

18. Berliner Colloquium zur Zeitgeschichte

**The End of Violence. New Directions in Violence Research**

Hosted by Gabriele Metzler (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin),

Felix Schnell (University of Essex)

Conference language: German

20 and 21 February 2015

*Questionnaire*

**Section 1**

**Emotion**

Introduction

Gabriele Metzler

Chair

Felix Schnell

\* What roles do emotions and feelings (subjective experiences of emotion) have in the ending of violence? How do they differ from feelings and emotions associated with violence and the willingness to use it?

\* What about management of emotions within violent groups? Under what conditions can external intervention stop emotionally influenced violent episodes?

\* What roles do conceptions and practices of masculinity play in the exercise and termination of violence?

**Section 2**

**Alternatives**

Introduction

Alexander Korb

Chair

Klaas Voß

\* What power relationships are expressed in acts of sexual violence in war?

\* How is this power justified?

\* What alternative decisions/events can change the relationship between perpetrators and victims of violence?

\* Can we historically and/or sociologically observe and systematize interruptions, terminations or transformations of violent acts?

**Section 3                      Transformation**

Introduction                      Klaas Voß

Chair                                      Bernd Greiner

- \* What happens to perpetrators after violence?
- \* How do the effects of violent experiences linger?
- \* What roles do interpretations of past violence have for perpetrators who again use violence in subsequent situations?
- \* Do forms and justifications of violence change?

**Section 4                      Theory and Empirical Knowledge**

Introduction                      Felix Schnell

Chair                                      Gabriele Metzler

- \* What theoretical “added value” could the discussion and classification of “endings of violence” provide?
- \* What special epistemological problems arise when one examines the end of violent practices?
- \* To what extent can we understand or explain violence and its end?
- \* What role could the fact play that scholars’ experiences are far removed, generally speaking, from the phenomenon of violence and that, in at least some cases, scholars tend to rationalize and theorize about human behavior?
- \* Is violence actually “quite simple” and only “made complicated” or even “encrypted” by scholarly analysis? What would that mean for our work?
- \* To what extent do similar findings from research on violent phenomena in very different cultural and epochal contexts suggest “anthropological constants?”
- \* The danger exists that models created in the humanities and social sciences of violent processes impose a pre-structured view of violence, so that instead of empirical evidence being interpreted with the help of theory, theoretical models reproduce themselves in interpretations. What does this mean for our work?

*Suggested Reading*

Timothy Brook (ed.): Documents on the Rape of Nanking. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999; 112-121, 130-151

Bill Buford, Geil auf Gewalt. Unter Hooligans. München: Goldmann, 2010; 219-234, 323-354

Robert Gerwarth, Im »Spinnennetz«. Gegenrevolutionäre Gewalt in den besiegten Staaten Mitteleuropas. In: Robert Gerwarth, John Horne (ed.): Krieg im Frieden. Paramilitärische Gewalt in Europa nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2013; 108-133

Jacques Sémelin, Extreme violence. Can we understand it? In: *ISSJ*. (2002),174; 429-431