

***WORKSHEET FOR DESCRIBING AND CATEGORIZING
A GENOCIDAL EVENT***^{1, 2}

A New Tool for Assembling More Objective Data and Classifying Events of Mass Killing

Israel W. Charny

Abstract

A new tool and sequence of research (and not another declarative scholarly statement about the definition of genocide) is presented for facilitating greater objectivity in our chaotic field of genocide studies: first, assembling the factual data as available about any event of mass murder systematically; second, contextualizing each of our judgments of, the nature of the crime as a choice being made by a given scholar or institution (e.g., a specific court), but not as God's word.

Word count of the above brief abstract is 77 words. The following section is either to be included in a lengthier abstract.

The Worksheet for Describing and Categorizing a Genocidal Event is believed to be innovative in several ways³:

1. This model presents researchers with a tool and methodology for developing more systematic, extensive and objective information about many different aspects of an event of mass killing. As far as we know, it provides the first ever systematic worksheet for assembling a wide variety of empirical data about how any given event of genocidal mass killing developed and unfolded and their outcomes. There have been some attempts at complex scoring systems, but these would seem to require a team of researchers and computer-generated reports⁴ while the present proposal is intended as an everyday working tool for narrative recording and assembling of information even and primarily by a single researcher. Of course, researcher's assembly of information subsequently can also be submitted to more complex coding and

computerizations.

2. Second, emphasis is placed on identifying the researcher (analyst) who is doing the assembly of data, and on identifying each researcher's guiding concept of genocide. It is to be understood that even assembling data that are as objective as possible takes place in a specific context of each researcher's professional identity and guiding conceptualizations.
3. Third, the proposed methodology purposely postpones any effort at classification or categorization of an event - whether as constituting "genocide" or not, and whether the mass killings qualify as "intentional genocide," "crimes against humanity," or any of the several other names that have been proposed for describing mass murders. Categorizing is postponed until *after* factual data about the event have been assembled. What happens too often today is that major energies are poured into the categorizations and even the collection of data about the event falls by the wayside, especially if the event is assigned to whichever kind of 'unimportant' or 'less important' or as if junk pile of a type of mass killing that doesn't qualify as the real McCoy of "genocide."
4. Now following the collection of actual information about the event – one proceeds to a process of categorization of an event of mass killing – categorization is to be understood as an act of judgment by each researcher, and not as scientifically established truths. Even in the case of legal ruling (e.g., the International Criminal Court ruling that genocide was committed in the slaughter at Srebrenica but that Serbia is not to be accused of genocide⁵) is to be understood that judgments are based on the attitudes and philosophy of the

persons doing the categorization.

5. It is also to be understood that classification by a researcher in the language of social sciences is different than efforts at a legal classification. The legal classifications in turn are also to be understood as based on existing codes of law that are formulated differently in the legal codes of different countries and in the international legal system, and also that like all laws may well see future changes.

In other words, unlike so many of the pseudo-certainties that have been advanced in the fledgling field of genocide studies by different people as if a given event of mass murder obviously and unquestionably constituted whatever something or other, we move towards a more comprehensive assembly of data about many different aspects of an event of mass killing, and towards a better understanding of the process of judgment by different researchers and not a priori absolutes from heaven.

Word count from end of brief abstract to here 681. Or if want longer abstract, all together 780,

Defining Genocide and the Obstacles of Definitionalism

So much – so very much—of genocide studies has been devoted to argumentation about what is genocide - which definition will triumph, and whether a given event of ugly mass murder of civilians constitutes genocide.⁶

One scholar argues in a recent article that the lack of definitional closure and decisiveness has been a prime cause of paralysis in the international system in response to mass murders such as in Rwanda and Sudan.⁷ If this is true it compels us all the more to develop new solutions. Personally I am no less impressed – and depressed - by the fact that the definitional squabbles and battles result in a loss of much of the simple real meanings of so many people being murdered. Being overly

occupied with intellectual disputations and turf power struggles, which I have identified in the literature under the name of “definitionalism,” is an anesthetic to feeling the genuine tragedy and horror of mass murder.⁸ Endless “Is it or is it not genocide?” controversies dull the simple ethical sensitivity that murders most foul have been committed.

The author of the present Worksheet is known in the literature of genocide studies for a wide-ranging definition of genocide that speaks determinedly to the *outcome* of many human beings being murdered rather than to the *intent*, and is not limited to intended *total* destruction of a people.⁹ The definition addresses the basic FACTS that when many unarmed human beings are killed by whomever for whatever ‘reasons’ in whatever ways, genocide has been committed. Note in a review of a recent book by Joyce Apsel and Ernesto Verdeja,¹⁰ Edward Westerman states definitively: “In Lemkin’s view **results** [bold-mine] with respect to targeted populations proved more important than the question of deliberate intent.”¹¹

My definition then goes on to call for a “multiple classification of genocide,” where a selection is made from a variety of types of genocide, each of which conveys information about the nature and extent of the killings, and is further linked to a schema for evaluating weights or gradations of the crime similar to classifications of homicide such as in the first, second or third degree.¹² Thus Cultural Genocide is not the same as Genocidal Massacre which is not the same as Intentional Genocide, and so on. These different categories are included in the Worksheet we will describe.

My definition¹³ quite simply defines *any* “mass killing of substantial numbers of human beings when not in the course of military action against the military forces of an avowed enemy, under conditions of the essential defenselessness and hopelessness of the victim” as genocide. I refer to it as “a generic definition of genocide.”

The prevailing responses to this definition that appear in one form or another in the literature of genocide studies have been that this definition is too broad, that it defines

everything as it were as “genocide,” hence that the power and awe of the special horrendous category of “genocide” are seriously diminished. These critiques argue that the concept is meaningless unless the definition of genocide is restricted to the different restrictions chosen by different scholars, and at least one scholar is so extreme that he even rules out all but one genocide, the Holocaust, from constituting genocide.¹⁴ Nonetheless, over the years there are also appreciations of the definition, including by a number of scholars who chafed and scoffed at my definition who have since written appreciatively that it is inspired by humanism and caring for human life.¹⁵

In his excellent volume, *Genocide Since 1945*, Philip Spencer, who directs a Joint Program in Human Rights and Genocide Studies in Kingston University, U.K., and in Germany and Italy, also concludes that recent legal rulings infer intent from outcome and do not stand on proving intent to begin with. He notes realistically that “the organizers of genocide have usually been clever enough not to leave evidence if they could avoid it”; and at the same time clarifies that “genocide can be intended even if it does not, in the end, take place.” Spencer concludes: “The concept of genocide, however slippery, captures both intent and outcome, planning and execution. Above all, it identifies a threat to humanity on an existential scale.”¹⁶ Spencer further evaluated my specific definition as follows:

The one-sidedness of genocide is a central issue for another pioneer, Israel Charny, who fought hard to raise the question of genocide at a time when it was not seen by many as a major problem. His acute awareness of the vulnerability of victims lies at the heart of his own redefinition of genocide... Charny’s emphasis in this definition on the weakness and vulnerability of victim groups is very important, particularly when it comes to thinking about what is to be done to help victims.¹⁷

The Knowledge that Even Data Collection is Influenced by a Researcher's Subjectivity

It is an axiom in the philosophy of science that virtually all acts of assembly of information by scientists are under the influence of guiding concepts in the scientist's mind and are influenced by the very techniques of observation and measurement employed by the scientist. An easy example in the world of medicine is when a researcher-practitioner is enthusiastic about a proposed new treatment method, the initial results of such treatment as seen by the same researcher, or by the circle of professionals who are influenced or devoted to him, will likely be far better than will prove to be the case in the future of more routine employment of the treatment. A more complex and extremely well-known statement of the dilemma is embodied in the profound crisis that was set off by Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty or Indeterminacy in the early 20th century (the more precisely the position of a particle is determined, the less precise can be measurements of its momentum, and vice versa). In my opinion, in the field of genocide studies there has been considerable disregard for knowledge of the principle that each researcher is playing a significant part even in assembling the information of an event of mass killing or genocide, and certainly when it comes to *choosing* the identification or category that is given to the event -- beginning with the choice of calling it genocide or not.

Thus, consider the following examples:

How many victims were killed?

Understandably, a researcher who belongs to the same group as the victims may embrace higher numbers of victims as an unconscious expression of personal tragedy and protest, and sometimes as a conscious strategy of a group to present their losses in the most catastrophic way possible.

Which victim group was targeted?

A researcher who is committed to a definition of genocide only as an intentional act

and/or as an intentional campaign to wipe out *all* members of a target group may easily ignore less intentional killings of millions of people, such as in Stalin's sequential wiping out of ethnic groups; or Mao's virtually indiscriminate killing in his ruthless campaign in the Cultural Revolution where he killed millions of Chinese citizens who were previously undefined as belonging to any identifiable group; or Pol Pot's murder of a third of the Cambodian population with only small numbers of them identifiable as members of defined target groups (the Buddhist priesthood, and the Muslim Cham people).

What were the means of committing the genocide?

It is a moot point that full-blown deniers of a genocide are out to warp the facts of the event in many different ways including denials of various means of execution such as the gas chambers of the Holocaust. But even well intentioned and scientifically grounded researchers are known to miss, ignore, and trivialize means of genocide that for one reason or another are not important to them, e.g., male researchers who do not report rape as a major weapon in a genocidal event, or researchers who are more partial to the use of military force who do not identify saturation bombing or other crimes of disproportionality as crimes against humanity or genocidal acts in the course of a legitimate war.

Paradoxically, the philosophy of science has generated a further insight that the more aware a researcher is and holds himself/herself to knowing about their biases (which *everyone* has), the more likely it will be that the researcher will assemble more objective information. It is an intriguing dialectic: The more you know that you may not be able to know (because you think you know it all before you start), the more you may indeed be able to know and learn in an unbiased way.

In my opinion, the field of genocide studies has been hugely characterized by little to no awareness or humility about the presentation of information, and certainly about the judgments of significance made by different researchers. The present tool is

intended boldly both to provide a more systematic framework and sequence for assembling the factual data about the many different aspects of a genocidal event, and a more systematic framework for making judgments about the classification of the event, while the researcher makes himself/herself aware that it is he/she who is seeing and interpreting the events to the best of their ability but nonetheless subjectively, and not that there are absolute truths and definitions.

Replacing Definitionalism with Solid, Factual Data Collection

Slowly but surely I have come to the conclusion that if we return to basic principles of the scientific method, and concentrate firstly on assembling all the known concrete FACTS of an event of genocide, we will be fulfilling a basic principle of science about getting verifiable information, and setting a far better stage for the kinds of evaluative and definitional concepts that we want to attach to these facts – and that these evaluations can be done well only *after* a database has been assembled.

As noted, many of us genocide scholars have spent hugely irksome and fatiguing parts of our lives literally fighting one another – too often also abusively – as to whether or not a tragic pileup of dead human bodies in whatever historical event constituted genocide, or a crime against humanity, or ‘plain’ mass murder or whatever. The process of our definitional squabbles corrupted us – more correctly we allowed them to corrupt us – into crazy power struggles between us, and this has also affected and seriously weakened our abilities to contribute and to convince international agencies and national governments to recognize an event of genocide as such.

The approach that I am proposing first of all goes back to the basic scientific method and its fundamentals of assembling concrete, verifiable, detailed information about all aspects of a genocidal event. This method frees us from our wasteful pursuits of absolute definitions and the accompanying personality–power battles that have eaten

away at so much vitality of our profession of genocide scholarship. Most important, this approach redirects us and our research staffs and students to good basic science.

Part 1 of the Worksheet

The Worksheet invites the following gathering of data:

1. Genocidal Intention (Objective)

First, much like describing a disease process clearly in medicine, we track the genocidal event in all of its aspects and signs and twists and turns. Intentionality is included in this assembly of data. We certainly want to know what degree of intentionality is seen in the process of bringing about murders of the designated victims, and whether the intent was to exterminate a total people or to kill a significant number of a designated group (per the Genocide Convention, “in whole or in part”); but also whether the killing culminated in a definite outcome of masses of dead bodies but was done without focused intentionality towards a specific identity group - e.g., a government indiscriminately killing civilians in an effort to keep its power as has been one aspect of the rampant killing in Syria these years.¹⁸

The Worksheet seeks to identify a wide variety of possibilities with regard to the objective of a genocide, including actual murders of a designated ethnic, national or religious group in what is known as *ethnic cleansing*;¹⁹ or genocide as a result of abuse of the human environment via ecological destruction, or via disastrous neglect or failure to meet engineering requirements for safety, e.g., the Chernobyl nuclear plant, or the deaths of civilians in floods in China as a result of massive rerouting of a natural water system.²⁰

This section of the Worksheet also invites an effort at understanding whether the genocidal event was largely directed by a commanding agency, e.g., a key leader like Hitler, Stalin, Mao, or Pol Pot, or the genocidal event unfolded sequentially

through a series of progressive events that expanded to increasingly severe and extensive means of extermination, and then also was fed by an intoxication of violence and an orgiastic progression to greater extremes. Note the same genocidal event can also be identified as *both* of the above – both commanded by a central agency and spurred by a progression that expanded and worsened from stage to stage. Thus, for many years and to a lesser extent there are some continuations today, there was an intense dispute between understanding the Holocaust as an *intentionalist* versus *functionalist* process. Many scholars also progressed to the conception that it was both commanded by Hitler and his senior cohorts like Eichmann, but also characterized by a progressive unfolding from stage to stage to climactic procedures that were not conceived or planned originally by Hitler, like the gas chambers and crematoria, and endless variations like the forced death marches that were carried out even as Germany was collapsing decisively.²¹

2. Targeted Victim Group

The Worksheet records the identity of the targeted victim group, and whether the definition of the intended victim is along lines of racial identity, religious identity, ethnic identity, political affiliation, gender, sexual preference, membership in whatever collective group, combinations of categories, or whatever definition. Note that *at all times the Worksheet allows for entering new categories and sub-categories that express most clearly the data as they become available to us*. Thus, if rotten genocidal killers choose mentally defective or physically defective people or plain intellectual-looking people with eyeglasses, for extermination, categories for this information are formulated and entered.

3. Means of Genocide

The Worksheet calls for identifying data about the means of genocide. There are so many possible instruments for killing, so many various means of execution – again I emphasize the outcome - all of which share the same terrible generic outcome of the deaths of many unarmed people.

Differences between various means of execution have many implications in their own right, including the comparative ‘efficiency’ of the means of killing, and in respect of our knowledge and sensitivity to the different kinds of terror, pain and suffering that the victims underwent. Thus some of the many alternative means of killing are the following:

- Direct face-to-face execution by hand or other contact weapons, e.g., like hacking and execution by machete in the Rwandan Genocide, or in our time decapitations by ISIS (ISIL);
- Death camps, concentration camps, gulags, labor camps, and prisons;
- Forced marches, forced deportations or “transfer” of populations; induced famine, e.g., the Ukranian Genocide, and according to emerging reports quite possibly today in North Korea;
- Medical killing, a la Dr. Mengele in the Holocaust, and by Dr. Ishii in the Japanese invasion of Manchuria;
- ‘Plain old’ mass killings, but here too the means of killing vary considerably and need to be specified, e.g., the airplanes that crashed into the World Trade Center on 9/11; or gas chambers – there are some reports of a gas chamber operating today in North Korea, let alone everybody, including David Irving, knows of the gas chambers in the Holocaust;
- Mass graves, and crematoria;

- Bombing of civilians as a means of genocide, whether intended or resulting from “facts on the ground” that huge numbers of civilians are killed by how the bombing is conducted (“saturation bombing”) – thus see the controversy about whether the Allied bombing of Dresden constituted genocide²²; or the more recent controversies about Israeli conduct of the Gaza War in 2014 in the face of Hamas’ use of civilians and their homes for launching missiles.²³
- The relatively new ‘blessing’ in our time of transnational genocidal terrorism - terrorist attacks with bombs exploding in civilian areas, markets, churches, hospitals, cemeteries, weddings - you name it; and much of it in a crazy proliferation (all over the world) of suicide bombings, where the killers do not try to protect their own lives;
- Looking to dread future possibilities of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) - -- heaven help us for what may lie ahead in respect of weapons of mass destruction of nuclear, chemical, biologic or other futuristic weapons.

4. Context – Organizing Theme and Inspiration Imagoes

Data are now gathered specifying the context or organizing theme and inspirational imagoes of the genocidal event being studied, thus, battles for power, superiority and domination, and/or the many battles to cleanse and purify and rid the world of the defiling Other:²⁴

- *Religious Supremacy* – My god can beat up your god anytime;
- *Ethnocentric Superiority* - Battles defined in respect of ethnocentric superiority – our people *uber alles*;
- *Battles for Ideological Purity, Supremacy or Domination* – Battles for our ways of life, thinking, values over others. Note that new forms of battles in the name of a political ideology can be developed at a drop of the hat, as in the Khmer

Rouge fabrication of an almost indescribable ideology as the understructure for destruction of no less than one third of their *fellow* citizens in Cambodia;

- *Economic System Superiority* - The traditional biggies both of capitalism and communism seek to capture more and more power no matter the expense in human lives, e.g., the history of efforts of communist-bloc countries to achieve domination over an “empire”; or the long time oil policies of the West that include shoring up blatantly totalitarian countries; and one should hardly overlook the deadly consequences of the endless ‘prostitution’ of arms sales by all economic systems – it appears that the sales are by virtually every one to almost any willing customer;
- *Utopianism* – which means that many of us good people have beautiful dreams of a better world, but go crazy and push on and on and become entrenched in beliefs that all those who oppose us have to be eliminated²⁵;
- *Wartime Crimes against Humanity (1)* - Genocide in the course of a war that in plain old-fashioned ways is intended to expand or dominate – and thereby is generally defined, in the concepts of the Catholic philosopher, Thomas Aquinas, as an *Unjust War*;
- *Wartime Crimes against Humanity (2)* - Genocidal killing in the course of what is defined as a *Just War* of legitimate self-defense, where the people fighting for their lives ‘lose it’ and go on to massacre enemy civilians in whatever number of genocidal events – thus, Israel’s War of Independence was clearly fought in self-defense against intended destruction of its people, but there were *also* several callous genocidal massacres of civilians and several bursts of formulations of genocidal policy in a number of areas and events^{26, 27};
- *Genocidal Terrorism* – In our time, Al Qaeda and Islamic State and other fundamentalist Islamic groups have definite intentions to undermine the

existing power structures of many countries in the world (national terrorism); and in many cases are part of a long-range intention to impose Islamic domination and the law of sharia over huge areas and in a larger sense over the entire world;

- *Genocidal Killings that Accompany Colonization* - such as the destruction of indigenous native peoples in many countries in North and South America;
- *Globalization* - Genocidal acts resulting from relentless globalization or exploitation of resources and major industrial development at the expense of the lives of a local population;
- *Consolidation of Power* –genocidal killing to shore up the control of a dictator or dictatorial government.
- “*Ecological Genocide*” - or in conventional legal terms, large-scale manslaughter by ignoring and overriding safety concerns, e.g., decidedly careless and indiscriminate development of nuclear energy at the expense of radiation leaks and a high probability of catastrophic accidents, or supercilious use of carcinogenic substances like asbestos;
- *Revolution* – Genocidal excesses of killing civilians in the name of the Great New Savior of a revolution by a people who have been oppressed by a previous regime;
- *Revenge and Attribution* - the delight of ‘getting back’ against people who committed genocide against your people and ‘deserve nothing better’; ‘counterrevolutionaries’ and ‘enemies of the state’; a regime sponsors harsh murderous campaigns against people in its own society who are identified, rightly or wrongly, as enemies of the state, and a passion of genocidal persecution expands against; or genocide is committed ‘mutually,’ back and

forth between two perpetrators, including genocide of a perpetrator by a victim group.²⁸

- Youth Bulge – It has been pointed out by any number of scholars that there is an increasing bulge of a population of unemployed youth, and that this is a prime population for recruiting killers.²⁹
- *Genocidal Killing for the Sake of Killing* – There are still other existing or emergent themes and inspirations for genocide. Personally, I have come to the conclusion that the killing impulse is instinctive or a natural substrate in the human mind. Much genocidal killing is, forgive me, ‘killing for killing’s sake.’ The desire and readiness to destroy other living beings is resonant within us human beings as one of our instinctive systems of thinking–behavior and is a part of the basic machinery with which we humans are endowed at the ‘factory’ when we are born. In a brilliant op-ed in the *New York Times*, Thomas Friedman created a fictional parable where the archetypal fictional hero Batman is discussing the source and motivation of evil. “He thought it was good sport. Because some men aren’t looking for anything logical like money. They can’t be bought, bullied, reasoned or negotiated with. Some men just want to watch the world burn.”³⁰

Obviously the above conclusion deserves and requires a full-scale scientific and philosophical investigation of its own, and this is not the place for it. The good news nonetheless is that the killer instinct can be sublimated to a use of power in self-defense and constructive uses of aggression for building life and not for violence and destruction. Not to kill others can be a positive goal of individuals and of a culture that fight against violence.³¹

5. Identity Of Perpetrator

Data entering continues with identification of *who* is the perpetrator executing the genocide. In a great number of cases to date it is national governments who are the perpetrators, but there are also a substantial number of situations where others such as the church – see for example the Crusades; or a political party – see a revolutionary party in Columbia in South America; or often enough a revolutionary political movement that grows in power to become the prevailing government – such as was the case in Communist Russia or in Communist China; today a prevailing source of genocide is transnational genocidal terrorism – what seemed like isolated incidents a few years ago is taking on the dimensions of an ‘Ebola epidemic of terrorism.’

There are also other ‘actors’ who can be identified as the perpetrators, including a present or past victim people who assert themselves in genocidal retaliation against their genocider; a military, para-military or ‘special force’ that executes genocidal murders (often enough on behalf of a government – such as in the disappearances in Argentina); and even the people themselves can be the immediate perpetrators of genocide, such as in rioting crowds, lynchings, and bloodthirsty public trials of “enemies.”

The subject of *who* executes a genocidal event broadens even further when in addition to identifying the major perpetrators – where we also look for the “architects” and the “executors,” we look for accomplices and bystanders, and then to others who give assistance to the execution of the genocide. Individuals, institutions and organizations play these roles. Any number of societal institutions need to be looked at for their roles as accomplices or bystanders as those who gave a significant form of assistance to a policy of executions and their implementation. Note on the Chart that an interaction is being defined between the identity of the perpetrator – referring to the full array of parties that

are involved executing a genocide and the specification of their roles in same – perpetrators, accomplices or bystanders. When looking at the responsible perpetrators who execute the genocide, these can represent any of a large range of identities – a government, political party, church, revolutionaries, terrorists, a people who themselves are the victims of an ongoing genocide and retaliate in kind, or a people who were victims in the past and are now retaliating against their victimizers, the military or paramilitary or police or “special forces,” the people as a crowd or collective that erupts, or perhaps another. The same is true of the other roles in bringing about genocide. Accomplices are also to be identified according to the groups they represent. So can bystanders. Prolific genocide scholar, Samuel Totten, who in addition to his scholarship has braved a remarkably courageous activism on the ground in dangerous Sudan, emphasizes that bystanders are not only within a state/region but “to a much greater extent are those bystanders outside the region who have the power to speak up without the fear of retaliation by the perpetrators and fail to do so.”³² For examples: What role did the legal establishment in Germany play in enabling and legitimizing the Nazi regime to consolidate its dictatorial power and to carry out its policies of killings? What role did the churches in Germany and in Europe play in enabling and even encouraging the Holocaust? Similarly, what roles did churches play in the Rwandan Genocide – a famous example is that of the pastor who ordered bulldozing his church to which thousands of people had fled for safety.³³

What roles did the medical professions play in the Holocaust: before the Holocaust in a campaign to “euthanize” the mentally deficient and mentally ill children³⁴; continuing with the roles of physicians in “selections” and in bringing the gas=‘medicine’ to the crematoria; and more?

Where do educational institutions figure in enabling the event? Do they have any real entry points into the processes that culminate in genocide? Can educators and their institutions ‘afford’ to take stands against powerful government or other societal agencies of killing?

What about the diplomats of a killing nation? The ‘plain intellectuals’? The musicians? The artists? Do any have possibilities of rescuing victims?³⁵

What roles did communication and media play in campaigns ‘advertising’ and ‘hypnotizing’ national and other audiences to internalize imagoes of given target peoples as ‘germs,’ ‘bacteria,’ ‘filth,’ or other sources of potential destruction to their host nation, people, culture, or religion? Thus, the extraordinary hypnotic public pageants and assemblies of the Nazis, or the tragically brilliant radio campaigns calling on the people to prepare to exterminate the “cockroaches” – the Tutsi in Rwanda.³⁶

6. Outcome

The worksheet calls for the best information available as to the numbers of victims killed, and an assessment of the relative percentage of the victim group that has been murdered.

The great researcher R.J. Rummel has been the outstanding demographer of genocide and has given us estimates of the tolls of genocides, including his unbelievable but data-grounded estimates of 54 million victims of genocide in the USSR under Stalin, and 36 million victims in China under Mao, and an estimated conservative total of 260 million dead by genocide in most of the last century.³⁷

A second frame for viewing the toll of a genocide is to look at what percentage of the population designated as intended victims has been murdered – the Herero in South Africa were virtually totally exterminated by the Germans at

the beginning of the twentieth century; in Cambodia the two million victims of the Khmer Rouge constituted one-third of the total population; in the Holocaust half of the Jewish population in the world was destroyed.

Another summarizing perspective comes from the data of the length of time during which the extermination was carried out. Who can forget the unbelievable killings by Rwandans of one another to the extent of 800,000 victims in no more than approximately 100 days!? For those of us like the great scholar Leo Kuper³⁸ who view the nuclear bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as genocidal events, nuclear genocide occurs first in a devastating flash but then follow agonizing hours and days for many more who die, and then long years of illness and disability, including defective births and the suffering and deaths of many others.

7. Responses to the Genocide

In our individual lives, there are probably very few people who have not asked themselves what they would have done and what they will do in the event of their being caught up in a genocide as designated victims. As we know, the tragic fate of the majority is that they are trapped and led ‘like sheep to slaughter,’ and have few opportunities for resistance and rarely inspire and generate resistance. However, there is still a sizable and unforgettable group of people who do resist being victims in a genocide and that is something we want to take note of in the Chart. In the Holocaust, for example, there are famous revolts in Treblinka,³⁹ Sobibor,⁴⁰ and the Warsaw ghetto.⁴¹

The probably even larger question is what are the responses of people and governments who are not slated to be victims. The Chart provides options for recording intervention, “righteous rescuers,” opposition – active fighting back

against the genocide, indifference, and allowance – or a failure to respond to the genocide taking place. The data are recorded both for people and agencies (e.g., the church) who live alongside the victim people – say inside the same country, and people, agencies (e.g. the International Red Cross) and countries who are outside the arena of the genocide but can take action that will influence its progression. (*See* the concept of *R2P* or Responsibility To Protect⁴²).

So far in the quite dismal history of our human race, there are very few instances where countries or groups of countries or agencies of international government have actually gone in to prevent a genocide.⁴³ What stands out more than the meager number of successes are a good number of situations in which there was a stark failure to intervene. Several of these have turned into notorious chapters in human history. Thus, the failure of the Allies in WWII to give any real assistance to the victims of the Nazis in the death camps – such as bombing the tracks to Auschwitz, or even the abject refusal of the United States (and others) to allow a shipload of refugees (the *St. Louis*) who had succeeded in escaping to disembark on their shores until the boat was forced to head back into killer Nazi land and most people died. Thus, the failures of U.N. troops in the Rwandan Genocide in 1994 – here the failure centers on the refusal of the U.N. in New York to send the additional troops that U.N. General Dallaire in Rwanda requested, let alone there are serious claims that the French government armed and trained the Hutu *Interahamwe* who were primarily responsible for the killing. A year later in 1995, another devastating example of the failure of the U.N. took place when the U.N. force of Dutch soldiers, who at first promised the Bosnian Muslims refuge, literally turned them over to the Serbs who murdered more than 8,000 in a massacre that many called the worst genocidal massacre since WWII. *There is no question that the subject of*

*adequate and effective intervention in exploding instances of genocidal killing is a cardinal issue for human civilization.*⁴⁴

There are other remarkable instances both of groups and of individuals who take on roles of assisting the victims and/or contribute to the prevention of the genocide. Examples on the level of groups and institutions include diplomatic officials of countries who have contributed passports for the escapes of many intended victims, towns in which the collectivity of residents cooperated in hiding many victims, churches that fulfilled what many of us believe is the true mission of a religious institution and provided safety for escaping victims. And of course there are any number of heroic individuals who have saved others, either as a group - see the story of Oskar Shindler saving as many people as he could to be workers in his plant, or heroic individuals who literally risk their lives taking in victims and giving them shelter. Israel designates and honors people who saved Jews in the Holocaust as “Righteous Gentiles” and the word “righteous” is being picked up somewhat with respect to other peoples in other genocides. There has been more interest shown by several scholars and the institutions of several other nations who have suffered genocide who have begun identifying cases where members of the enemy people saved victims, e.g., Turks/Muslims who rescued Armenians/Christians in the Armenian Genocide.⁴⁵ Thus, “Gariwo, the Forest of the Righteous” is an organization headquartered in Milan, Italy that sponsors gardens of the righteous – thus far in Italy, Rwanda, Bosnia and Armenia – and has been lobbying the European Parliament for the establishment of a “European Day of Remembrance for the Righteous.”⁴⁶ (Sadly, the chairman of Gariwo conveys that the director of Israel’s Yad Vashem refused to consider the inclusion of righteous people from other genocides.⁴⁷)

8. Other Important Characteristics of the Genocidal Event

Aside from the guiding principle of this Worksheet that invites each scholar and researcher to correct, modify, revise and augment any category of data, Row 8 in the Worksheet specifically calls for focusing on any other important characteristic of a given genocidal event that a researcher sees fit to identify, e.g., how common it was in Rwanda for neighbors and even members of a single family to be the executioners of neighbors and relatives, or the ways in which local populations assembled during the Cultural Revolution in China to rule on the fates of fellow citizens and neighbors.⁴⁸ Altogether, the data cells create a picture of the unique aspects that are to be found in each genocidal event.

Part 2 of the Worksheet:

Value Judgments of Whether an Event is Genocide or another Related Crime

Having assembled the factual data about an event of genocide, the Worksheet invites each researcher to proceed to the ‘beloved game’ of assigning a definition of the category to which the event belongs.

There are two axes of judgment. The first is an intellectual designation and follows historical and social science terms and classifications. The second judgment is as to the most correct legal definition of a given event under the whatever legal system in which the event is to be judged. Generally this will be international law, but in any given case it can be the specific legal code of a given country, or both international and a more local law, and the researcher must clearly identify the legal system(s) being used. As of today, the legal situation is fluid and immature but clearly developing, with a growing accumulation of judgments in so short a number of years far beyond what many of us older genocide researchers dared to expect.

A word of caution: Just because a legal verdict is rendered, it isn't necessarily truth.

Legal judgments of genocide, like judgments everywhere in life, include bizarre outcomes such as were seen in the ruling we have seen of the International Court of Justice in the case brought by Bosnia against Serbia about the genocidal massacre at Srebrenica, where the court ruled first of all that the event indeed constituted genocide, but bizarrely failed to identify Serbia as the perpetrator of the genocide.⁴⁹

All of the chaos and nastiness that have been in the field of genocide studies about defining an event of mass murder is cordially invited to come forth now, but this time not in a combative context so much as in an invited act of judgment by each scholar, where it is agreed and clear that the judgment *in no way affects the accumulation of factual data that has been completed up until now nor further data that will be added in the future.*

In metaphors of medical practice, our 'doctors' will have concluded recording the history and complaints and symptoms, and will have examined the patient, and now our 'doctors' are invited to offer their best judgments and choices of the category or categories to which the genocidal events are to be referred.

Making *judgments* is clearly differentiated from assembling *facts*. The earlier work on the first part of the worksheet aims at reaching consensual factual information about what happened. Now each researcher formulates his/her own *judgments*—opinions, choices – how to define and classify the event. There is an a priori understanding that the classifications are selected among alternatives are the choices of different researchers, and are not sacrosanct facts of absolute knowledge.

Of course, in some cases the known facts will drive us towards a necessary classification - - if the perpetrator fully intended to kill a victim people, it is inevitably an Intentional Genocide and one expects most researchers to say so. But in many cases the final classification is more a judgment of the severity, meaning and significance of the event than the facts in themselves disclose.

As the field progresses, there will certainly be more serious significance to such judgments of ongoing events by our ‘doctors,’ and especially as to what actions should be taken to stop an ongoing genocide. Such recommendations for interventions are not included in the present worksheet at this time, nor have we prepared different data sheets for past genocidal events and events currently in progress.

Identifying the Biases of Researchers

Scholars and researchers are also asked to spell out the basic definition of genocide they have personally adopted, as well as any other relevant value positions that are guiding their scholarly work. Thus, a researcher who is committed to special valuation of the Holocaust as a unique event that goes beyond other cases of genocides would spell out this guiding conviction that obviously will enter into the choices he makes in defining Axis One and Axis Two classifications of genocide. The Worksheet itself provides room for a brief notation, but it is suggested that researchers may want to add an additional page on which they spell out their basic positions more fully.

In this paper I have spelled out my own distinct bias for a “generic definition of genocide” with multiple sub-classifications of the specific type of genocide. I am also happy to add as an Appendix to this article a checklist of my personal definitions of ethical and professional criteria for publishing statements accusing policies and actions of being genocidal.⁵⁰

With regard to legal definitions, legal professionals operate under many different national and international legal systems so that judgments say of genocide will be the specific system in which one is working.

It is basically always true in science that a scholar or researcher *does* have some point of view with respect to the controversial or ambiguous or unknown knowledge in the

field in which they are working. Identifying personal positions and biases, and taking responsibility for the role they play in one's judgments, is one proven method in science for trying to reduce the role of blind biases and their impositions on the assembly of information.

Conclusion

The collection of data about an event of mass killing needs to be done as carefully and objectively as possible without any connection to the judgments that are to be made as to whether the event constituted a genocidal act. The methodological format presented here calls both for such assembly of data and for judgments about the most appropriate definitions or classifications of the event. It is the author's convictions that there are multiple forms of genocide – similar to how common murderers also are classified in different groups and degrees; and that the use of the word “genocide” cannot be restricted to Intentional Genocide – a concept that rightly describes a good number of events such as the Holocaust, and Armenian Genocide - but far from all cases of genocidal killing. Throughout, it is emphasized that the proposed model is open to corrections, additions, and revisions by other scholars.

Summary of Suggested Directions for Use of the Worksheet for Describing and Categorizing Genocidal Events

Rule 1

For each dimension of the genocidal event, it is entirely permissible to select multiple characteristics, e.g., multiple means of an extermination such as death camps and forced marches in the Holocaust; or a combination of organizing themes, such as ideological domination, ethnic cleansing and genocide in the course of an unjust war in the former Yugoslavia.

Rule 2

The Worksheet is designed to enable scholars and researchers to add categories at all times, in other words to use multiple categories already listed *and* to add new categories. The history of genocide is clearly one where killings are carried out in a wide variety of different forms and sequences.

Rule 3

The Worksheet allows and indeed encourages any scholar to propose corrected or revised definitions of a category.

Rule 4

The Worksheet is presented in a condensed summary form, but it is suggested that additional blank pages be provided for each of the nine rows in the worksheet, so that scholars working with this material have space to write extended comments and notes about *any* aspect of the genocidal event.

Rule 5

The assembly of data is intended to be as factual as possible in all Rows 1-7. The clarification of type of genocide in Rows 8-9 on the other hand is understood to be an act of *judgment* made by the researcher. These are choices by the researcher and not established data in themselves. The numerous disputes in the field to date about categorizing genocide will continue, but now against a background of data sheets which record many facts about each of the cases involved. Each researcher is responsible for the choices–judgments he/she makes in categorizing an event.

The first Axis (Row 8) refers to classification in historical and social science categorizations of the genocidal events.

The second Axis (Row 9) refers to legal classifications. These are ostensibly more anchored in a set of established legal definitions, but the truth is that legal judgments too are forever being modified and revised, in many cases even when the original text of the law in question remains unchanged. Perpetrators who are brought to trial say before the International Criminal Court, such as Karadzic, formerly President of the Serbian Republic in Bosnia, routinely appeal to the court not only with regard to the *facts* of events but often more as to the *interpretation* of the events. Slowly but surely legal systems, wisely and unwisely as the case may be, are building a series of clarifications of what the legal definitions of the different crimes of mass murder will be. This Axis invites the researcher to give an *opinion* as to the definition that is called for in existing law in the specific researcher's understanding.

Rule 6

It is recommended that each scholar and researcher using this Worksheet spell out on an additional page their basic definition of genocide and any other relevant value positions that are guiding their scholarly work. Identifying personal biases, and taking responsibility for tracking the roles one's biases play in the collection of data and in judgments of classifications are possible controls for biases in scientific methodology.

Appendix

Israel Charny's Proposed Checklist of Ethical and Professional Criteria for Publishing Statements Accusing Policies and Actions of being Genocidal (-including Crimes against Humanity)

Does the statement ...

1. Relate with genuine empathy to *all* those who lost their lives and all those who suffered threats of loss of life?
2. Focus on promoting an ideological or political position, more than on respecting the human tragedy and condemning the evil that caused loss of life?
3. Present the *facts* of the event as objectively as possible based on all available information; and bring charges based on the facts, including towards otherwise victims --present or past, and including one's own people?
4. Promote the writer or organization's status or prestige more than it expresses genuine concern for human life?
5. Honor and confirm the right to self-defense of people who come under threat to their lives, and clearly differentiates killings committed in self-defense from killings committed in aggressive actions?
6. Weigh carefully interactive actions and processes between peoples-- or does it restore an *Us-Them thinking* dichotomy between one party that is defined entirely as abused victims, and another party that is cast as purely abusers and satanic?

Note: This criterion definitely does not rule out the many cases of genocide that were in fact perpetrated by an overwhelmingly murderous leader, despotic ideology, and/or a large number of participants from a given perpetrator group.

7. Seek to delegitimize the further existence of any people?
Seek or support annihilatory (genocidal) vengeance against a perpetrator people?
8. Convey and encourage a high road of genuine caring and protection of all remaining living people?

Suggestions for revisions, additions & other changes are welcomed by the author.

©Israel W. Charny, encygeno@gmail.com. Originally published in GPN.

Available on www.ihgilm.com

Israel Charny is the Executive Director of the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide in Jerusalem and a past president of the International Association of Genocide Scholars. He is the author of Fascism and Democracy in the Human Mind; Fighting Suicide Bombing; and three forthcoming books with Rowman and Littlefield publishers: COULD I? We the People Commit and Can Prevent Genocide: A Book for Learning about Ourselves BEFORE; A Democratic Mind: Psychology and Psychiatry with Fewer Meds and More Soul; Psychotherapy for A Democratic Mind: Treatment of Intimacy, Tragedy, Violence and Evil.

Email: encygeno@gmail.com

Word count 13,466

Chart plus 4

Appendix plus 2

NOTES FOR ISRAEL CHARNY'S WORKSHEET FOR DESCRIBING AND CATEGORIZING A GENOCIDAL EVENT

¹ This work has been in development over many years and has had extensive feedback from colleagues around the world in the course of presentations at several conferences. The present text, is further revised and expanded from the draft that was published in *GPN GENOCIDE PREVENTION NOW*, Issue 12, Winter 2012 (a Web site that will be maintained only until 2017).

<http://www.genocidepreventionnow.org/Home/tabid/39/ctl/DisplayArticle/mid/1165/a/id/648/Default.aspx>

I want to express my appreciation to several colleagues for their helpful critical reviews of this article, especially to Samuel Totten, Michael Bazyler, Philip Spencer, Henry Theriault, and Hannibal Travis, with the usual demurrer that the responsibility is that of the author.

² This publication is intended first and foremost to bring researchers a new tool for repeated use and further development in the study of events of mass killing. It is not intended as a comprehensive review of the literature or of the contributions of the many thinkers and scientists in the field of genocide studies. An earlier draft of the Worksheet included identifications of the names of some of the classic contributors to the field next to the major concept they had contributed, e.g., Leo Kuper on “genocidal massacres,” or David Scheffer’s “atrocities crimes.” However, when I sent

the paper out for critical review by a number of colleagues, I was flooded with questions and protests in both possible directions of *why* had I included so and so's name and *why* had I not included such and such others? The names of all researchers now have been removed from the Worksheet Chart but many are listed below along with selected references to selected concepts. As noted in the Chart, "It is obviously impossible to give all the references since these embody the entire literature of genocide studies." The numbers refer to the cells in which the concepts appear on the Chart.

“Intentional Genocide” (1A)

United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide [9 December 1948, U.N. GOAR Res. 96 (11 Dec. 1946) 78 U.N.T.S. 277].

Spencer, Philip (2012). Intent. In *Genocide Since 1945*. London: Routledge, pp. 12-13.

Genocidal Massacre (1B)

Kuper, Leo (1981). *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twenty First Century*. London: Penguin Books, 1981. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982.

Markusen, Eric (1999). Genocidal Massacres. In *Encyclopedia of Genocide*, p. 248.

Crimes against Humanity (1D—see also 9D and 10D)

The first prosecution for crimes against humanity took place at the Nuremberg Trials.

Sadat, Leila Nadya (2011). *Forging a Convention for Crimes against Humanity*. New York: Cambridge

Manslaughter (1D)

Churchill, Ward (1986). Genocide: Toward a Functional Definition. *Alternatives*. 11(3), 403-430.

Humanicide (1E) The term humanicide appears for the first time to our knowledge in Drost, Pieter N. (1959). *The Crime of State. Book 1: Humanicide. Book 2: Genocide*. Leiden: AW Sythoff. Drost's book is the earliest work we know of in the English language after the seminal work of Raphael Lemkin. See Lemkin, Raphael (1944). *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for World Peace, and before the first three pioneering works in English in the United States by Horowitz, Kuper, and Charny that are known to have set the stage for the development of genocide studies:

Horowitz, Irving Louis (1976). *Genocide: State Power and Mass Murder*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers. Revised editions under the title *Taking Lives*.

Kuper, Leo (1981). *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century*. London: Penguin Books; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982.

Charny, Israel W. (1982). *How Can We Commit the Unthinkable?: Genocide, The Human Cancer*. In collaboration with Chanan Rapaport. Foreword by Elie Wiesel. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1982. Paperback [with title change: *Genocide*,

the Human Cancer: How Can We Commit the Unthinkable?]. New York: Hearst Professional Books [William Morrow], 1983. (*See also* translation into Portuguese, with a new Introduction and updated bibliography, (1998).

The word *humanicide* is then used occasionally by a few researchers, e.g., *see also* Sheleff, Leon Shaskolsky (1979). *The Bystander: Behavior, Law, Ethics*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

See also a clear article advancing the basic concept of humanicide but does not employ the word.

McFarland, Sam; Brown, Derek; and Webb, Matthew (2013). Identification with all humanity as a moral concept and psychological construct. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22, 194-198.

Democide (1E)

Rummel, R.J. (1991). *Democide: Nazi Genocide and Mass Murder*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Rummel, R.J. (1997). *Power Kills: Democracy as a Method of Nonviolence*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Rummel, R.J. (1999). The New Concept of Democide. In *Encyclopedia of Genocide*, pp. 18-34.

Highly Violent Societies (1E)

Gerlach, Christian (2006). Extremely violent societies: An alternative to the concept of genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), pp. 455-471.

Mass Killing (1E)

Valentino, Benjamin (2005). *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Ethnic Cleansing (1F)

Naimark, Norman N. (2001). *Fires of Hatred: Ethnic Cleansing in Twentieth-Century Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Genocidal Manslaughter (1F)

Churchill, Ward (1986). Genocide: Toward a functional definition. *Alternatives*, 11 (3) 403-430.

Accomplices to Genocide, Conspiracy to Commit Genocide, Facilitating**Genocidal Act (1F)**

Charny, Israel W. (1994). Accomplices to Genocide. In Toward a Generic definition of genocide. In George Andreopoulos (Ed.), *Genocide: Conceptual and Historical Dimensions*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, p. 65 [Presented originally at the Raphael Lemkin Symposium at the Yale University Law School on Genocide, February, 1991].

Travis, Hannibal (2012). The International Arms Trade and the Prevention of Genocide: The Law and Practice of Arming Genocidal Governments. In Totten, Samuel (Ed.). *Impediments to the Prevention and Intervention of Genocide: A Critical Bibliographic Review*. Vol. 9. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, pp. 204-7, 218-21.

Travis, Hannibal (2014). The United Nations and Genocide Prevention: The problem of racial and religious bias. *Genocide Studies International*, 8(2), 122-152.

Genocide by Attrition (1G)

Fein, Helen (2014). Genocide by Attrition 1939-1993. The Warsaw Ghetto, Cambodia, and Sudan: Links between human rights, health and mass death. *Health and Human Rights*, 2(2), 10-45.

Ecological Destruction = Ecocide (1G)

Charny, Israel W. (1994). Genocide as a Result of Ecological Destruction and Abuse. In Toward a generic definition of genocide, *ibid*, p. 65

Political Genocide or Politicide (1H)

Harff, Barbara, and Gurr, Ted Robert (1988). Towards empirical theory of genocides and politicides. *International Studies Quarterly*, 32 (3), 359-71.

Religious Genocide (1H)

The concept of genocide on the basis of religious identity is a 'given' in the formulation of the overall concept of genocide as created by Raphael Lemkin. In a sense almost all of the literature of genocide studies refers to religious genocide. Two

excellent specific references are the seminal work of Leo Kuper and the comprehensive overview of genocide by Philip Spencer: Kuper, Leo (1981). *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twenty First Century*. London: Penguin Books, 1981. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982

Spencer, Philip (2012). *Genocide since 1945*. London: Routledge, *ibid*.

Ideological (1H)

This concept too is central to almost all genocide studies.

Charny, Israel W. (1982). Escaping into Ideology. In *How Can we Commit the Unthinkable: Genocide: The Human Cancer*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, pp. 111-113.

Kiernan, Ben (2007). *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Semelin, Jacques (2009). *Purify and Destroy: The Political Uses of Massacre and Genocide*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Genocide for Power and Domination (1H)

Horowitz, Irving Louis (1976). *Genocide: State Power and Mass Murder*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Killing for Killing's Sake and Necrophilia (1I)

Fromm, Erich (1964). *The Heart of Man: Its Genius for Good and Evil*. New York: Harper & Row.

Friedman, Thomas (October 4, 2014). ISIS, Boko Haram, and Batman. *International New York Times*.

Cultural Genocide (1J)

This concept appears in the early writing of Raphael Lemkin, and he is generally credited with its prominent inclusion in the *United Nations Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide* (9 December 1948).

Lemkin's definitive work in which he first presented the word-concept "genocide," appeared in the later years of the monstrous WWII: Lemkin, Raphael (1944). *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, *ibid*. However, Lemkin also left a rich legacy of unpublished work (in his archives one finds one after another rejection by publishers who say his work is very interesting but will not have a market!). The first scholar that I know of who devoted himself to retrieving Lemkin's writings was Steven L. Jacobs. See Jacobs, Steven L. (Ed.), *Not Guilty? Raphael Lemkin's Thoughts on Nazi Genocide*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992, and more recently: Jacobs, Steven L. (2012). *Lemkin on Genocide*. Plymouth, MA: Lexington. See also Frieze, Donna-Lee (2013). *Totally Unofficial: The Autobiography of Raphael Lemkin*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Gender (2E)

Jones, Adam (2000). Gendercide and genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research*. 2(2), 185-211.

Enemy Civilians in War (2G)

Markusen, Eric, and Kopf, David (1995). *The Holocaust and Strategic Bombing: Genocide and Total War in the Twentieth Century*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Transnational Genocidal Terrorism, and Suicide Bombing (3H)

Charny, Israel W. (2007). *Fighting Suicide Bombing: A Worldwide Campaign for Life*. New York: Praeger Security International

Dekmajian, R. Harair (2007). *Spectrum of Terror*. Washington, DC: C.Q. Press.

Weapons of Mass Destruction: Nuclear, Biological, Chemical, Other Futuristic Weapons (3I)

Santoni, Ronald E. (1987). Genocide, nuclear omnicide, and individual responsibility. *Social Science Record*, 24(2), 38-41.

Lifton, Robert J., and Markusen, Eric (1990). *The Genocidal Mentality: Nazi Holocaust and Nuclear Threat*. New York: Basic Books.

Leslie, John (1996). *The End of the World: The Science and Ethics of Human Extinction*. Routledge.

Rees, Martin. (2003). *Our Final Hour: A Scientist's Warning: How Terror, Error, and Environmental Disaster Threaten Humankind's Future in the Century--On Earth and Beyond*. New York: Basic Books.

United Nations (2013). Weapons of mass destruction. First Committee 2013 civil society presentations.

http://www.un.org/disarmament/special/meetings/firstcommittee/68/pdfs/NGO-29-Oct_WMD.pdf

Rape (3J)

Joeden-Forgey, Elisa Von (2010). "Gender and Genocide". In Donald Bloxham and Moses, Dirk A. (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford University Press.

Smith, Roger W. (2013). Genocide and the Politics of Rape. In Apsel, Joyce and, Verdeja, Ernesto (Eds.) *Genocide Matters: Ongoing Issues and Emerging Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Preventing Births (3J)

Fournet, Caroline (2013). Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group. The Actus Reus of Genocide. In Behrens, Paul, and Herham, Ralph (Eds.). *Elements of Genocide*. New York: Routledge, pp. 53-69.

Planetocide (3J)

To the best of my knowledge this concept – which is obviously the bread and butter in the burgeoning science fiction of star wars - has been introduced in the formal academic literature by this author in a satire (that is intended to ring true):

Charny, Israel W. (1987). How to avoid (legally) convictions for crimes of genocide (a one-act reading). In Totten, Samuel (Ed.), *Genocide: Issues, Approaches, Resources*. *Social Science Record* [whole issue], 24 (2), 89-93. Reprinted in

California Courier, April 21, 1988 (See also editorial column in same issue: Harut Sassounian. Villains of our times: Talaat, Hitler, Stalin, Amin, Pol Pot.)

Random Genocide and Genocidal Terrorism (3J)

Charny, Israel W. (1987). How to avoid (legally) convictions for crimes of genocide (a one-act reading), *ibid.*

Breyer, Daniel (2006). Integrity and Anxious Wonder. In Crimmins, Ken, and DeVrise, Herbert (Eds.). *The Reason of Terror: Philosophical Responses to Terrorism*. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, p. 261-289.

Forsythe, David P. (2009). (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Human Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dehumanization and Demonization (4A)

Charny, Israel W., in collaboration with Rapaport, Chanan. *How Can We Commit the Unthinkable? Genocide, the Human Cancer*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Stanton, Gregory

Revolutionaries (5D)

Melson, Robert (1996). *Revolution and Genocide: On the Origins of the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust*. University of Chicago Press.

Crimes against Humanity (10D)

This is a category that is seen very differently by different scholars. Some scholars place crimes against humanity as a separate category that is to bear a somewhat lesser

degree of responsibility than the categories of “genocide.” Others consider crimes against humanity a subset or type of genocide, and use the category otherwise for massive terror and injury to broad populations. The latter can include actual killing but the killing is done differently than intentional genocidal targeting of a specific victim people (so that in some case there can be charges against a perpetrator both of genocide and crimes against humanity). Still other scholars want to get rid of the term genocide altogether and work entirely within the concept of crimes against humanity or with some other concept they propose. One sensitive genocide scholar has pointed out that victim peoples inevitably will insist that the event that befell *them* be known as “genocide” and only as genocide.

For this writer, the critical issue in any and all mass killing of unarmed civilians is that the lives of human beings were terminated, and therefore I advance the concept that all mass killing of unarmed civilians be defined first of all as genocide, and then subclassified further into meaningful categories or types. In this way the everyday usage of “genocide” is respected and our need to identify and differentiate different types of genocidal mass killing is also fulfilled.

Charny, Israel W. (1999). *Classification of Genocide in Multiple Categories*.

Encyclopedia of Genocide. Two volumes. Editor: I.W. Charny. Associate Editors:

Rouben Paul Adalian, Steven L. Jacobs, Eric Markusen, Samuel Totten;

Bibliographic Editor: Marc I. Sherman. Managing Editor: Pauline Cooper. Forewords

by Archbishop Desmond Tutu and Simon Wiesenthal. Santa Barbara, CA and Oxford, UK: ABC-Clio, 1999, 2000, pp. 3-9.

Attempted Genocide

Michael Bazylar, a professor of law, points out that although attempted genocide is indeed “on the books,” there has never been any legal action based on it. Personal Communication.

³ There are important and complex data systems for predicting genocide and political violence. However, these require systematic coding and more than likely a team of researchers. Thus, Ulfelder, Jay, and Valentino, Benjamin (2008). *Assessing Risks of State-Sponsored Mass Killing*.

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1703426 Retrieved June 21, 2014; Ulfelder, Jay (June 10, 2014). *A Useful Data Set on Political Violence that Almost No One Is Using*.

<https://dartthrowingchimp.wordpress.com/2014/06/10/a-useful-data-set-on-political-violence-that-almost-no-one-is-using/> Retrieved January 4, 2016 and including the senior author’s musing on her blog that almost no one is using the tool. The present Worksheet is for everyday use, including by individual researchers, to record the known facts of a past or ongoing genocidal event. There are also some datasets about political violence featured on the Internet, but in more than once case, the links did not work, and as far as I can see none are tailored to create a “case history” of a

genocidal event. The Uppsala Conflict Data Program at Uppsala University in Sweden has recorded ongoing violent conflicts since the 1970s.

<http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/definitions/>. Retrieved January 4, 2016.

4

5

⁶ Charny IW. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Genocide, ibid.*

⁷ Gallagher, Adrian M. (2012). A system society and community perspective on genocide. *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, 7(2/3), 166-183.

⁸ Charny, Israel W. (1994). Toward a generic definition of genocide,, *ibid*, pp. 64-94.

It may be of interest to genocide scholars that this was originally the talk that I gave at the “First Raphael Lemkin Seminar on Genocide” at Yale University in February 1991, that was referred to in an earlier note. The symbolism of honoring the heroic founder of genocide studies, Raphael Lemkin, as well as the meaning of holding a seminar at the prestigious law school and university at which Lemkin taught when he first came to the U.S. touched me so deeply that with my wife’s agreement, I flew from Israel to the U.S. despite the fact that at the time we were in the throes of the Gulf War and missiles were being fired daily on Israel. Only Israel’s national airline, El Al, was flying at the time, and the flights to and from the U.S. also were emotionally charged with an extra sense of danger. But I felt the Symposium marked a breakthrough event in the development of genocide scholarship.

⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁰ Apse, Joyce, and Verdeja, Ernesto (2013) (Eds.). *Genocide Matters: ibid.* New York: Routledge.

¹¹ Westerman, Edward B. (2014). Review of Joyce Apse and Ernesto Verdeja (2013), *Genocide Matters: Ongoing Issues and Emerging Perspectives* (New York: Routledge). In *Genocide Studies International* (2014), 8(1), 112-115, quotation on p. 114.

¹² Charny, Israel W. (1990). Towards a generic definition of genocide, *ibid.*; Classification of a genocide in multiple categories, In *Encyclopedia of Genocide, ibid.*, pp. 3-9 – includes a section, “A Proposed Definitional Matrix for Crimes of Genocide,” pp.7-9.

¹³ Charny, Israel W. (1994). Toward a generic definition of genocide, *ibid.* (quotation on p.76).

¹⁴ Katz, Steven (1994). *The Holocaust in Historical Context*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

¹⁵ “It is time to match Feinian rigour with a more Charnyian range. In short, if we are to tackle genocide’s root causes -- as scholars and human beings -- we are going to have to struggle and campaign for prevention in terms of a much more holistic antidote than we have so far dared to contemplate... While I do not accept Israel

Charny's definitional ultra-inclusivism in matters of genocide, I recognize that there is an underlying humanitarian principle in his work which is in need of scholarly recognition and development." Levene, Mark (2004). A dissenting voice: or how current assumptions of deterring and preventing genocide may be looking at the problem through the wrong end of the telescope, Part I. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 6 (2), June, 153-166, quotation on p. 163.

¹⁶ Spencer, Philip (2012). *Genocide Since 1945*. London and New York: Routledge, quotations on pp.13-14, 21.

¹⁷ Spencer, Philip (2012), *ibid.*, pp. 21, 27.

¹⁸ By now there are thousands of news reports. Here is one from as early as 2012: An unnamed employee of the *New York Times* in Syria and Damien Cave (August 27, 2012). Mass graves evidence of slaughter by Assad forces: Syrian soldiers searched house to house killing as they went, activists say. *New York Times*.

See also the Resolution of the International Association of Genocide Scholars on Syria-June 5, 2012. Genocide Alert also issued an emergency alert for Syria. In *GPN Genocide Prevention Now*, the Web magazine of the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide in Jerusalem, we called Syria an "Incremental Genocide" and tracked the mounting figures from issue to issue. Nonetheless, amazingly here too, in the first years of the Syrian genocidal horror, otherwise fine scholars were embroiled in disputes as to whether a definition of "genocide" was called for, or was it a plain old

“revolution” or “civil war” as if in these conditions mass killings a priori define a lesser crime than genocide. One prominent leader in the field denied emphatically on the listserv of the International Association for Genocide Scholars that a genocide was unfolding while adding the only real danger of genocide in the Middle East was from Israel (!). Too often we genocide scholars have been ‘nuts’ in our judgments, and we will do much better first and foremost concentrating on assembling the factual data of a mass killing event.

¹⁹ Blum, Rony; Stanton, Gregory H; Sagi, Shira; and Richter, Elihu D. (2008). Ethnic cleansing' bleaches the atrocities of genocide. *European Journal of Public Health*, 18(2), 204-209.

Personally, I very much view ethnic cleansing as one of the many or multiple forms of genocide, and thereby do not at all minimize its deadly significance as genocide. The purpose of identifying the specific subcategory of a genocide is to convey more meaningfully how the specific genocidal mass murder was carried out since there are many different scenarios for committing genocide. At the same time, in my judgment, genocide – the killing of masses of unarmed people – is genocide no matter what we smart-alecs and academics come up with in our categorizations. Helpless civilians are dead and we have no right to leave them without a name that clearly protests the genocide that killed them. The Worksheet calls first of all for accurate facts. It is only in the second part of the Worksheet that each researcher is to choose

conceptual labels, and these are not to affect the processes of the assembly of data which are to continue as an event of mass killing continues and as further information becomes available.

²⁰ Charny, Israel W. (1994). Toward a generic definition of genocide, *ibid.*

The paper includes a proposal of a concept and category of Ecological Genocide.

²¹ Porter, Jack Nusan (1999, 2000). Holocaust Controversies: A Point of View. In *Encyclopedia of Genocide, ibid.*, pp. 307-313.

²² Markusen, Eric, and Kopf, David (1995). *The Holocaust and Strategic Bombing, ibid.*

²³ See the Resolution of the United Nations Human Rights Council (June 2015):

Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories: Report of the detailed findings of the Independent Commission of Inquiry established pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1.

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=16166&LangID=E>.

See then the *NGO Monitor* (June 29, 2015). Experts Provide Alternative Voice to UN Gaza Report: Events and Interviews.

http://www.ngo-monitor.org/article/experts_provide_alternative_voice_to_un_gaza_report_events_and_interviews

This is the report of military/legal and Middle East experts who, in the words of Major-General Mike Jones, Former Chief of Staff, U.S. Central Command, advance a strong counter thesis: "While it is positive that the UN's Gaza report acknowledged that all combatants are required to abide by the law, and that Hamas' and other groups' indiscriminate rocket fire at Israel was unlawful, it is disappointing that the report fails to condemn these groups for unlawfully failing to distinguish themselves as combatants, as well as purposefully co-locating amongst civilians, knowingly placing them at risk, with absolutely no military necessity to do so."

²⁴ Cohn, Norman (2001). *Europe's Inner Demons: The Demonization of Christians in Medieval Christendom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Semelin, Jacques (2009). *Purify and Destroy*, *ibid*.

²⁵ A shocking almost unbelievable example of utopian thinking – and an explicit call to kill those who stand in the way of the better society – was discovered posthumously in the writings of no less than Abraham Maslow, the beloved founder of humanistic psychology! Maslow, Abraham H. (1979). *The Journals of A.H. Maslow*. 2 Vols. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole. Edited by Richard J. Lowry; *see also* Chalquist, Craig (date unknown-retrieved 2 December 2012). Maslow's Descent: When high peaks cast long shadows. www.terrapsych.com/maslow.html

²⁶ Morris, Benny (1988). *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem, 1947-1949*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Morris, Benny (2004). *The Birth of the*

Palestinian Refugee Problem, Revisited. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Morris, Benny (2011). 1948. *A History of the First Arab-Israeli War*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

²⁷ There have been people, including prominent genocide scholars, who have charged the newly founded State of Israel with genocide for killing Arabs during the War of Independence. Thus see the debate that erupted between Martin Shaw of Roehampton University in London and the author of this paper that led to a major story in an international newspaper: Beckerman, Gal (February 25, 2011). Top genocide scholars battle over how to characterize Israel's actions. *The Forward*. <http://forward.com/news/135484/top-genocide-scholars-battle-over-how-to-character/>.

²⁸ Nicholas Robins was perhaps the first scholar to conceptualize forthrightly the idea that a people who have been victims of a genocide can themselves become the perpetrating genociders.

²⁹

³⁰ Friedman, Thomas L. (October 4, 2014). ISIS, Boko Haram and Batman. *International New York Times*. Thomas Friedman explains evil in a 'comic book type conversation' between Batman and his helper.

³¹ Charny, Israel W. (2007). *Fighting Suicide Bombing, ibid*.

³² Totten, Samuel (February 19, 2014). Personal Communication.

³³ BBC News (April 19, 1998). Priests get death sentence for Rwandan genocide [a court in Rwanda sentenced two Catholic priests to death for their role in the genocide of 1994.] <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/79987.stm>

Wikipedia: “Athanasé Seromba (born 1963) is a Rwandan priest who was found guilty of aiding and abetting genocide and crimes against humanity committed in the Rwandan genocide. Seromba was priest of a Catholic parish at Nyange in the Kibuye province of western Rwanda. He was charged with the deaths of around 2,000 Tutsis who took refuge in his parish church. According to the charges brought against him, Seromba ordered his church to be bulldozed on April 6 1994, and then shot some survivors. Seromba surrendered himself to the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) on February 6, 2002. On February 8, 2002 he pleaded not guilty to the charges of genocide, complicity in genocide, conspiracy to commit genocide and extermination as a crime against humanity. He was found guilty and sentenced to 15 years in prison. Seromba appealed the verdict. On 12 March 2008, the Appeals Chamber of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) decided his responsibility was even greater than previously found, affirmed his conviction, and increased his sentence to a life sentence.”

See also Venturini, Gabriella (28 February 2007). "Rwanda's Unanswered Screams: Still seeking justice after the Seromba trial". *The Hague Justice Portal*.

<http://www.haguejusticeportal.net/index.php?id=7123>

³⁴ Proctor, Robert N. (1988). *Racial Hygiene: Medicine under the Nazis*. Harvard University Press; Sachs, S. (1985). *Action T4: Mass Murder of Handicapped in Nazi Germany*. Tel Aviv: Papyrus Publishing House, Tel Aviv University (Hebrew); Sereny, Gitta (1983). *Into that Darkness: An Examination of Conscience*. Vintage Books; Werthman, Fredric (1967). *A Sign for Cain*. New York: Macmillan.

³⁵ A touching and perhaps a promising program for reaching the mid-level diplomats of many countries was created by the late Fred Schwarz under a rubric of an Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation. The diplomats are invited to gather at the Institute's site immediately adjacent to Auschwitz–Birkenau, where they participate in a several day seminar aiming at heightening their awareness that they may be able to save human lives if they recognize persecutory genocidal processes in time and make good moral choices about their roles. Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation (New York). www.info@auschwitzinstitute.org.

³⁶ Chalk, Frank (1999). Radio Propaganda and Genocide. MIGS [Montreal Institute for Genocide Studies] Occasional Paper.

http://migs.concordia.ca/occpapers/radio_pr.html

³⁷ Rummel, R.J. (1990). *Lethal Politics: Soviet Genocide and Mass Murder since 1917*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Rummel, R.J. (1991). *China's Bloody Century: Genocide and Mass Murder since 1900*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Other basic works of R.J. Rummell include the following:

Rummel, R.J. (1994). *Death by Government*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Rummel, R.J. (1999). *Statistics of Democide: Genocide and Mass Murder since 1900*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

See also earlier references to other works. R.J. Rummell passed away in 2014. He is considered by many genocide scholars to have developed the outstanding empirical research of genocide to date.

³⁸ Kuper, Leo (1985). *The Prevention of Genocide, ibid.*

³⁹ Wiernik, Yankel (1945). *A Year in Treblinka: An Inmate Who Escaped Tells the Day-to-Day Facts of One Year of his Torturous Experiences*. Published by American representation of the General Jewish Workers' Union of Poland [175 East Broadway, New York 2, NY]; Willenberg, Samuel and Bartoszewski, Wladyslaw T (author, editor) (1989). *Surviving Treblinka*. New York: Meridian [Penguin Books].

See also Arad, Yitzhak (1987). *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka: The Operation Reinhard Death Camps*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

⁴⁰ Film: *Escape from Sobibor* (Initial release: April 12, 1987). Running time: 2h 23m.

Director: Jack Gold; Music composed by: Georges Delerue; Story by: Richard Rashke, Stanislaw Szmajzner

Schelvis, Jules (2007). *Sobibor: A History of a Nazi Death Camp*. Berg, Oxford & New York.

Rashke, Richard (1995). *Escape from Sobibor* (Second Ed.). University of Illinois Press.

⁴¹ Film: *Uprising* (Initial release: 2001). Running time: 2 h 57 m. Director: Jon Avnet;

Music composed by: Maurice Jarre; Story by Jon Avnet and Paul Brickman.

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. *The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising*. In *The Holocaust: A Learning Site for Students*.

<http://www.ushmm.org/outreach/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007745>

Gutman, Israel (1998). *Resistance: The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising*. Boston: Mariner Books [Houghton Mifflin Harcourt,].

⁴² In 2006, the UN Security Council passed a landmark resolution obligating governments to protect human life (UN Security Council Resolution 1674). This major development known as the “Responsibility to Protect” or *R2P* for short, was a legislative initiative spearheaded by former Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans, who worked alongside Mohamed Sahnoun, a Muslim who was a Special

Advisor to the Director-General of the United Nations. Kofi Anan, the former Secretary-General of the UN and current UN Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon also subsequently joined the initiative as staunch supporters. *See* Oxfam Press Release (April 28, 2006). Security Council Passes Landmark Resolution – World Has Responsibility to Protect People from Genocide; World Health Organization (September 2005); World Summit Outcome, Document 15. Evans, Gareth and Sahnoun, Mohammed (November-December 2002). *The Responsibility to Protect. Foreign Affairs.*

The resolution is revolutionary because the long prevailing principle dominating international law negates the rights of states to interfere with any decisions of other sovereign states. The meaning of *R2P* is that the principle of state sovereignty is no longer absolute, but regrettably notwithstanding considerable intellectual excitement about the new concept, there is still little evidence of its application in the realpolitik of life (see for example the cases of Sudan and Syria) and some observers offer the opinion that it will fade away. *See* also Williams, Ian (August 3, 2009). Ban Ki Moon and *R2P*. *Foreign Policy in Focus*; and *The Economist* (July 23, 2009). An Idea Whose Time has Come – and Gone. <http://www.economist.com/node/14087788>

⁴³ NATO's intervention in Kosovo in 1999 is considered by many a transformational event which showed that genocide could be prevented. At this writing an

international coalition led by the U.S. was created as a military deterrent to the fundamentalist Muslim ISIS, a group whose avowed intention is to create an extended “Caliphate” state that has been rampant with genocidal actions in areas it conquered. The coalition began by focusing on saving the lives of embattled Kurds in the city of Kobani, Iraq and is continuing to other areas of Iraq – although it is further deeply complicated by the entry of Russia into the picture though not actually as a member of the coalition.

⁴⁴ Any number of proposals have been made for an international police force or rapid reaction forces. See the author’s proposal for an International Peace Army that is composed of three interactive “armies”: (1) the IPA Military; (2) the IPA Medical and Humanitarian army; (3) the IPA for the Rebuilding of Safe and Tolerant Communities. This proposal is unique in making all three “armies” components of a single integrated command. Charny, Israel W. (1999). An International Peace Army: A Proposal for the Long Range Future. In *Encyclopedia of Genocide, ibid*, pp.650-653.

⁴⁵ Yair Auron of the Open University of Israel has been researching the subject of righteous Muslims. In his forthcoming book he deals with a Circassian-Muslim village in the Caucasus Mountains in 1942 where the villagers saved 32 young children in the Nazi siege of Leningrad. See Auron, Yair (2015). “*He Who Saves*

One's Soul": The Story of the Circassian-Muslim village in the Caucasus Who Saved Jewish Children from Leningrad and Its Significances. Tel Aviv: Resling (Hebrew).

Auron also reports that he has been to Rwanda to interview Hutu-Muslims who saved Tutsis, both Muslim and not Muslim alike. He adds that he is now gathering material about Turks who saved Armenians during the Armenian Genocide. He is also studying the cases of Palestinians who saved Jews during the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, as well as cases where Jews saved Palestinians. Auron also reports that in the village in which he lives in Israel, which is named "Oasis of Peace" and is the only joint Palestinian-Jewish community in Israel, they have recently opened a "Garden of the Righteous Worldwide."

⁴⁶ Radice, Ulianova, and De Fazio, Valentina (2014). *Gariwo – La Foresta dei Giusti*. Published by the organization [via G. Boccaccio 47, 20123 Milano, www.gariwo.net].

⁴⁷ Personal Communication from the chairman of Gariwo, Gabriele Nissim, at the International Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide at the Open University of Israel, November 2014.

⁴⁸ Chang, Jung, and Halliday, Jon (2005). *Mao: The Unknown Story*. New York: Knopf.

⁴⁹ Foster Jason Morgan, and Savoie, Pierre-Olivier (2007). World Court finds Serbia responsible for breaches of Genocide Convention, but not liable for committing

genocide. *American Society International Law*, 11 (9).

www.asil.org/insights070403.cfm (Retrieved December 4, 2012).

On February 26, 2007, the International Court of Justice issued its judgment in the Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide: Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro. The case was the first time a country sued another country for a breach of the U.N. Genocide Convention. The judgment was complex and lengthy and in the opinion of many of us absurd. The court concluded that Serbia had violated its obligations under the Convention by failing to prevent the genocide of over 7,000 Bosnian Muslims at Srebrenica in July 1995. At the same time the Court ruled that Serbia was not the perpetrator directly responsible for the genocide.

BBC News (April 25, 2013). Serbian president apologises for Srebrenica 'crime.'

<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-22297089>.

⁵⁰ (Published in *GPN* Issue 12) The *GPN* website will be closing in 2017, but the article can be found at www.ihgilm.com/