Part I
Choose one of the following two questions.

Analyze the implications of domain assumptions about the nature of human nature and debates over whether humans are inherently violent and greedy, on the one hand, or fundamentally nonviolent on the other. How has this debate developed over time? What evidence is presented on both sides of the argument? What are the implications of these assumptions for social theory and public policy?

In *Civilization and Its Discontents*, Freud argues that “man is a wolf to man” (*homo homini lupus*). Given his assumption about the nature of humans, high levels of violence within societies are not surprising but to be expected. What are the different assumptions on human nature that are made within the literature on nonviolence? Discuss the debates among these differing views. And what are the consequences of these assumptions for research? Are there theories of nonviolence that free themselves from claims about human nature?

Part II
Prepare an essay on two of the following topics.

Conflict is normally viewed as a negative aspect of social life. However, sociologist and other social scientists have questioned this assumption. Please discuss and explain how conflict, on different levels of interaction, can be a constructive response to changing social conditions.

X That there is a link between power and violence can hardly be refuted. Nonetheless, scholars disagree on the nature of this link. What are some of the arguments that have been raised in this debate, and how does our view of power and violence affect social interaction?

X Recently, some scholars (e.g., James Jasper) have encouraged sociologists to rediscover strategy and to reclaim it from rational choice and game theorists. Scholars of nonviolence have for quite some time emphasized strategy in their studies. Discuss the role of strategy in the nonviolent action literature and what social scientists concerned more with conflict than nonviolence might learn from it.