
- 12) ***Needed "living space" achieved through genocidal measures***
- 13) ***Legal or quasi legal documents to marginalize and disenfranchise the target population***: The Ten Commandments of the Committee of Union and Progress, the Nuremberg Laws, The Hutu Ten Commandments

Features found in two of the genocides:

- 14) *Use of forced or slave labour for before killing:* Found in the Armenian and Jewish genocides.

Third Stage: Concentration (or seizure)

In this stage the target population is separated from the rest of the community and is concentrated in one area. This allows the perpetrators easy access to the target population for stage four.

Features found in all three genocides:

- 15) *Deportation:* Target populations forcibly deported from their homes and communities en masse
- 16) *Concentration:* Target population concentrated into ghettos, camps, and buildings such as school and church complexes
- 17) *Target population requests international assistance:* With a negative response leaving the targets isolated within the reach of the perpetrating population

Features found in two of the genocides:

- 18) *Forced Marches:* Found in the Armenian and Jewish genocides
- 19) *Concentration Camps:* Found in the Armenian and Jewish genocides.

Fourth Stage: Annihilation

“The final solution” stage is the aim and the end of the destruction process, followed by confiscation of personal effects.

- 20) *Use of organized killings squads:* The Special Organization, the *Einsatzgruppen*, and the *Interahamwe*
- 21) *Use of “outrage” to justify the implementation of the genocide:* The Armenian “rebellion” at Van, the murder of the German diplomat von Roth by world Jewry, and the Murder of Rwandan President Habyarimana
- 22) *Excuse of enemy nation:* promotion of an “us versus them” or “kill or be killed” belief
- 23) *Use of “duty” to compel compliance:* Participation in genocide part of national duty to your homeland and fellow citizens (defined by race)
- 24) *War used as a cover:* International bystanders fail to recognize the genocide because of their focus on an ongoing war.
- 25) *War used as an excuse:* Genocide is a necessity of the war for the survival of the perpetration group. All members of target population are “at war” with the perpetrating nation.
- 26) *Claim of conspiracy:* Target population was conspiring with the enemy of the perpetrating authority against the majority citizens. The Armenians “conspired” with Russia against Turkey, world Jewry “conspired” for the downfall of Germany, and the Tutsis “conspired” with the RPF.
- 27) *Threat of strong negative consequences to majority population member who may attempt to save a member of the target population.*

Figure 1.2 Map of the Decline of the Ottoman Empire from 1807 to 1924





Figure 1.3 Top map shows Turkey's borders under the treaty of Sevres, as negotiated in 1919, while the bottom map shows Turkey's borders under the Treaty of Lausanne which was ratified in 1923

Figure 1.4 Map showing German language spoken populations in Europe



THE "TEN COMMANDMENTS" OF THE COMMITTEE OF UNION AND PROGRESS, 1914-1915 (sic)

- 1) Profiting by Arts:...close all Armenian Societies, and arrest all who worked against Government at any time among them and send them into the provinces such as Bagdad or Mosul, and wipe them out either on the road or there.
- 2) Collect arms.
- 3) Excite Moslem opinion by suitable and special means, in places as Van, Erzeroum, Adana, where as a point of fact the Armenians have already won the hatred of the Moslems, provoke organised massacres as the Russians did at Baku.
- 4) Leave all executive to the people in the provinces such as Erzeroum, Van, Mumuret ul Aziz, and Bitlis, and use Military disciplinary forces (i.e. Gendarmerie) ostensibly to stop massacres, while on the contrary in places as Adana, Sivas, Broussa, Ismidt and Smyrna actively help the Moslems with military force.
- 5) Apply measures to exterminate all males under 50, priests and teachers, leave girls and children to be Islamized.
- 6) Carry away the families of all who succeed in escaping and apply measures to cut them off from all connection with their native place.
- 7) On the ground that Armenian officials may be spies, expel and drive them out absolutely from every Government department or post.
- 8) Kill off in an appropriate manner all Armenians in the Army - this to be left to the military to do.
- 9) All action to begin everywhere simultaneously, and thus leave no time for preparation of defensive measures.
- 10) Pay attention to the strictly confidential nature of these instructions, which may not go beyond two or three persons.

The Nuremberg Laws

The Laws for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour

September 15, 1935

Section 1

1. Marriages between Jews and citizens of German or kindred blood are forbidden. Marriages concluded in defiance of this law are void, even if, for the purpose of evading this law, they were concluded abroad.
2. Proceedings for annulment may be initiated only by the Public Prosecutor

Section 2

Extramarital sexual intercourse between Jews and subjects of the state of Germany or related blood is forbidden.

Section 3

Jews will not be permitted to employ female citizens under the age of 45, of German or kindred blood, as domestic workers.

Section 4

1. Jews are forbidden to display the Reich and national flag or the national colours
2. On the other hand they are permitted to display the Jewish colours. The exercise of this right is protected by the State.

Section 5

1. A person who acts contrary to the prohibition of Section 1 will be punished with hard labour.
2. A person who acts contrary to the prohibition of Section 2 will be punished with imprisonment or with hard labour.
3. A person who acts contrary to the provisions of Sections 3 or 4 will be punished with imprisonment up to a year and with a fine, or with one of these penalties.

Section 6

The Reich Minister of the Interior in agreement with the Deputy Führer and the Reich Minister of Justice will issue the legal and administrative regulations required for the enforcement and supplementing of this law.

Section 7

The law will become effective on the day after its promulgation; Section 3, however, not until January 1, 1936.

The Nuremberg Laws on Citizenship and Race:

September 15, 1935

Article 1

- 1) A subject of the state is one who belongs to the protective union of the German Reich, and who, therefore, has specific obligations to the Reich.
- 2) The status of subject is to be acquired in accordance with the provisions of the Reich and the state Citizenship Law.

Article 2

- 1) A citizen of the Reich may be only one who is of German or kindred blood, and who, through his behavior, shows that he is both desirous and personally fit to serve loyally the German people and the Reich.
- 2) The right to citizenship is obtained by the grant of Reich citizenship papers.
- 3) Only the citizen of the Reich may enjoy full political rights in consonance with the provisions of the laws.

Article 3

The Reich Minister of the Interior, in conjunction with the Deputy to the *Fuehrer*, will issue the required legal and administrative decrees for the implementation and amplification of this law.

Promulgated: September 16, 1935. *In force:* September 30, 1935.

First Supplementary Decree of November 14, 1935

On the basis of Article III of the Reich Citizenship Law of September 15, 1935, the following is hereby decreed:

Article 1

- 1) Until further provisions concerning citizenship papers, all subjects of German or kindred blood who possessed the right to vote in the *Reichstag* elections when the Citizenship Law came into effect, shall, for the present, possess the rights of Reich citizens. The same shall be true of those upon whom the Reich Minister of the Interior, in conjunction with the Deputy to the *Fuehrer* shall confer citizenship.
- 2) The Reich Minister of the Interior, in conjunction with the Deputy to the *Fuehrer*, may revoke citizenship.

Article 2

- 1) The provisions of Article I shall apply also to subjects who are of mixed Jewish blood.
- 2) An individual of mixed Jewish blood is one who is descended from one or two grandparents who, racially, were full Jews, insofar that he is not a Jew according to Section 2 of Article 5. Full-blooded Jewish grandparents are those who belonged to the Jewish religious community.

Article 3

Only citizens of the Reich, as bearers of full political rights, can exercise the right of voting in political matters, and have the right to hold public office. The Reich Minister of the Interior, or any agency he empowers, can make exceptions during the transition period on the matter of holding public office. The measures do not apply to matters concerning religious organizations.

Article 4

- 1) A Jew cannot be a citizen of the Reich. He cannot exercise the right to vote; he cannot hold public office.
- 2) Jewish officials will be retired as of December 31, 1935. In the event that such officials served at the front in the World War either for Germany or her allies, they shall receive as pension, until they reach the age limit, the full salary last received, on the basis of which their pension would have been computed. They shall not, however, be promoted according to their seniority in rank. When they reach the age limit, their pension will be computed again, according to the salary last received on which their pension was to be calculated.
- 3) These provisions do not concern the affairs of religious organizations.
- 4) The conditions regarding service of teachers in public Jewish schools remains unchanged until the promulgation of new laws on the Jewish school system.

Article 5

- 1) A Jew is an individual who is descended from at least three grandparents who were, racially, full Jews... (Sic)
- 2) A Jew is also an individual who is descended from two full-Jewish grandparents if:
 - a) He was a member of the Jewish religious community when this law was issued, or joined the community later;
 - b) When the law was issued, he was married to a person who was a Jew, or was subsequently married to a Jew;

c) He is the issue from a marriage with a Jew, in the sense of Section I, which was contracted after the coming into effect of the Law for the Protection of German Blood and Honor of September 15, 1935;

d) He is the issue of an extramarital relationship with a Jew, in the sense of Section I, and was born out of wedlock after July 31, 1936.

Article 6

1) Insofar as there are, in the laws of the Reich or in the decrees of the National Socialist German Workers' Party and its affiliates, certain requirements for the purity of German blood which extend beyond Article 5, the same remain untouched...

Article 7

The *Fuhrer* and Chancellor of the Reich is empowered to release anyone from the provisions of these administrative decrees.

The Hutu Ten Commandments

As published in Kangura, No. 6 (December 1990)

- 1.** Every Hutu must know that the Tutsi woman, wherever she may be, is working for the Tutsi ethnic cause. In consequence, any Hutu is a traitor who:
 - Acquires a Tutsi wife;
 - Acquires a Tutsi concubine;
 - Acquires a Tutsi secretary or protégée.

- 2.** Every Hutu must know that our Hutu daughters are more worthy and more conscientious as women, as wives and as mothers. Aren't they lovely, excellent secretaries, and more honest!

- 3.** Hutu women, be vigilant and make sure that your husbands, brothers and sons see reason.

- 4.** All Hutus must know that all Tutsis are dishonest in business. Their only goal is ethnic superiority. We have learned this from experience. In consequence, any Hutu is a traitor who:
 - Forms a business alliance with a Tutsi;
 - Invests his own funds or public funds in a Tutsi enterprise;
 - Borrows money from or loans money to a Tutsi;
 - Grants favours to Tutsis (import licenses, bank loans, land for construction, public markets...).

- 5.** Strategic positions such as politics, administration, economics, the military and security must be restricted to the Hutu.

- 6.** A Hutu majority must prevail throughout the educational system (pupils, scholars, teachers).

- 7.** The Rwandan Army must be exclusively Hutu. The war of October 1990 has taught us that. No soldier may marry a Tutsi woman.

- 8.** Hutu must stop taking pity on the Tutsi.

- 9.** Hutu wherever they be must stand united, in solidarity, and concerned with the fate of their Hutu brothers. Hutu within and without Rwanda must constantly search for friends and allies to the Hutu Cause, beginning with their Bantu brothers. Hutu must constantly counter Tutsi propaganda. Hutu must stand firm and vigilant against their common enemy: the Tutsi.

- 10.** The Social Revolution of 1959, the Referendum of 1961 and the Hutu Ideology must be taught to Hutu of every age. Every Hutu must spread the word wherever he goes. Any Hutu who persecutes his brother Hutu for spreading and teaching this ideology is a traitor.

General Glossary

Ahnenerbe: Founded on July 1, 1935, by Heinrich Himmler, the *Ahnenerbe* was a Nazi German think tank that viewed itself as a "study society for Intellectual Ancient History." The *Ahnenerbe's* main goal was to research the anthropological and cultural history of the Aryan race. The *Institut für Wehrwissenschaftliche Zweckforschung* ("Institute for Military Scientific Research"), which conducted extensive medical experiments using human, usually Jewish, subjects, became attached to the Ahnenerbe during World War II.

Arusha Accords: Also known as the Arusha Peace Agreement, were a set of five mediated accords signed in Arusha, Tanzania on August 4, 1993, by the government of Rwanda and the rebel Rwandan Patriotic Front. The power sharing agreement was meant to end the three-year long Rwandan Civil War and established a transitional government. Further, the Accords invited the involvement of the United Nations to establish a peacekeeping force and oversee the implementation of the agreement.

Council of Ten: The Council of Ten, also known as The Supreme Council of the 1919 Paris Peace Conference, consisted of the five chief representatives of the US, France, United Kingdom, Italy and Japan, each accompanied by his foreign minister

Dur Sturmer: "The Stormer" was a weekly tabloid-format Nazi newspaper published by Julius Streicher from 1923 to 1945. It was a significant part of the Nazi propaganda machinery and was vehemently anti-Semitic.

Einsatzgruppen: The SS paramilitary death squads responsible for mass killings, of undesirable segments of the populations. Jews were a specific target of the *Einsatzgruppen* in particular, but they also targeted other population groups and political categories. The *Einsatzgruppen* operated throughout the territory occupied by the German armed forces following the German invasions of Poland in 1939, and later of the Soviet Union, in 1941, carrying out a range of operations from small scale, to larger ones lasting days, such as the massacres at Babi Yar. The *Einsatzgruppen* were the first Nazi organizations to commence mass killing of Jews as an organized policy and are guilty for the murders of over 1,000,000 people.

Gacaca People's Court: A system of community justice inspired by tradition and established in 2001 in Rwanda to address crimes committed by Hutu genocidaires from the 1994 Rwandan Genocide. The Gacaca courts are a method of transitional justice, designed to promote healing and moving on from the crisis. Rwanda has especially focused on criminal prosecutions in the Gacaca courts, putting justice partially into the hands of the victims.

Interahamwe: Kinyarwandan for "those who fight together." The Interahamwe is best known as the Hutu extremist death squads. The Hutu extremist paramilitary organization had the backing of Rwandan government leading up to, and during, the Rwandan Genocide.

Jemiyet: “The Central Committee” of the Young Turks.

Kangura: Anti-Tutsi newspaper published by Hassan Ngeze established in 1990 following the invasion of the rebel Rwandan Patriotic Front and sponsored by the ruling Hutu extremist party, the MRND.

MRND: The National Republican Movement for Democracy and Development was the Hutu dominated ruling political party of Rwanda from 1975 to 1994 under President Juvénal Habyarimana. After Habyarimana's death in April 1994, hard-line elements of the party were among the chief architects of the Rwandan Genocide. After Rwanda was conquered by the rival Tutsi-dominated Rwandese Patriotic Front, the MRND was driven from power and outlawed.

National Socialist German Workers Party: Also known as the Nazi Party, it was a political party in Germany between 1919 and 1945 led by Adolf Hitler. It was known as the German Workers' Party prior to a 1920 change of name. Nazi ideology stressed the failures of capitalism, communism, economic liberalism, and democracy; supported the "racial purity of the German people" and that of other North-western Europeans. Moreover, the Nazis claimed they were the protector of Germany from Jewish influence and corruption.

RPF: The Rwandan Patriotic Front was created in 1987 by the Tutsi refugee diaspora in Uganda. The first Tutsi refugees fled to Uganda to escape ethnic purges against the Tutsis by the Hutu majority in the beginning of 1959. On 1 October 1990, the Rwandan Patriotic Army (RPA), the armed wing of the RPF, invaded northern Rwanda. After initial gains, the offensive was turned back with the help of Zairean and French troops sent to reinforce the Habyarimana regime. The war reached a stalemate and the two sides entered into peace negotiations. These talks resulted in the signing of the Arusha Accords in 1993 to create a power-sharing government. The cease-fire ended on 6 April 1994 when Habyarimana's plane was shot down near Kigali Airport, killing the President and Cyprien Ntaryamira, the President of Burundi. The RPF took control of Kigali on 4 July and the whole country by 18 July 1994. A transitional government was sworn in with Pasteur Bizimungu as President. The RPF is the current ruling political party of Rwanda, led by President Paul Kagame.

RTL: The Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines, a Rwandan Hutu hate propaganda radio station which broadcast from July 8, 1993 to July 31, 1994. It is recognized for having played a significant role during the Rwandan Genocide.

Special Organization: An Ottoman imperial government Special Forces unit established by Enver Pasha under the War Department. The Special Organization was an active killing unit used to ambush and kill the Armenian caravans as they moved into the desert as a result of their ordered deportations.

The SS: The *Schutzstaffel* was formed in 1925 as a personal protection guard unit for Adolf Hitler. A key paramilitary organization of the Nazi Party and built upon Nazi racial ideology.

Under the leadership of Heinrich Himmler between 1929 and 1945, the SS grew from a small paramilitary formation to one of the largest and most powerful organizations in the Third Reich

UNAMIR: The United Nations Assistance Mission in Rwanda was a mission instituted by the United Nations and led by Gen. Romeo Dallaire to aid the implementation of the Arusha Accords. The mission lasted from October 1993 to March 1996. Its activities were meant to aid the peace process between the Hutu-dominated Rwandese government and the Rwandan Patriotic Front. Due to its inability to prevent, and stop the planned genocide of the Tutsis the mission is generally regarded as a failure.

Young Turks: Also known as the *Committee of Union and Progress*. The Young Turk Movement emerged in reaction to the absolutist rule of Sultan Abdul-Hamid (Abdulhamit) II (1876-1909). The Young Turks gained power of the Ottoman Empire with a 1908 revolution. In 1904 the Young Turks began to base their nationalism on the pseudo-scientific race theories of Europe, instead the more inclusive ideology of “Ottomanism” that they had previously supported. The Young Turks lost power of Turkey with the loss of World War I.

Glossary of Names

Enver, Ismail: (1881-1922) Also known as Enver Pasha, and Enver Bey. He was a leader of the 1908 Young Turks revolution and the Minister of War for the Ottoman Empire throughout the First World War.

Bandura, Albert: (b. 1925) A psychologist and the David Starr Jordan Professor Emeritus of Social Science in Psychology at Stanford University. Bandura is responsible for groundbreaking contributions to many fields of psychology, including social cognitive theory, and personality psychology. Further he was influential in the transition between behaviorism and cognitive psychology. He is recognized as the originator of social learning theory.

Coloroso, Barbara: (b.1948) A former Franciscan nun and a well recognized author, speaker, and consultant on parenting, teaching, school discipline, positive school climate, bullying, grieving, nonviolent conflict resolution and restorative justice. In her book, *Extraordinary Evil: a Brief History of Genocide* (2007), Coloroso examines genocide through the lens of her theory on bullying.

Dallaire, Romeo: (b. 1946) Lieutenant-General Dallaire is known for having served as Force Commander of UNAMIR, the ill-fated United Nations peacekeeping force for Rwanda between 1993 and 1994, and for trying to stop the Rwandan genocide perpetrated by the Hutu extremists against Tutsis and Hutu moderates. Dallaire is retired from the military and currently serves as a Canadian senator, humanitarian, and has authored of two books.

Habyarimana, Juvenal: (1937-1994) President of Rwanda from 1973 until 1994. Habyarimana's closest advisers were his wife Agathe and the akazu ("little house"), an informal group of Hutu extremists from his home province. On April 6, 1994, he was killed when his airplane was shot down close to Kigali International Airport. His assassination is largely recognized as the start signal for the Rwandan genocide.

Frank, Hans: (1900-1946) A German lawyer who worked for the Nazi party during the 1920s and 1930s and later became a high-ranking official in Nazi Germany. He was prosecuted for his role in perpetrating the Holocaust during his tenure as the Governor-General of the portion of occupied Poland that was not directly incorporated into the German Reich known as the General Government. He was found guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity by the Nuremberg Tribunal and sentence to death by hanging.

Goebbels, Joseph: (1897-1945) Devote follower of Hitler and leading Nazi Party member. In 1933 when the Nazis came to power Goebbels was appointed Propaganda Minister. Goebbels remained with Hitler in the Berlin bunker to the end. Shortly after Hitler's suicide, Goebbels and his wife, Magda, killed their six young children, and then both committed suicide.

Goldhagen, Daniel: (b. 1959) An American author and former Associate Professor of Political Science and Social Studies at Harvard University. Goldhagen authored two well recognized books about the Holocaust: *Hitler's Willing Executioners* (1996) and *A Moral Reckoning* (2002). In 2009 he wrote *Worse Than War* (2009), which examines the phenomenon of genocide.

Gourevitch, Philip: (b.1961) An American author and journalist. Gourevitch worked as staff writer for *The New Yorker* and the former editor of *The Paris Review*. He is best known for his book, *We Wish To Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed With Our Families* (1998).

Hatzfeld, Jean: (b. 1949) Hatzfeld is a Reporter, war correspondent, writer, and the son of European Jews who had fled the Nazis. Hatzfeld authored the book *Machete Season: The Killers of Rwanda Speak* (2003), in which he conducted a series of interviews with a imprisoned gang of genocidaires.

Hitiyaremye, Alphose: (b. 1955) A Rwandan farmer and business owner, and one of the genocidaires interviewed in Hatzfeld's book *Machete Season: The Killers of Rwanda Speak* (2003). Hatzfeld expected that he would be brought up before a Gacaca People's Court and sentenced to several years' probation and community service. The genocidaire was released in 2003

Hitler, Adolf: (1899-1945) Austrian-born German politician and decorated veteran from World War One. Hitler was the leader of the Nazi Party, and Chancellor of Germany from 1933 to 1945. Further, Hitler served as head of state as *Führer und Reichskanzler* from 1934 to 1945. Hitler spend one year in jail as a result of the failed coup d'etat known as the Beer Hall Putsch, which occurred in Munich on November 8–9, 1923. During his time in jail Hitler wrote his memoir, *Mein Kampf* ("My Struggle"). Hitler ultimately wanted to establish absolute Nazi German hegemony in continental Europe. To achieve this, he pursued a foreign policy with the declared goal of seizing *Lebensraum* ("living space") for the Aryan people which caused the outbreak of the Second World War. During the Battle of Berlin at the end of the war, Hitler married his long-time mistress Eva Braun. The two committed suicide two days later on 30 April 1945, and their corpses were burned.

Lepsius, Johannes: (1858-1926) A German Protestant missionary who was outspoken about to the Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire. During World War I he secretly published his work "*Bericht über die Lage des armenischen Volkes in der Türkei*" ("*Report on the situation of the Armenian People in Turkey*") in which he documented and condemned the slaughter of the Armenian people. A second edition entitled "*Der Todesgang des armenischen Volkes*" ("*The way to death of the Armenian people*") included an interview with Enver Pasha. The official military censorship forbade the publications because it feared that it would affront the strategically important Turkish ally.

Mizinge, Elie: (b. 1944) A former Rwandan soldier and police officer who left the force to become a farmer in 1992. Mizinge was an active genocidaire, and one of the genocidaires

interviewed in Hatzfeld's book *Machete Season: The Killers of Rwanda Speak* (2003). Hatzfeld expected that he would be brought up before a Gacaca People's court and sentenced to two or three years probation.

Morgenthau, Henry: (1856-1946) The American ambassador to the Ottoman Empire during the First World War. As ambassador to the Ottoman Empire during World War I, Morgenthau is recognized as the most prominent American to speak out against the Armenian Genocide.

Munzigura, Adalbert: (b. 1971) The head of a Hutu death squad, a lower level organizer of the Rwandan genocide and one of the genocidaires interviewed in Hatzfeld's book *Machete Season: The Killers of Rwanda Speak* (2003). Munzigura was sentenced to twelve years imprisonment and he was released on 5 May, 2003.

Ngeze, Hasan: (b. 1962) a Rwandan journalist who founded the newspaper *Kangura* in 1990. Ngeze is best known for publishing the "Hutu Ten Commandments", which promoted a strong anti-Tutsi attitude among Rwandan Hutus prior to the Rwandan Genocide. In 1993, Ngeze became a shareholder and correspondent for the newly-founded Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines (RTL), which was largely a radio equivalent of *Kangura*. During the Rwandan Genocide, Ngeze provided RTL with names of people to be killed in his prefecture, which were broadcast on air. Ngeze was sentenced to life imprisonment in 2003, by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. In 2007, the Appeals Chamber of the ICTR reversed some of his convictions, but confirmed others. It also changed his life sentence to one of 35 years' imprisonment.

Scheubner- Richter, Max Erwin von: (1884-1923) A founding member of the Nazi party. Scheubner served During the First World War in Ottoman Turkey as the German vice consul of Erzerum and documented the Turkish massacres of Armenians in his many telegraphs to the Embassy in Constantinople and Germany. During the Beer Hall Putsch, walking arm-in-arm with Hitler, he was shot and killed as Hitler and others marched toward armed guards on 9 November 1923. Scheubner was the only first-tier Nazi leader to die during the Putsch. Of all the party members who died in the Putsch, Hitler had claimed Scheubner-Richter to be the only "irreplaceable loss."

Speigelman, Art: (b. 1948) The son of Holocaust survivors, Speigelman is an American comics artist, editor, and advocate for the medium of comics, best known for his Pulitzer Prize-winning comic book memoir, *Maus* (1986).

Staub, Ervin: (b. 1938) Staub is a Holocaust survivor who was born in Hungary. Staub is a Professor of Psychology, Emeritus, at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and founding Director of the Doctoral program on the Psychology of Peace and Violence. Staub is best known for his works on helping behaviour and altruism, and on the psychology of mass violence and genocide.

Streicher, Julius: (1885-1946) A prominent Nazi prior to World War II. He was the founder and publisher of *Der Stürmer* newspaper, which became an important element of the Nazi propaganda machine. His publishing firm also released three anti-Semitic books for children. After the war, he was convicted of crimes against humanity by the Nuremberg Tribunal and sentenced to death by hanging.

Talaat, Mehmet: (1874-1921) Also known as Talaat Pasha, and Talaat Bey. He was the Minister of the Interior of Turkey throughout the First World War, and in 1917 he became the Grand Vizier, and resigned in 1918 with the defeat of the Ottoman Empire by the British. Talaat was assassinated on 15 March, 1921 by Soghomon Tehlirian, an Armenian from the province of Erzurum.

Tehlirian, Soghomon: (1897-1960) An Armenian genocide survivor who assassinated Talaat Pasha on 15 March, 1921 in Berlin Germany. Tehlirian was tried for murder, but was acquitted by the German court on grounds of temporary insanity.

Wangenheim, Hans Freiherr von: (1859-1915) German diplomat and Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire 1912-1915.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for the guidance and assistance given to me by my thesis director, Jean-Guy Goulet, Ph.D. Saint Paul University. Professor Goulet's ability to remind me of my passion in researching this topic, along with his timely and thorough feedback, made working with him on this thesis one of the immense pleasures of my academic career.

I would also like to thank my panel, Deirdre Butler, Ph.D. Carleton University, and Megan Bradley, Ph.D. Saint Paul University for their clear direction and insights which were of great assistance in ascertaining my direction and establishing the parameters of this study. In addition I would like to acknowledge the assistance of the staff in the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies and the Library at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C.

Friends have also proved an invaluable resource. The interest and support that each demonstrated in this study proved invaluable. Those people include: Jane Parker; Maureen Korp, Ph.D.; John Callahan Ph.D.; and, Stephanie Helmerson.

Finally I would like to thank my family, without whose sacrifice and support this thesis would not have been possible, my mother, Dianne Webb, my sister Pauline Anderson, and my brother Alex Anderson. Most importantly I must thank my loving husband Tuan Le, and my three wonderful children who acted as a constant living reminder of why research into the topic of genocide is important, Brandon Le, Graeme Le, and Abigail Le.