

Free annotation for jeffrey sharlet's article "fierce debate divides scholars of ...

[Sociology](#), [Racism](#)



In his article "Fierce Debate Divides Scholars of the 1994 Rwandan Genocide", Jeffrey Sharlet presents a well-directed and relevant example of how sharp social problem can cause a number of misunderstandings and disputes among the researchers of this problem. At the same time, by this the author of the article emphasizes the complexity and ambiguity of the issue of Rwandan Genocide in 1994 as well. Sharlet states: "The steps by which Rwanda proceeded from such hope to such horror are many and complex. Scholars from a range of disciplines and political backgrounds have all been trying to make that basic point in the seven years since the exile army conquered Rwanda's capital" (Sharlet "Fierce Debates Divides Scholars") The Jeffrey Sharlet's key points are in the representation of the debate over the Rwandan Genocide question, in the presence of the multiple visions and findings of this problem, and in the conclusion that the issue has not been solved yet and can be hardly solved in the future.

After the overview of Mr. Mamdani's scholar work, Sharlet begins to develop the key points of the article: "Scholars with years' more experience studying Rwanda say that's because Mr. Mamdani has profoundly misread the country's history. Interpretations such as his, they say, contribute to the international community's misunderstanding of what happened there" (Sharlet) It is the part where the core of the debate over the Rwanda issue is going to be uncovered. In order to evolve and prove his idea, Jeffrey Sharlet includes in the article a variety of other scholars' opinions, which confront to Mr. Mamdani's research and explain their own visions of the genocide. Thus, he adds the views of such scholars as David and Catherine Newbury, Filip Reyntjens, Philip Gourevitch, Villia Jefremovas, and Alison Des Forges into

the article. What is also essential, along with researchers' different points of view, Sharlet fills his work with historical references as well. It makes the evidence of the author's idea more accurate and impressive.

I perceive " Fierce Debate Divides Scholars of the 1994 Rwandan Genocide" as a definite encyclopedia of references to the sources for further studies.

The brief overview of a number of books and researches allows the reader to get the full picture of the disputable issue and to insight into the core of the conflict within the scientific world. Providing the reader with an analysis of scholar works, Sharlet avoids expressing his own opinion on the issue; the neutral style of the article thus helps the reader to concentrate on the complexity and multiplicity of the question of the genocide in Rwanda in 1994.

In conclusion, needless to say that Jeffrey Sharlet's " Fierce Debate Divides Scholars of the 1994 Rwandan Genocide" is written in the scientific manner so that the work can be useful for those who start to study the Rwandan Genocide, its causes and consequences, the origin of the conflict and the initial reasons of why the civilians of one country started to kill each other.

Works cited

Mamdani, Mahmood. When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002. Web. 3 Jul. 2015.

Sharlet, Jeffrey. " Fierce Debates Divides Scholars of the 1994 Rwandan Genocide." Chronicle of Higher Education, 3 Aug. 2001 Vol. 47 Issue 47. PDF file.

<https://assignbuster.com/free-annotation-for-jeffrey-sharlets-article-fierce-debate-divides-scholars-of-the-1994-rwandan-genocide-essay-sample/>