

## Introduction

Emiliano Perra

With this Roundtable, we conclude the fruitful conversation initiated in the second issue of *JPR* by Christian Gudehus's remarks 'on the label, field, and heuristics of perpetrator research', published alongside comments from Ernest Verdeja, Raya Morag, Marcia Esparza, Christophe Busch, and the Editors of the journal.<sup>1</sup> In publishing Gudehus's rejoinder and comments by Aliza Luft and Daniel Bultmann, we believe we have presented a sufficiently broad range of opinions on the important points raised in the first intervention. We thank all contributors who made this possible, and we hope to have provided food for thought to the readers of *JPR* and the broader community of scholars working in this growing interdisciplinary field.

- 1 Christian Gudehus, 'Some Remarks on the Label, Field, and Heuristics of Perpetrator Research', *Journal of Perpetrator Research*, 2.1 (2018), 3-8; Ernesto Verdeja, 'Response to Christian Gudehus', *Journal of Perpetrator Research*, 2.1 (2018), 9-12; Raya Morag, 'On the Definition of the Perpetrator: From the Twentieth to the Twenty-First Century', *Journal of Perpetrator Research*, 2.1 (2018), 13-19; Marcia Esparza, 'Examining the Political and Military Power in Latin America: A Response to Christian Gudehus', *Journal of Perpetrator Research*, 2.1 (2018), 20-25; Kara Critchell and others, 'Response to Christian Gudehus', *Journal of Perpetrator Research*, 2.1 (2018), 33-36.

*Journal of Perpetrator Research* 3.1(2020), 187

doi: 10.21039/jpr.3.1.67 © 2020 by the Author



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>