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(1) 1904 Hereros of South Africa 65,000 out of 80,000 killed by the German government
(2) 1915 - 1922 Armenians of Turkey 1,500,000 killed by the Ottoman Empire
(3) 1918 - 1921 Jews living in Ukraine 100,000 - 250,000 killed by Pogroms by Ukrainian government
(4) 1932 - 1933 Ukrainians 38,000,000 killed by imposed famine by USSR government under Joseph Stalin
(5) 1936 - 1939 Soviet Political Dissenters 400,000 - 500,000 killed by USSR
(6) 1939 - 1945 Jews of Europe 6,000,000 killed along with 6,000,000 others including Slavs, Gypsies, handicapped, and Jehovah's Witness by Nazi Government of Germany
(7) 1950 - 1959 Buddhists in Tibet number killed unknown by Chinese government
(8) 1965 - 1966 “Community” in Indonesia 600,000 political opponents killed by the Indonesian government
(9) 1965 - 1972 Hutus of Burundi 100,000 - 300,000 killed by the Tutsi
(10) 1965 - present Guatemalan Indians number killed unknown by Guatemalan soldiers
(11) IHO people of N. Nigeria amount killed unknown by government soldiers
(12) Bengalis in East Pakistan, now Bangladesh 1,000,000 - 3,000,000 killed by the Pakistani government
(13) 1972 Ache Indians of Paraguay amount killed unknown by the Paraguayan government
(14) 1975 - 1979 Cambodians 1,700,000 - 1,900,000 killed by the Khmer Rouge government
(15) 1975 - 2000 Citizens of East Timor 100,000 killed by Indonesian troops
(16) 1980 to present Members of the Baha'i (Religion in Iran) amount killed unknown by the Ayatollah Khomeini government
(17) 1991 - 2003 Kurds amount killed unknown by the Iraqi government
(18) 1992 - 1998 Muslims of Bosnia 200,000 killed by Croatians and Serbians
(19) 1994 Tutsi mostly civilians 800,000 killed in the African nation of Rwanda by the Hutu
(20) 1995 - present Tamil people amount killed unknown by the Sri Lankan government
(21) 1998 Albanians in Kosovo amount killed unknown by the Serbians
INTRODUCTION: NEVER AGAIN?

It was to be one of the bloodiest days of the twentieth century. In a highly organized campaign, families were killed as they fled their homes, people were hunted down and slaughtered, women were murdered as they were giving birth. Thousands of men, women, and children were herded into a stadium where they were mowed down by soldiers’ machine gun fire and hand grenades. Corpses were pushed by the thousands into large burial pits. Within four months, nearly one million people were murdered simply because of their ethnic origin.

The type of horror described above came to be known as “genocide” following the Nazi extermination of some twelve million Jews and other “undesirables” during the Holocaust. When World War II ended and the Nazi concentration camps were liberated, the world was shocked and horrified by the crimes that had taken place. Leaders world-wide made promises and signed the Genocide Convention which pledged that such an event would never again happen. Tragically, the promise of “never again” was broken time after time throughout the second half of the twentieth century.

The events described in the first paragraph did not take place during the Nazi Holocaust. They took place in Rwanda in 1994, nearly fifty years after the world had pledged “never again.” In 1998, President Clinton, who was in office during the Rwandan Genocide, spoke about the events. He said that “...to help ensure that those who survive in the generations to come never again suffer genocidal violence, nothing is more vital than establishing the rule of law.” These words rang hauntingly of the same sentiments that were expressed after the Nazi Holocaust and the development of the Genocide Convention in 1948.

During the twentieth century, nearly 170 million people were killed by governments or political violence, forty million of them in genocides. In contrast, roughly forty million soldiers died in wars and revolutions in the same period. Why has this happened? How has the international community tried to prevent this? Why has it failed the promise of “never again”? What about the United States? How have our leaders dealt with this terrible problem?

“It may seem strange to you here, but all over the world there were people like me sitting in offices, day after day, who did not fully appreciate the depth and the speed with which you were being engulfed by the unimaginable terror.”
— President Bill Clinton, 1998

In the pages that follow, you will explore the world’s response to genocide over the past century. Part I explores the history of the international community’s efforts to deal with genocide. Part II examines five case studies of genocide and both the world and U.S. response to each case. Part III looks at individual rather than state responses to genocide. Ultimately, you will be asked to formulate how you think the United States should respond in the future when confronted with another genocide.

Note to Students

During the twentieth century, governments or political violence killed more than 170 million civilians. What you will read in the coming days focuses on one type of killing of civilians: genocide. In its strict legal definition, genocide refers to widespread murder and other acts committed by governments or other groups with the intent to destroy a national, racial, religious or ethnic group. Scholars calculate that there were more than 40 million victims of genocide in the twentieth century. Of course, there have been other kinds of killing as well. Civilians have been targeted for political reasons and during wartime, for instance. This unit is not meant to ignore these other tragedies of history, but rather to focus on the particular issue of genocide and how the world has attempted to cope with this repeating problem. The five case studies discussed in this unit focus on government-perpetrated genocide. Most genocides have been perpetrated by governments but it is important to note that government involvement is not necessary for genocide to occur.
According to the United Nations Genocide Convention, genocide is a coordinated plan to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group by killing, causing serious bodily or mental harm, inflicting conditions designed to bring about its destruction, preventing births within the group, or removing children from the group. Many genocides have occurred throughout history, from the murder of Christians by the Romans in the first century to the deaths of nearly one million people in Rwanda in 1994. Yet the word genocide did not exist until the 1940s.

Until then there was no single word to describe the organized destruction of an entire group. It may seem strange to us today, but there was also no legal mechanism for the international community to respond to mass-murder and atrocities perpetrated against a people. If a person killed someone on the street, he or she could be charged with a crime: murder. He or she could then be prosecuted under the laws of that nation and punished if found guilty. However, if a government or another group attempted to annihilate a whole group of people, what crime had it committed? It was murder on a mass scale, but how could the state be held responsible? Who held jurisdiction for prosecuting such a large-scale crime?

Who devised the term “genocide”?

Raphael Lemkin, a legal scholar, recognized that these questions needed to be answered. He began thinking about the questions after the Armenian Genocide (1915-1918) and contemplated the answers from the early 1920s until his death.

Lemkin followed the case of a young Armenian, Soghomon Tehlirian, who had murdered the Turkish minister of the interior in Berlin in 1920 because Tehlirian held him responsible for the organized killing of Armenians. Lemkin found it hard to understand a system in which Tehlirian could be charged and tried for the death of a single man, but which did not hold Turkish leaders accountable for killing more than a million Armenians.

“Is it a crime for Tehlirian to kill a man, but it is not a crime for his oppressor to kill more than a million men?”

— Raphael Lemkin

Lemkin began what would become a lifelong crusade to convince the international community that it must do something to prevent what had happened in Armenia from happening in other places.

What is the international community?

The international community is a general term often used to describe the interaction of states and how they cooperate together to resolve issues between them. Lemkin believed that preventing genocide was complex, requiring international cooperation to stop states or groups from committing mass murder.

The events of the early twentieth century changed how states saw the international community. U.S. President Woodrow Wilson put forward an ambitious plan to build a more peaceful and cooperative world. He proposed a League of Nations that would attempt to enforce basic principles of conduct for states. It was this framework that Lemkin attempted to harness in his own battle to make genocide an international crime.

How was the international community affected by the First World War?

The First World War created the climate in which the Armenian Genocide took place. It also created the impetus for the international community to begin to organize itself in order to prevent further death and destruction from war.

World War I changed the way the world looked at itself. Ten million soldiers died on the battlefield and at least five million civilians perished from disease and starvation. Many historians argue that a system of international communication entailing procedures to resolve disputes would have prevented World War I.

President Woodrow Wilson also believed that a
failure in the international system led Europe into World War I. Even while the war was raging, Wilson drafted a plan for lasting world peace. In January 1918, he unveiled his fourteen-point proposal to re-shape international relations. Central to Wilson’s plan were the principles of self-determination, open diplomacy, freedom of the seas, free trade, and arms limitation. To oversee the new international system, Wilson called for the creation of a permanent global organization—the League of Nations.

Wilson imagined a new era characterized by the open publication of treaties and the settlement of disputes by impartial commissions. Wilson hoped the League would serve as the “court of public opinion” in which the “conscience of the world” would make itself heard.

Why did America reject a larger international role?

Britain, France, and Italy, the key allies of the United States in World War I, had little use for Wilson’s ideas. Rather, they wanted the League of Nations to secure their wartime victory. As the chairman of the special committee that drew up the blueprint of the League in 1919, Wilson worked hard to maintain unity among the Allied forces. His committee’s proposal for the organization of the League reflected British and French concerns.

With negotiations concluded, President Wilson took the case for the League to the American public. He claimed that the League would build on the progress of earlier International Peace Conferences. According to Wilson’s recommendations, all member states of the League would gather annually to discuss international issues. Meanwhile, a council of the world’s great powers would meet more frequently to deal with international crises. Opponents of the League argued that the new organization would largely be a tool of Britain and France. In the U.S. Senate, opponents objected to the provision that required members to come to the defense of any other member under attack. They did not want U.S. troops to be forced to defend the borders of a French colony in Africa or to protect the British Empire’s interests in India, for example.

Why did the League of Nations fail?

After the League of Nations treaty took effect in January 1920, the organization’s flaws became apparent. Enforcement of the League’s ambitious covenant proved to be the biggest problem. Although League members pledged to cooperate in preventing aggression, protecting the rights of minorities, and limiting armaments, there were no effective mechanisms to force them to honor the covenant. The requirement that all League members agree on important decisions often blocked action.

Moreover, League membership was far from universal. In 1920 the United States Senate rejected U.S. participation. Meanwhile, the British and French deliberately excluded other important countries from League membership. Germany, for example, was not.

The Madrid Conference

In 1933, Lemkin planned to travel to Madrid to present a draft of a law to other international lawyers at an international conference. The law he had drafted intended to deal with the destruction of groups as well as their intellectual and cultural life. To make his case, Lemkin planned to recount the murder of the Armenians and to warn the international community of Hitler, who had recently come to power in Germany. The Foreign Minister of Poland, hoping to cultivate better relations with Hitler, refused to let Lemkin travel to Madrid. Instead, Lemkin’s proposal was read aloud in Madrid to lawyers from thirty-seven different countries. There were few supporters. Those present wondered why these crimes committed years previously by the Ottoman Empire against Armenians needed to be legislated against—they believed that these crimes happened so rarely that no law was needed. In addition, Lemkin’s proposals met with criticism because international law dealt with the law between nations, not with how nations treated people inside their own borders. Soon after the conference, Lemkin was fired from his job as a public prosecutor for refusing to stop criticizing Hitler. The Polish foreign minister accused him of insulting Poland’s German “friends.”
allowed to join until 1926, while the Soviet Union was barred until 1934. Confronted with its first major challenge in 1931, the League failed to stop a Japanese invasion into the Chinese province of Manchuria. Later in the 1930s, the League proved powerless in the face of Italian and German aggression. By the time World War II began, international statesmen had all but given up on the League.

**World War II**

While the millions of deaths of World War I shook the world, the death toll and ferocity of World War II would eclipse what had transpired a generation earlier and squelch Wilson’s vision of a more cooperative world.

As Hitler’s armies advanced to the east, they unleashed a form of warfare that included the elimination of entire groups of people that they considered less than human including Jews, Slavs, and Gypsies, among others.

"The whole of Europe has been wrecked and trampled down by the mechanical weapons and barbaric fury of the Nazis.... As his armies advance, whole districts are exterminated. We are in the presence of a crime without a name."

— British Prime Minister Winston Churchill

**Giving the Crime a Name**

Although genocide had existed since the beginning of recorded history, there was no single word to describe what it meant until Raphael Lemkin created the word “genocide” as a way to give a name to the terrible crime against the Jews of Europe by the Nazis. “Geno” is from Greek, meaning race or tribe, and “cide” is derived from Latin, meaning killing. Lemkin first used the word in his book *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, published in 1944, which outlined the law and practices of the Nazis in occupied Europe. Lemkin, a Jew, had fled Poland for the United States ahead of the Nazis. His family chose to remain in Poland. The Nazis murdered forty-nine of his relatives; only four survived.

**World War II**

During the Second World War, U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt envisioned an international community of nations that would cooperate to prevent conflict and end need and injustice throughout the world. Ultimately, Roosevelt’s vision found its expression in 1945 when the United Nations was formed in San Francisco by the countries of the world fighting against Germany and Japan.

In addition to Roosevelt’s vision for a more cooperative international community, the Allies of World War II recognized that the enemy’s atrocities and war crimes could not go unpunished. In 1943, in response to the large-scale murder of civilians by the Nazis, Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union signed the Moscow Declaration. Drafted by British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, it included a statement on atrocities that promised to prosecute those who had committed mass murder.

“Let those who have hitherto not imbued their hands with innocent blood beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty, for most assuredly the three Allied powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done.”

— from the Moscow Declaration

**What were the Nuremberg trials?**

Following their victory, the Allies kept the promise they had made and put twenty-four accused Nazi war criminals on trial in Nuremberg, Germany. (Many others would be tried later on; some were never tried.) They were charged with crimes against peace, crimes against humanity, and violating the rules of war. Numerous defendants argued that only a state and not individuals could be held responsible for these actions. They also argued that their actions were not illegal because under the long-held interna-
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Choice was in fact possible to him [or her].

Why did Lemkin propose a UN resolution banning genocide?

While Raphael Lemkin believed that the Nuremberg Trials were an important step, he also felt it necessary to create a law that did not link the prevention of genocide solely to wars between states. In 1946, Lemkin began a campaign at the UN to introduce a resolution prohibiting all forms of genocide. Lemkin’s timing was good. Images of the Nazi death camps and testimony from Nuremberg were fresh in the public’s mind.

In addition, as a new institution the UN held great promise. Lemkin was not accredited at the UN, but he spent days wandering the halls, working his way past security guards and cornering diplomats to lobby for the resolution. Lemkin argued that genocide could have a terrible effect on the world—not only in the present day but for the generations to come.

“...we can best understand this when we realize how impoverished our culture would be if the peoples doomed by Germany, such as the Jews, had not been permitted to create the Bible, or give birth to an Einstein, a Spinoza; if the Poles had not had the opportunity to give to the world a Copernicus, a Chopin, a Curie the Czechs, a Huss, a Dvorak; the Greeks, a Plato and a Socrates; the Russians, a Tolstoy and a Shostakovich.”

— Raphael Lemkin

In December 1946, the UN General Assembly unanimously passed a resolution that condemned genocide and began to draft a treaty that would ban the crime.

What is State Sovereignty?

State sovereignty means the absolute authority of the state to govern itself free of outside interference. Governments—whether headed by democratically elected officials or self-imposed dictators—have traditionally strongly defended the principle of sovereignty. Sovereignty has served as the foundation of international relations. Governments have supported the UN, the League of Nations, and earlier international efforts based on the assumption that their sovereignty would be protected. In practical terms, sovereignty has never been absolute. Strong countries have always influenced the policies of weaker countries.
ample, it was unclear how many people had to be killed for an event to be considered genocide. Some worried that the convention could make possible the intervention in another state's internal affairs when genocide wasn't taking place. Others claimed that some of the provisions, including the lines about inflicting “mental harm,” could be applied against the United States in the racially segregated south or that the U.S. could be held accountable under the convention for genocide against Indian tribes in the nineteenth century. The main objection to the treaty was that it was seen as infringing on U.S. sovereignty and would allow foreign countries and organizations to examine the internal affairs of the United States.

In addition, some politicians distrusted the United Nations. This affected the progress of ratification by the Senate. President Eisenhower, newly elected and not willing to alienate a powerful group in the Senate including Senator Joseph McCarthy, disavowed the Genocide Convention and all other human rights treaties. Eisenhower’s administration felt that these treaties exceeded the traditional bounds of international law by trying to influence the internal workings of individual countries. The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, said that the United States would use education, not law, to further the cause of human rights around the world.

The Genocide Convention received little attention in the Senate until 1967. Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin, with the backing of Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, began a campaign to resurrect consideration of the Genocide Convention with a speech on the floor of the Senate.

How did the Cold War affect the role of the UN?

International cooperation on all international issues at the UN proved difficult due to increasing hostility between the United States and its wartime ally, the Soviet Union. These tensions were so profound that they became known as the Cold War and would last for nearly four decades. Because of the veto system, U.S.-Soviet hostility often prevented the Security Council from acting. Voting in the UN’s General Assembly generally followed the lines of Cold War alliances. Whenever key U.S. and Soviet interests clashed, there was little hope of making treaties work—including the Genocide Convention.

What was the reaction in the United States to the convention?

President Harry S Truman strongly supported ratification of the Genocide Convention by the U.S. Senate (as required by the Constitution). The convention ran into opposition in the Senate on several grounds. First, the language was indefinite. For example, it was unclear how many people had to be killed for an event to be considered genocide. Some worried that the convention could make possible the intervention in another state’s internal affairs when genocide wasn’t taking place. Others claimed that some of the provisions, including the lines about inflicting “mental harm,” could be applied against the United States in the racially segregated south or that the U.S. could be held accountable under the convention for genocide against Indian tribes in the nineteenth century. The main objection to the treaty was that it was seen as infringing on U.S. sovereignty and would allow foreign countries and organizations to examine the internal affairs of the United States.

In addition, some politicians distrusted the United Nations. This affected the progress of ratification by the Senate. President Eisenhower, newly elected and not willing to alienate a powerful group in the Senate including Senator Joseph McCarthy, disavowed the Genocide Convention and all other human rights treaties. Eisenhower’s administration felt that these treaties exceeded the traditional bounds of international law by trying to influence the internal workings of individual countries. The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, said that the United States would use education, not law, to further the cause of human rights around the world.

The Genocide Convention received little attention in the Senate until 1967. Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin, with the backing of Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, began a campaign to resurrect consideration of the Genocide Convention with a speech on the floor of the Senate.

Over the next seventeen years, Proxmire would make 3,210 more speeches (one every morning on the Senate floor) against genocide.
When did the United States ratify the Genocide Convention?

Proxmire’s speeches were all different. He recounted events of genocide around the world. He pointed out that the Soviet Union ratified the convention in 1953 and he often highlighted the effects on international debates and diplomacy of the United States’ failure to ratify the treaty. He identified U.S. failure to help the Jews during World War II. This began to hit home around the fortieth anniversary of the Allied liberation of Nazi extermination camps.

In 1985, President Ronald Reagan visited a cemetery in Bitburg, Germany. The visit was intended to mark the anniversary of the end of World War II and to demonstrate solidarity with German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, an important ally in the Cold War struggle against the Soviet Union. In addition to the German soldiers buried there, however, there were members of the SS, known for its brutality and central role in the extermination of Jews. Although Reagan added a visit to a concentration camp, there was an outpouring of criticism in the United States from many veterans’ groups, Jewish organizations, and members of both political parties angered by the president’s cemetery visit. In response to the protests, the White House decided to push for ratification of the Genocide Convention. On February 11, 1986 the Senate ratified the Genocide Convention 82-11.

What reservations did the Senate attach to the Genocide Convention?

Although the United States Senate approved the Genocide Convention, it attached a series of reservations to the treaty designed to protect U.S. sovereignty. (International law permits states to attach reservations, declarations, or understandings to a treaty that qualify or clarify their support of a treaty.) The reservations stated that before the United States could be judged by an international court, it would have to accept the jurisdiction of the court.

What events indicated a change in the international attitude toward state sovereignty?

The Kurds of Northern Iraq: When the first war against Iraq ended in 1991, U.S. forces set up a UN operation in northern Iraq to protect the 3.7 million

After the Cold War

The end of the Cold War in the late 1980s revitalized the United Nations. The UN led the way in organizing peacekeeping missions in war-torn nations and providing humanitarian relief to combat starvation and disease in countries around the world. The human rights standards that were among the founding principles of the UN gained new meaning. The international community enacted economic sanctions and took military action to punish or prevent extreme abuses of human rights.

What is the future of international cooperation?

Although international cooperation has increased significantly in the past half century, it rests on disputed underpinnings. The human rights values championed by the UN and others are not without critics.

How far these human rights will be extended in the twenty-first century is open to question. China, Russia, and other non-Western powers, as well as conservative critics in the United States contend that an emphasis on human rights will topple a crucial pillar of the international system—the principle of state sovereignty. Defenders of state sovereignty maintain that states should be free from external control. Those who wish to prioritize human rights argue that there must be limits to state sovereignty, particularly when universal human rights are at stake.

“Sovereignty implies conducting an independent foreign and internal policy, building of schools, construction of roads... all types of activity directed towards the welfare of people. Sovereignty cannot be conceived as the right to kill millions of innocent people.”

— Raphael Lemkin

What events indicated a change in the international attitude toward state sovereignty?

The Kurds of Northern Iraq: When the first war against Iraq ended in 1991, U.S. forces set up a UN operation in northern Iraq to protect the 3.7 million
Kurds who had been targeted previously in a genocide by Saddam Hussein. Until the end of the second war on Iraq in 2003, the Kurds depended largely on the international community to protect them from the Iraqi army and to provide them with relief supplies. Active international involvement in the Kurdish situation set an important precedent elsewhere around the world. Intervention in the sovereign state of Iraq in order to protect the Kurds from further acts of genocide and for humanitarian purposes marked a changing tide internationally.

Kosovo: The war against Yugoslavia in 1999 also represented a critical turning point. For the first time, a U.S.-led international coalition launched a war specifically to stop a government from carrying out human rights violations and genocide against Kosovar Albanians (a minority group) within its borders. The United States and its allies placed safeguarding human rights above preserving state sovereignty. This intervention did not have the support of the UN Security Council because of opposition from China and Russia. Chinese and Russian leaders argued that this concern for human rights was simply a ploy to bolster the influence of the United States and its NATO allies. Their staunch opposition to the intervention in Kosovo exposed a disagreement over what principles should govern international relations.

What do other critics of human rights interventions say?

Other critics of the United States and its allies point to a double standard in promoting human rights or preventing genocide. They note that Western nations have been reluctant to intervene in regions where they lack financial interests and military bases. In the 1990s, for example, the West stood on the sidelines as governments in Sudan and Rwanda conducted wars and massacres that claimed millions of lives.

Why has the United States resisted joining the International Criminal Court?

The International Criminal Court (ICC) represents an attempt by the international community to put in place a permanent court to try those accused of genocide and war crimes. Thirty countries have ratified the 1998 agreement. However, the United States refuses to ratify it in its present form. The ICC’s critics in the United States note that the language of the treaty is unclear and could allow for politically motivated and unfair prosecutions. In addition, they point out that certain rights protected by the American Constitution like a trial by jury would be lost for an American tried by the international court.

The ICC’s supporters counter that if a nation investigates and tries its own citizens for the crimes then the ICC does not have jurisdiction. American supporters of the court believe that an international system of justice like the ICC furthers the cause of international human rights and the rule of law. Whether the United States can resolve these disagreements or renegotiate parts of the treaty remains to be seen.

What role the United States and the international community should play in preventing genocide continues to be murky. While most Americans agree with the sentiment “never again,” what this means for policy is unclear. The role of the international community and the United States in preventing genocide remains to be defined. In the next section you will have the opportunity to examine five historical case studies of genocide that give a brief overview of the responses of the United States and the international community.
It is hard to imagine that throughout the twentieth century the extermination or attempted extermination of an entire group occurred time after time. Despite widespread acknowledgment that genocide should not and will not be tolerated, both the United States and the world have struggled to respond to this recurring problem for a variety of reasons. The complexity of balancing a country’s role in the international community requires many hard decisions and difficult trade-offs.

In Part I of the background reading you learned how genocide is defined and about the evolution of the international community’s response to it. In this section, you will examine five thumbnail sketches of genocides that occurred during the twentieth century. (The map on page ii provides an overview of other genocidal acts that occurred during the twentieth century.) Each case study touches upon the events leading up to the genocide, the actual events of the genocide, and the various responses of the United States and the international community. In addition, there are controversies that surround each case study. A grey box in each case study touches on some of the disputes and disagreements.

You will see that there are a number of common threads that run through these genocides. These case studies are not meant to be comparative, yet the elements of fear, the struggle for power, economic and political distress, propaganda, and increasing nationalism can be found in each. It is also important to take note of the advances and the setbacks to the international commitment to “never again” allow genocide to occur.

The Armenian Genocide

In 1915, the Turkish government began an organized campaign of deportation and annihilation of the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire. By 1923, 1.5 million Armenians, over two thirds of the Armenian population, had been murdered, deported, or forced into the desert where they starved to death. The international community did not intervene to stop the massacre. The atrocities committed against the Armenian people at the hands of the Turkish government was one of the first genocides of the twentieth century.

What were the origins of the Turkish-Armenian conflict?

Turkish invasions of the Armenian kingdoms began in the eleventh century. By the sixteenth century most of the Armenian kingdoms were incorporated into the Ottoman Empire. As a Christian minority, Armenians were relegated to second-class citizenship and suffered official discrimination. Despite these factors, the Armenians existed in a state of relative peace with ethnic Turks and most were loyal to the Empire.

The Ottoman Empire began to weaken during the nineteenth century. European powers vied for control over the Empire. Internal corruption increased and economic conditions worsened. As Armenians began to demonstrate their desire for political representation, ethnic tensions increased between the Turks and the Armenians. Near the turn of the century the government ordered massacres in an effort to lessen Armenians’ expectations for government representation and protection. The massacres led to the death of more than three hundred thousand Armenians.

In 1908, the Young Turks (officially named the Committee of Union and Progress or CUP) led a revolution and seized power from the sultan. The Armenians initially celebrated this change in power. The new rulers, who originally promoted a platform of equality and constitutionalism, quickly turned to extreme nationalism. Afraid of external conquest, the Young Turks used propaganda and fear to drum up widespread support for an entirely ethnic Turkish state rather than the existing multinational empire. With the outbreak of World War I in 1914 and Turkey’s entrance into the war, nationalism increased, serving to further the idea that “Turkism” should re-
place “Ottomanism.” The Armenians came to be seen as a roadblock to the Turkish state. Plans were drawn to remove the roadblock.

**How was the genocide committed?**

On April 24, 1915 over two hundred Armenians were rounded up in Constantinople, marking the start of the Armenian Genocide. They were arrested, deported, and executed. From that day forth, deportation, execution, and starvation became the plight of the Armenian people.

Turkish officials claimed that the Armenians planned to revolt and destroy the Ottoman Empire. This claim produced widespread Turkish support for the deportation of all Armenians. Government orders gave Armenians three days to pack their belongings and leave. To protect against potential resistance, all able-bodied Armenian men were shot. The women, children, and few surviving men began a long march to non-existent relocation centers in the Syrian Desert. These massive caravans were denied food and water and were raided and attacked by bands of Turks under commission by the government. Hundreds of thousands of people died during deportation.

Turkish officials who resisted the deportation process were replaced by other officials considered by the government to be more reliable.

---

**How did the United States respond to the Armenian Genocide?**

President Woodrow Wilson characterized the situation in the Ottoman Empire as a civil war. He saw the events as “sad but justified to quell an internal security threat.” Determined to keep America out of World War I, he did not see meddling in the “sovereign affairs” of another country as the way to maintain America’s desired neutrality. Most citizens of the United States agreed with President Wilson’s non-interventionist policy.

There was some dissent among the American people about non-intervention, however. U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire Henry Morgenthau lobbied furiously for intervention.

> “I earnestly beg the [State] Department to give this matter urgent and exhaustive consideration with a view of reaching a conclusion which may possibly have an effect on checking [Turkey’s] government and certainly provide opportunity for efficient relief which now is not permitted.”
> — Ambassador Morgenthau

Dissenters did not believe that a desire for neutrality should exempt a government from the duty to intervene in the face of such atrocities. Despite their efforts to persuade the United States and the rest of the world to intervene, little was done to ease the suffering of the Armenians. President Wilson maintained
that keeping the U.S. out of World War I was his top priority.

**How did the international community respond to the Armenian Genocide?**

The international community condemned the Armenian Genocide and threatened to hold the Young Turks personally responsible for the massacres against the Armenians. This proved to be more of an idle threat than a true commitment. Preoccupied with World War I as well as their own domestic issues, other governments took no strong actions to curb the killing or bring the perpetrators to justice. Furthermore, no law yet existed prescribing how to respond to such an event.

Some small international efforts to raise money and offer support did take place during the genocide. While not enough to curb the ever increasing death toll, these relief efforts did ensure the survival of those few Armenians who managed to escape death. Additionally, there were instances of resistance to the Turkish government within the Ottoman Empire itself. Though few and far between, these efforts made a significant difference in the survival of the Armenian people.

> "While some Turks robbed their Armenian neighbors, others helped by hiding them in safe dwellings. While some Kurds willingly participated in the massacres, others guided groups of Armenians through the mountain passes to refuge on the Russian side. Finally, while some Arabs only saw the Armenians as victims, others shared their food."

— Scholar Reuben P. Adalian

**What happened after World War I ended?**

World War I ended in 1918. In the postwar period, four hundred of the Young Turks who were directly involved in the orchestration of the Armenian Genocide were arrested. There was also a change in government within the Empire. Domestic trials ensued and charges were pressed for crimes ranging from "unconstitutional seizure of power" to "conspiring to liquidate the Armenian population." The leaders of the Young Turks were condemned to death for their roles in the genocide. They eluded justice by fleeing to foreign countries and were not pursued by the new Turkish government or the international community. Many Turks joined the new Nationalist Turkish movement led by Mustafa Kemal. The killing of Armenians continued. By 1923, nearly 1.5 million Armenians had been killed under government orders.

In 1923 the Ottoman Empire, renamed Turkey, was declared a republic and received international recognition. With this new beginning, the Turkish-Armenian issues of resettlement and restitution were
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Confronting Genocide: Never Again?

On September 1, 1939, Nazi Germany began a war of conquest and expansion when it invaded Poland. Three days later Great Britain and France responded by declaring war on Germany. Within months, nearly all of Europe was at war. In six years, the Nazis exterminated some twelve million civilians (including six million Jews) whom they considered inferior in a genocide widely referred to as the Holocaust. Hitler’s “Final Solution” to the “Jewish Question” took place under the guise of war.

What were the origins of the Nazi persecution of the Jews?

In 1933, the people of Germany faced great economic hardship. Nearly six million people were unemployed. The Nazi Party, promising to revitalize the economy, rose to power. With Chancellor Adolf Hitler as leader, the Nazis significantly reduced unemployment and restored a sense of national pride in the country. Racism, particularly anti-Semitism, was at the heart of Hitler’s philosophy. He believed that the Germans were the “master race,” entitled to rule the world. In his mind, Jews were poisoning the blood and culture of the German people, and preventing the Germans from attaining their political and cultural potential.

Hitler labeled Europe’s 9.5 million Jewish people as “vermin that must be expunged” and an obstacle to German domination in Europe. As he gained more and more supporters throughout Germany and elsewhere in Europe, already present anti-Semitism drastically increased.

On April 1, 1933 Hitler called for a boycott of Jewish businesses. This boycott was meant to officially mark Jews as different and inferior, as well as to plunge them into economic distress and strip them of any political or social power. A few Germans defied the boycott but the great majority avoided Jewish businesses from that day forth. The success of this boycott, in essence, gave Hitler the encouragement to begin systematically exporting and exterminating all European Jews.

“The Forgotten Genocide”

Today, the Turkish Government dismisses all charges of genocide and denies that the relocation of Armenians was actually a plan to exterminate the whole of the Armenian population. The United States, along with many other members of the international community, has not pressed Turkey to admit to the genocide. Turkey’s proposed admission into the European Union has caused a stir among those working to gain an acknowledgment and apology from the Turkish government. Many are enraged by the idea that Turkey could be allowed to join the EU without admitting to the genocide. Others contend that too much time has passed to open old wounds.

The Holocaust

USHMM, Courtesy of Hans Frankl

A sign reading “Jews Are Unwanted Here.”
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How could it have happened?

World War II ended in Europe on May 8, 1945. Germany's troops surrendered unconditionally. The liberation of the concentration camps revealed the horrors of the Holocaust for the world to see. Today, many wonder how it was possible for the Holocaust to occur. Where was the international community? Where was the United States? Why didn't someone stop Hitler? The answers to these questions are complex, confusing, often frustrating, and sometimes completely nonexistent.

Some contend that it was not until the end of the war when the camps were liberated that the world finally understood the severity of the situation. Others claim that governments and individuals alike knew what was taking place and chose not to stop it. The truth probably lies somewhere in between and differs widely for each country and individual. At the end of the war, however, when the concentration camps were liberated, there was no denying the gravity of the situation.

How did Hitler implement his “Final Solution”?

Before invading Poland the Nazis drew up plans to annihilate the whole of European Jewry and all other “undesirables” (namely Slavs, Gypsies, German homosexuals and mentally and physically disabled people). The Nazis built concentration camps and trained traveling killing squads. Great fear and loyalty were instilled in the Nazi army and the German people. Beginning in 1941, all Jews over the age of six were forced to wear the yellow Star of David on their outer clothing. During the war, ghettos were established for the Jewish people as well as transit camps and forced labor camps.

Killing during the Holocaust was a highly organized and industrialized process. The Nazis devoted significant bureaucratic and military resources to implement their plans. Hundreds of thousands of people were sent to extermination camps where they were systematically murdered in gas chambers. Others were worked to death at labor camps (concentration camps). They never received adequate sustenance, were constantly exposed to poor conditions and were subjected to severe mistreatment. Still others were killed by mobile killing squads that traveled throughout the Soviet Union and elsewhere murdering millions. In the final months of the war, in a last ditch attempt to prevent the Allies from liberating large numbers of prisoners, the Nazis instituted “death marches” for prisoners. Food, water, and rest were not provided; the goal of these marches was death for all. In total, more than six million Jews were exterminated in the Holocaust, along with six million other “undesirables.”

How did the world respond?

The United States, along with much of the world, ignored early signs of the extent of Nazi fanaticism. Because of Hitler's high popularity among the German people and his significant political successes,
some countries and individuals even strongly supported Hitler’s actions and ideals. When Europe was engulfed in fighting, each country struggled with loyalty issues, national interests, security, and fear. Many countries allowed some German Jews to enter and attempted to defend their country and their Jewish citizens militarily. Others sided and even collaborated with Hitler. Some remained uninvolved.

Before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, most Americans did not want to get involved in the war that embroiled the rest of the world. The great majority believed that the United States should stay out of Europe’s problems. In addition, the country was beginning to recover from the economic hardships of the Great Depression. President Roosevelt, who anticipated the need to stop Hitler, was unable to take action against the Nazis because domestic political opinion did not support it. When, on December 7, 1941 Japan attacked the U.S. naval base at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, the United States immediately declared war on Japan. Several days later Germany declared war on the United States.

In 1942 President Roosevelt began to receive information about Nazi extermination practices. Although the Allies warned the Nazis that they would be held accountable for their crimes, the Allies took little action during the war to stop the genocide. For example, some wonder why the United States did not choose to bomb the concentration camps or the railroads that transported Jews and others to their death. Military officials decided that resources could be better used for other war missions. The Nazi death camps received publicity in the U.S. newspapers, but the stories were met with skepticism and disbelief. The military successes of the Allies changed the course of the war, but did not significantly curb Germany’s highly organized, well-established killing system.

“The responsibility for this crime of murdering the entire Jewish population of Poland falls in the first instance on the perpetrators, but indirectly also it weighs on the whole of humanity, the peoples and governments of the Allied States... . By passive observation of this murder of defenseless millions and of the maltreatment of children, women, and old men, these countries have become the criminal’s accomplices....”
—Polish Jew Szmul Zygielbojm, May 1943
Written in his suicide letter

What happened after the war?

Refugee and displaced person camps were set up by the Allied forces. Between 1948 and 1951 nearly seven hundred thousand Jews emigrated to the newly established state of Israel. Thousands of others relocated to countries around the world. International commitment to humanitarian assistance and intervention proved to be stronger than ever after the genocide ended.

The world vowed that such atrocities would “never again” take place. The Genocide Convention was drafted and signed by dozens of countries.
The Cambodian Genocide

The Communist Party of Democratic Kampuchea, known commonly as the Khmer Rouge, took control of Cambodia on April 17, 1975, replacing Lon Nol’s Khmer Republic. This takeover occurred after five years of violent civil war in Cambodia. Many Cambodians were elated at the change in government and celebrated the prospect of a new era of peace in their country. The celebration ended quickly as the Khmer Rouge began a campaign of mass starvation and killing which led to the deaths of nearly two million Cambodians.

What led to the Cambodian Genocide?

In 1970, Cambodia’s leader Prince Sihanouk and his monarchy were deposed in a military coup. Lieutenant Lon Nol took over and formed a new right-wing government. Prince Sihanouk and his supporters joined a Communist guerrilla organization called the Khmer Rouge. In 1970, the Khmer Rouge attacked Lon Nol’s army, starting a civil war. In 1975 they finally overthrew Lon Nol’s government and took power. The civil war had ended but an even more brutal phase began.

Pol Pot, the leader of the new Khmer Rouge, imagined a classless society in Cambodia—a Communist utopia. Immediately after taking power, he led his new government in a campaign to rid the country (renamed “Democratic Kampuchea”) of all class distinctions that existed between rural and urban populations. The Khmer Rouge envisioned a Cambodia without cities, private property, or money, where all goods would have to be exchanged and bartered. All urban Cambodians were forced out of the cities and made to live an agrarian life-style.

“Wewill bethe first nation to create a completely Communist country without wasting our time on the intermediate steps.”
—Khmer Rouge Minister of Defense Son Sen

The Khmer Rouge attempted to destroy one society and mold another. Pol Pot wanted an entirely self-sufficient country, capable of feeding itself, defending itself, and expanding to gain more land and power in Asia.

As part of the “transition,” all banks and forms of currency were destroyed. Telephone and postal services were abolished. Media was censored. Religion was forbidden. Clothing was collected and

Auto-Genocide

Auto-genocide (self-genocide) is the term given by the UN Human Rights Commission to genocide of a people against itself rather than another ethnic group. A large percentage of the deaths in the Cambodian Genocide were of ethnic Khmer people—people from the same cultural group as the Khmer Rouge. It is for this reason that the Cambodian Genocide is often referred to as an “auto-genocide.” There were, however, many other groups targeted by the Khmer Rouge as well.
destroyed; the entire country was forced to dress in the same government-issued black pants and shirts. Every hospital was closed and medicines were banned. The educational system was dismantled and all books were confiscated and burned.

**How was the genocide carried out?**

An estimated 1.7 million people died under the Khmer Rouge between 1975 and 1979 as a result of execution, starvation, disease, exposure to the elements, and overwork. The new leadership killed any perceived resisters or “non-valuable” members of society. The transition to Communism also resulted in an abrupt transition to a repressive and murderous regime. Former Lon Nol government soldiers, civil servants, Buddhist monks, ethnic and religious minorities, elderly citizens, intellectuals, and groups of people thought to have contact with Vietnamese, such as Eastern Khmers, were among those hunted down. The simple act of wearing glasses—a symbol of intelligence and literacy—often brought execution.

Urban dwellers were made to leave the cities and towns and move to work camps in rural Cambodiam. Food productivity drastically fell with the transition to communal agriculture. The Khmer Rouge government continued to export a large percentage of the available food to China to repay past debts. The Khmer Rouge kept rations dangerously low while forcing people to work long hours in the hot sun. Malnutrition increased and starvation led to the death of hundreds of thousands of people. The great majority of deaths during the genocide resulted from deliberate starvation and malnutrition.

“To spare you is no profit, to destroy you is no loss.”
— Khmer Rouge slogan

Men, women, and children “disappeared” from villages and work camps on a regular basis. Families were split up and fear and distrust were cultivated among citizens. The government used propaganda and food to entice starving individuals to turn on others, making a large-scale revolt against the Khmer Rouge highly unlikely. Resisters to Khmer Rouge policies faced execution, often by disembowelment, by beatings, or by having nails hammered into the back of their heads. Additionally, the Khmer Rouge instilled in the Cambodian people an intense fear and hatred of the Vietnamese people, whom they called “monsters.” A border dispute with Vietnam had led to war between the two countries. Many Cambodians believed following the Khmer Rouge orders was the only way to escape a full scale Vietnamese invasion—an event that they believed would lead to a certain and horrific death for all.

The radical rule of Pol Pot ended in 1979 when the Vietnamese army invaded and overthrew the Khmer Rouge government, capturing Phnom Penh.

**How did the world respond?**

There was little international effort to stop the killing in Cambodia. The Khmer Rouge expelled all foreigners from the country immediately after taking power. It was nearly impossible for the outside world to gain first-hand knowledge of what was taking place in Cambodia, so news coverage was sparse. At the same time, the Vietnam War was coming to an

Snapshots of genocide victims taken before their execution at Tuol Sleng Prison in Phnom Penh—the Khmer Rouge’s largest torture and killing center.
end as the United States withdrew from South Vietnam. Communism and capitalism were both vying for political dominance around the world. Most governments were focused on their own affairs. There were networks of people who helped smuggle Cambodians out of the country and to safety, as well as many small international efforts to raise funds, but over all, very little attention, time, or money was devoted to the Cambodian Genocide. Yet again, genocide was underway as the world watched.

**How did the United States respond?**

U.S. policy in the Vietnam War contributed to the rise of Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge. During the Vietnam War, Cambodia had attempted to stay neutral, yet both North Vietnamese and Vietcong forces used Cambodian territory to hide, supply, and train their troops. As this military activity increased in Cambodia, President Nixon authorized B-52 bomber raids on Cambodian sanctuaries. From 1969 to 1973 there were more than thirty-six thousand B-52 bombing missions against Cambodia. The resulting political, economic, and social instability, coupled with the pre-existent peasant unrest, contributed to the Khmer Rouge’s rise to power.

During the Ford administration (1973-1976) the United States maintained economic embargoes against the Communist countries of Vietnam and Cambodia. No significant measures were taken to curb the human rights abuses in Cambodia; the United States was more concerned about containing Communism and winning the Cold War. In addition, other significant issues focused U.S. attention elsewhere. Finally, the United States had not yet signed the Genocide Convention and most did not feel obliged to contribute time, energy, or money to solving the Cambodian problem.

Jimmy Carter became president in 1976 and inherited the “Cambodian Problem” just as it began to erupt into a massive blood bath. As the killing increased and it became more and more obvious that genocide was underway, President Carter’s administration struggled to balance its commitment to human rights with broader imperatives such as winning the Cold War. Disturbed by the number of tyrannical regimes the U.S. had supported in the name of anti-Communism, Carter made an effort to give priority to human rights.

> “I want our country to set a standard of morality. I feel very deeply that when people are deprived of basic human rights that the president of the United States ought to have a right to express displeasure and do something about it. I want our country to be the focal point for deep concern about human beings all over the world.”
> — Jimmy Carter

Though he emphasized human rights and tried to make them a vehicle of his foreign policy, his efforts proved largely ineffective as Cold War initiatives and domestic priorities required most of his attention. In addition, the Vietnam War had left most American citizens and government officials averse to the idea of going back into Southeast Asia. In the end, very little was done to stop the genocide.

**What happened in Cambodia after the genocide?**

The genocide ended in 1979 when the Vietnamese invaded Cambodia in response to a border dispute. The Vietnamese overthrew the Khmer government and forced them into exile in the countryside. The Vietnamese established a temporary coalition government under which it was once again legal to own property and Buddhism was revived as the state religion. However, because of animosity toward Vietnam and Cold War allegiances, the United States and its allies continued to recognize the
The Bosnian Genocide

In 1984, Sarajevo, Yugoslavia was home to the Winter Olympics. Known as a multicultural and cosmopolitan city, Sarajevo seemed to be an ideal host for the world games. Fewer than ten years after the Olympics, the city barely stood. Nearly every inch of it was riddled with bullet holes, and Yugoslavia had disintegrated into war. Sarajevo was no longer seen as a symbol of successful multiculturalism, but rather as a city of hatred and ethnically motivated killing. The Bosnian Genocide was underway.

What were the origins of Yugoslavia’s unrest?

Yugoslavia came into existence in 1918. From its birth, the country struggled with the competing politics of the Eastern Orthodox Serbs and the Roman Catholic Croats. Nazi occupation during World War II brought severe bloodshed to the country. More than one million Yugoslavs died, many in massacres. Serbs, Muslims, and Croats all perpetrated these atrocities and all suffered severe losses. Tens of thousands of Serbs, in particular, fell victim to wartime massacres, as the Croats collaborated with the Nazis.

By 1945, the defeat of the Nazis and a cruel civil war had brought Communist leader Marshal Tito to power. Tito’s iron-fisted rule and popularity as a wartime hero held Yugoslavia together during the Cold War. Under Tito, an intricate federal system distributed political power among Yugoslavia’s ethnic groups. Despite his efforts, Tito could not completely erase the hatred and anger that had taken root during World War II. After his death in 1980, the country’s power-sharing arrangement fell apart. A political and economic crisis followed. Leaders on all fronts used ethnic tensions to try to gain more political power. In the Republic of Serbia, for example, Slobodan Milosevic rose to power in the late 1980s by rekindling
ethnic Serbian nationalism. Milosevic’s moves to assert Serbia’s dominance in turn fueled nationalism in Yugoslavia’s other republics.

“Yugoslavia’s tragedy was not foreordained. It was the product of bad, even criminal, political leaders who encouraged ethnic confrontation for personal, political and financial gain."
— Richard Holbrooke, Chief Bosnia Negotiator for the United States

In 1991 and 1992, Yugoslavia’s federal system completely disintegrated, with the republics of Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia, and Macedonia declaring independence. Fighting erupted in Slovenia and Croatia in 1991 and spilled over into Bosnia in early 1992. (Only two republics—Serbia and Montenegro—remained part of Yugoslavia.) Bosnia became the site of yet another twentieth century genocide.

Who was targeted during the Bosnian Genocide?

Muslim and Croat civilians—mostly men—were targeted during the genocide. While they supported the creation of an independent state, local Serbs saw themselves and their land as part of Milosevic’s “Greater Serbia.” The Serbs attempted to expel Muslims and Croats from Serb areas. Specifically targeting civilians, the Serbs used torture, gang rape, concentration camps, and massacres to carry out their “ethnic cleansing” against Bosnian Muslims and Croats. During the war, Muslims and Croats were guilty of atrocities as well. However, Serb forces were responsible for most of the brutality against civilians.

How did the world respond?

The international community played a complicated role in the Bosnian Genocide. Asserting that the stability of the continent was at stake in Bosnia, while denying that the events amounted to genocide, the European Union unsuccessfully attempted mediation. The UN then sent a peacekeeping force to the country in 1992 and established six “safe areas” using lightly armed troops from European nations. Serbian aircraft were prohibited from flying over the country and economic sanctions were imposed on the Yugoslav government.

Nevertheless by 1993, Bosnian Serb forces controlled 70 percent of Bosnia’s territory and their plan for “ethnic cleansing” continued. The European leaders were eager to assert their leadership and peacekeeping abilities and the United States was willing to step back. (The United States government was also reluctant to call events in Bosnia a genocide.)

“We do not interfere in American affairs. We hope that they do not interfere in ours.”
— Jacques Delor, Chairman of the European Commission

The peacekeeping effort proved to be largely ineffective in stopping the genocide. The so-called UN safe areas all fell to the Serbs and were “ethnically cleansed,” most infamously perhaps in Srebrenica where UN troops, who had promised to protect Bosnian Muslims, withdrew. Some eight thousand were massacred.
“The tragedy of Srebrenica will forever haunt the history of the United Nations. This day commemorates a massacre on a scale unprecedented in Europe since the Second World War—a massacre of people who had been led to believe that the UN would ensure their safety. We cannot undo this tragedy, but it is vitally important that the right lessons be learned and applied in the future. We must not forget that the architects of the killings in Srebrenica and elsewhere in Bosnia, although indicted by the international criminal tribunal, are still at large. This fact alone suggests that the most important lesson of Srebrenica— that we must recognize evil for what it is and confront it not with expediency and compromise but with implacable resistance— has yet to be fully learned and applied. As we mark the anniversary of the death of thousands of disarmed and defenseless men and boys, I wish to express once again to their families and friends my deepest regret and remorse. Their grief cannot be assuaged and must not be forgotten.”

—Kofi Annan, UN Secretary-General, July 11, 2000

How did the tide turn in Bosnia?

In 1995, an alliance between Croatia and Bosnia’s Muslims tilted the balance of power on the battlefield against the Serbs. In addition, as Serbian massacres of Bosnian Muslim villagers and artillery attacks against Sarajevo continued, journalists and individual citizens galvanized public opinion in the U.S. and worldwide, calling for an intervention to stop the bloodshed.

Ultimately, it was the United States that took the lead in bringing peace to Bosnia. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) launched a bombing campaign against the Bosnian Serb army. NATO’s air war, led by U.S. pilots, allowed Bosnian Croat and Muslim fighters to take the initiative on the ground.

By the fall of 1995, a new map of Bosnia had taken shape. The Serb-held portion of the country shrank to 49 percent, while the Muslims extended their control to 29 percent of the territory and the Croats to 22 percent. Ironically, the ethnic cleansing that the international community had tried to prevent was mostly complete; Bosnia consisted of three largely ethnically pure regions, each with its own army. In all, more than two hundred thousand people had died in the struggle and 2.3 million had lost their homes.

In October 1995, a cease-fire was reached. A formal peace agreement was signed in Dayton, Ohio in December 1995. The agreement was meant not only to end the war, but also to build a democratic, multi-ethnic state. To a large degree, it is the United States that has stood behind the international commitment to maintain Bosnia’s borders and to compel the young state’s three main ethnic groups to share the responsibilities of government. When U.S. peacekeepers first entered Bosnia, President Bill Clinton pledged that they would stay no longer than a year. By 1999, he conceded that accomplishing his goals in Bosnia would
In the spring of 1994, the world watched as violence engulfed the tiny central African country of Rwanda. Over the course of one hundred days, nearly one million people were killed at the hands of army militias, friends, family members, and neighbors. In a country that had a total population of fewer than eight million, these numbers are mind-boggling. In a world that had pledged “never again,” the reality seemed instead to be “again and again.”

What are the origins of the Tutsi-Hutu conflict?

The hostility between Hutus and Tutsis, however intense, reaches back only a few decades. Although a minority, making up approximately 15 percent of the population, the Tutsis have long held most of the land in Rwanda (and neighboring Burundi). For centuries, they were primarily cattle herders while the Hutus, making up 84 percent of the population, were farmers. (The Twa people comprise the remaining 1 percent of the population.) Under German and then Belgian colonial rule, the economic differences between the two groups deepened. The Belgians openly favored the Tutsis. Educational privileges and government jobs were reserved solely for officials who remain at large is wanting. Hundreds of millions of dollars in economic aid have been spent to restore the economy.

Nevertheless, Bosnia has made little economic progress. More than half of its workers are unemployed and foreign aid accounts for roughly one-third of the country’s economic output. Politically, voters from all three ethnic groups have consistently supported candidates with nationalistic views. The multi-ethnic central government envisioned by the Dayton treaty exists largely on paper.
Identity cards were used to identify Tutsis during the genocide.

the Tutsis. Identity cards were issued to document ethnicity. (These types of cards were later used to identify the Tutsi during the 1994 genocide.) This colonial favoritism contributed to tensions between the Hutus and Tutsis.

Despite the growing tensions, widespread violence did not break out between the two groups until the country gained independence in 1962 as Rwanda-Urundi. (The country later split into the nations of Rwanda and Burundi.) In the late 1950s, the Belgians hastily organized elections in Rwanda and Burundi as their colonial empire in central Africa began to crumble. Hutu parties gained control of the Rwandan government in 1959, reversing the power structure and triggering armed opposition by the Tutsis. In three years of civil war, fifty thousand Rwandans were killed and another one hundred thousand (almost all Tutsi) fled the country. In neighboring Burundi, the Tutsi-led government crushed repeated Hutu uprisings. In 1972 as many as one hundred thousand Hutus were killed in Burundi.

Ethnic conflicts notwithstanding, the vast majority of Hutus and Tutsis struggled side by side for survival as small farmers. By 1994, Rwanda, with a population of 8.4 million people and a land area the size of Maryland, was among the world’s most densely populated and poorest nations. Poverty and the scarcity of land played into the hands of politicians seeking to further their power by igniting ethnic tensions.

What events led to the Rwandan Genocide?

In 1990, the region’s problems were further complicated by the invasion of Rwanda by the rebel army, the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF). Most of the soldiers in the RPF were Tutsi refugees who had been living in neighboring Uganda since the early 1960s. In August 1993, the Arusha Accords peace agreement between the rebels and the government was signed in Tanzania and a small UN force was put in place to oversee the accord.

Events in Burundi, however, soon reignited tensions. In October 1993, Tutsi army officers killed Burundi’s first Hutu president, Melchior Ndadaye, in an attempt to overthrow the new government. Burundi plunged into violence. As many as one hundred thousand people, most of them Hutu, were killed.

Hutu extremists in Rwanda used the Burundi crisis as an opportunity to fan hostility against Tutsis in their country. In April 1994, Rwandan President Juvenal Habyarimana was killed in a suspicious plane crash, along with the second president of Burundi. Within hours of the crash, Hutu extremists executed eleven UN peacekeepers from Belgium and began carrying out a well-organized series of massacres. After the murder of the Belgians, the UN peacekeeping mission in Rwanda was brought to an abrupt halt as nearly every UN soldier was evacuated.

How was the genocide carried out?

The Rwandan Genocide lasted for one hundred days. Nearly one million people were killed in this time. Machetes and clubs were the most widely used weapons. Thousands of Tutsis and moderate Hutus were hacked to death each day by Hutus, many of them friends, neighbors, and relatives. Civilian death
squads called Interhamwe, or “those who fight together” had trained prior to the start of the genocide and were responsible for the largest massacres. The majority of other Hutus were given machetes and incited over the radio to kill. Told that the Tutsis would destroy Rwanda and kill all of the Hutus, the Hutus were made to believe that they had to kill the Tutsis first. Hutus who refused to kill or attempted to hide Tutsis were killed as well. The largest massacres occurred in areas where Tutsis had gathered together for protection, such as churches, schools, and abandoned UN posts.

Radio played an integral role in the genocide. A nation crazed with fear and desperation heard repeated broadcasts labeling the Tutsi as “cockroaches” and “devils.” Loudspeakers in the streets disclosed names and locations of Tutsis on the run. The United States, the only country in the world with the technical ability to jam this hate radio, refused, stating that it was too expensive and would be against people’s right to free speech.

How did the international community respond?

Prior to the start of the genocide, the United States and the United Nations both disregarded warnings they received from Rwandans as well as from General Romeo Dallaire, head of the UN peacekeeping mission in Rwanda. These warnings clearly stated that a plan to exterminate the Tutsis was underway. Dallaire made an urgent request to be granted permission to raid the Hutu weapons caches. He was denied permission on the grounds that it was too dangerous, unprecedented, and against his mandate. He was instructed to inform the Hutu leaders that a genocide was about to begin. As the organizers of the genocide, these Hutu leaders were already well aware of this.

Once actual killing broke out, world leaders condemned the violence in Rwanda, but balked at intervening to stop it. U.S. officials in the Clinton administration refused to define the killings as “genocide,” in part because they did not want to be obligated to intervene under the Genocide Convention. Even as the rivers filled with corpses and the streets were lined with severed limbs, the international community did not intervene. The conflict was characterized as “ancient ethnic hatred” by many and the risk of intervention was seen as too high.

Eventually, the Tutsi-led Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) stepped up its assault against the government and the massacres came to a halt. By July 1994, the RPF had seized the capital and forced the Hutu army to flee in panic. Fearful of reprisals, hundreds of thousands of Hutus abandoned their homes, many taking refuge in the Congo. International forces, including two thousand American troops, arrived after the massacres had ended to protect international relief operations for the nearly two million Hutu Rwandan children who lost their parents in the genocide rest at a camp in Goma.

UN Photo 186797/ J. Isaac. Reprinted with permission.
**Somalia Syndrome**

In 1993, U.S. troops stationed in Mogadishu, Somalia on a humanitarian mission were involved in a clash with Somali militia. The firefight that ensued on October 3, 1993 was the bloodiest fire fight involving U.S. troops since Vietnam. The conflict resulted in eighteen dead American GIs and nearly one thousand dead Somalis. The American troops were killed and dragged through the streets of the capital city of Mogadishu. Broadcast for the world to see, the American public was particularly outraged and all American peacekeeping troops in Somalia were removed as the country slipped into chaos. This battle changed America’s responses to the world’s humanitarian crises, especially those in Africa. America's reluctance to get involved in certain conflicts, often those involving ethnic strife, is commonly referred to as the “Somalia Syndrome.”

“Three brief years separated the vigorous military intervention that overrode Iraqi sovereignty and supported humane values in defense of some 1.5 million Kurds in April 1991 from the total passivity in responding to the Rwandan bloodbath during which perhaps a million people were murdered in April 1994. In between, there was Somalia.”

— Scholar Thomas G. Weiss

refugees, including many of the killers. The last UN peacekeepers left Rwanda in early 1996.

**Why did the international community fail to intervene?**

In the years since the Rwandan Genocide, diplomats and scholars have debated why the international system failed Rwanda’s victims. The reasons remain unclear. State sovereignty, apathy, financial restraints, bureaucracy, fear and safety concerns, and “Somalia Syndrome” are among them. In 1998, while visiting Rwanda, President Clinton apologized for his administration’s part in disregarding the events of 1994.

“The international community, together with nations in Africa, must bear its share of responsibility for this tragedy, as well. We did not act quickly enough after the killing began. We should not have allowed the refugee camps to become safe havens for the killers. We did not immediately call these crimes by their rightful name: genocide. We cannot change the past. But we can and must do everything in our power to help you build a future without fear, and full of hope.”

— President Bill Clinton in Rwanda, 1998

Despite President Clinton’s apology and the apologies of others, the United States and other nations have done little to address the deeper causes of one of the world’s bloodiest and most explosive conflicts. Progress has been made in preventing a new round of bloodletting between Tutsis and Hutus, but some worry that the international community is not doing all that it should. The country, with its fragile stability and complicated past, could easily explode into violence again, as could neighboring Burundi.

“If it were to happen again tomorrow, would the international community be there? Quite honestly, I don’t know.”

— UN Secretary General Kofi Annan

**How is Rwanda recovering from the genocide?**

Rwanda’s government has taken steps to heal the wounds of Tutsi-Hutu conflict within Rwanda. Almost all of the Hutu refugees have returned home. Local elections have been held and Hutus have been appointed to top government positions, including the presidency. The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (in Arusha, Tanzania) has tried some of the top organizers of the genocide, though there are currently more than one hundred thousand suspects still...
awaiting justice, and many others at large. A local, traditional justice system known as Gacaca (pronounced ga-cha-cha) is trying to bring justice and healing to the remaining victims and perpetrators. Nonetheless, memories of the 1994 genocide remain fresh, while many Hutus remain in jail and countless Hutus and Tutsis live as displaced persons or refugees. Intermarriage and close friendships between Tutsis and Hutus are no longer as common as they once were. Moreover, Rwanda’s poverty, which has worsened since 1994, threatens to touch off further ethnic conflict. Regional instability, the ongoing war in the Congo, and the massive refugee problem in the African Great Lakes Region are additional factors that threaten stability in Rwanda.

“The world is becoming normal. But some of the flowers which are flowering have bodies beneath them.”
—Esther Mujaway, Rwandan counselor

The case studies discussed in this unit represent only some of the genocides that have scarred the twentieth century. The frequency with which genocides have occurred in the past suggest that the world will see more cases of genocide in the future. In the coming days you will have an opportunity to consider a range of alternatives for U.S. policy on this issue. Each of the four viewpoints, or Options, that you will explore is based in a distinct set of values or beliefs. Each takes a different perspective on our country’s role in the world and our relationship with the UN. You should think of the Options as a tool designed to help you understand the contrasting strategies from which Americans must craft future policy.

At the end of this unit, you will be asked to make your own choices about where U.S. policy should be heading. In doing so, you may borrow heavily from one Option, combine ideas from several, or take a new approach altogether. You will need to weigh the risks and trade-offs of whatever you decide. There are, of course, no perfect solutions.
OPTIONS IN BRIEF

OPTION 1 — LEAD THE WORLD IN THE FIGHT TO STOP GENOCIDE

Genocide is unacceptable—anywhere, at any time. Nearly forty million individuals were killed in genocides throughout the twentieth century. Pledging “never again” and then standing by while genocide scars the face of the earth cannot be tolerated. We must align rhetoric with reality and start taking our responsibility to uphold the Genocide Convention seriously. When the world fails to act, we must take it upon ourselves to prevent and stop genocide whenever and wherever it occurs. We must be willing to try perpetrators of genocide in specially created tribunals or courts. Preventing genocide must become a foreign policy priority for the United States.

OPTION 2 — STAND WITH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY AGAINST GENOCIDE

The last hundred years have seen genocides in the four corners of the globe. Genocide is a global concern and requires a unified global response. No single nation has the necessary experience, resources, or credibility to set or apply standards for international behavior. We must recognize the UN as the entity with the legitimacy and experience to develop and maintain a long-term, international effort to prevent and stop genocide. If the UN is going to have the strength it needs to meet this responsibility, we must play a leadership role in supporting the effectiveness of the UN on security matters. If we are ever to see a time when genocide is no more, we must stand together with the international community against acts of genocide whenever and wherever they surface.

OPTION 3 — SPEAK OUT, BUT PRESERVE STATE SOVEREIGNTY

Genocide is a terrible crime and we must speak out against it. However, directly meddling in the internal affairs of another country—even in the face of genocide—will only set us up for disaster in the future. The principle of state sovereignty has been central to the international community for hundreds of years and it remains an integral part of the UN today. Eroding the principles of state sovereignty could significantly weaken the United Nations, leading to more harm than the crime we are trying to prevent. Failing to protect state sovereignty will also open the doors to international meddling in the affairs of the United States. We do not want other countries telling us what to think or how to act, so we should not tell them. The right of nations to govern themselves must be preserved.

OPTION 4 — INTERVENE ONLY WHEN U.S. INTERESTS ARE DIRECTLY THREATENED

Genocide is a sad fact of human nature. There have been many genocides in the past century and there will be many more to come. It is unrealistic to think that the United States can stop them all. We must be pragmatic in today’s difficult world. The first priority of our foreign policy must be to make our country stronger and safer. We can speak out against genocide and encourage the UN and our allies to do the same, but unless it directly threatens our stability, our involvement should be limited to diplomatic initiatives. Risking American lives and spending huge sums of money to try to prevent genocide is not sensible unless it is done to protect our economic and security interests.
Genocide is unacceptable—anywhere, at any time. Nearly forty million individuals were killed in genocides throughout the twentieth century. Most of the world, including the United States, stood by and watched these genocides unfold despite their proclaimed commitment to “never again” allow such horrific crimes. We must align rhetoric with reality and start taking our responsibility to uphold the Genocide Convention seriously. As the only remaining superpower, we have both the opportunity and the responsibility to stand up for human rights throughout the world. We must make the prevention of genocide a foreign policy priority and act to stop it whenever and wherever it occurs, regardless of the sentiments of other nations.

There are currently numerous conflicts simmering all over the globe with the potential to develop into mass killings and genocides in the coming years. We must work diligently to prevent these conflicts from erupting into genocide as well as directly intervene if the conflicts escalate to genocide. We cannot depend on or wait for others to stop a bloodbath. We have seen time and again that the United Nations Security Council is too often paralyzed by political divisions and bureaucratic red tape to act. Likewise, many individual countries have neither the resources nor the desire to intervene. If the international community fails to mobilize quickly or shirks its responsibility, we must take it upon ourselves to do all that we can to stop the killing. We must then hold perpetrators of genocide accountable for their actions in specially created tribunals or courts.

**What should we do?**

- The United States must not shirk its responsibility as a superpower to defend the rights of the helpless. We should announce to the world that the United States will do everything in its power to prevent and to stop genocide wherever it may occur in the world.
- If a genocide occurs, we must tell the world what we know and try to rally support for stopping it. If no one will help, we must act on our own.
- We should devote additional resources to monitoring situations that have the potential to develop into genocide. We should equip and train our military for interventions to prevent genocide.
- The United States recognizes that the principle of state sovereignty is not sacred, especially when human lives are at stake. We should announce that the U.S. will not allow tyrants to hide behind state sovereignty if they are committing the crime of genocide.

**Option 1 is based on the following beliefs and assumptions**

- As the world’s superpower and a beacon of liberty and human rights, the United States has the responsibility to protect the powerless—even if the rest of the world or the UN cannot agree on what to do.
- State sovereignty no longer applies if a state fails to protect its own people from mass murder, genocide, or crimes against humanity.
- The international community has proven itself to be largely ineffective over the years at preventing genocide.
- The effects of genocide cannot be localized or contained by state borders. Genocide anywhere affects all people. It is in our national interest to stop it whenever and wherever it occurs.
PROS  **ARGUMENTS FOR**

- Preventing genocide provides a clear moral purpose to our foreign policy.

- The political squabbles that divide the international community have often prevented tyrants from being held accountable for their actions. The United States can and should act to bring safety and justice to those who need it.

  &

- Acting alone when necessary avoids the delays and inefficiency of the international community.

CONS  **ARGUMENTS AGAINST**

- Unilateral action can lead to misperceptions about the intentions and goals of U.S. policy. We cannot afford to increase already present anti-American sentiment by sticking our noses into other people’s business.

- Acting alone could get us embroiled in long-term problems that we do not have the capability or will to resolve.

- State sovereignty is a vital principle of the international system. Intervening in another state’s sovereign affairs will significantly erode this system and lead to more serious problems.

- Intervening in the internal affairs of another country, no matter how noble the cause, will provide a precedent for other nations to intervene in our internal affairs.

- The United States does not have the resources, nor the right, to be the world’s police officer.

- While preventing genocide is a noble idea, we must focus our foreign policy efforts on those issues that directly affect America’s economic and political interests. Intervening in every case of genocide will be extremely expensive, dangerous, and time consuming.
The last hundred years have seen genocides in every corner of the globe. More than forty million people from many nations have been victims. Genocide around the world must be stopped and a strong and unified global response is required to do so. No single nation has the necessary experience, resources, or credibility to set or apply standards for international behavior. The UN has these necessary components and must be the force behind genocide prevention and confrontation. If the United States tries on its own to address this issue our motives will be questioned and we will receive blame for anything that goes wrong. In today’s world we cannot afford to increase anti-American sentiment as a result of our foreign policy.

We must recognize and support the United Nations as the entity with the legitimacy and experience to develop and maintain a long-term, international effort to prevent and stop genocide. The great majority of nations agree that genocide must not be allowed to happen again, yet it continues to occur around the world. Nothing can go further to prevent it than a clear international commitment to upholding the rule of law. As the world’s only superpower, we must renew our commitment in the UN, taking a leadership role in strengthening and supporting its effectiveness in security matters. If we are ever to see a time when genocide is no more, we must stand together with the international community against acts of genocide whenever and wherever they surface.

**What should we do?**

- The United States should work to encourage an international campaign to prevent and stop genocide by making it one of the highest priorities of the United Nations.
- The United States should drop its reservations to the Genocide Convention and sign on to the International Criminal Court.
- The United States should work to encourage greater cooperation among members of the UN Security Council and be willing to devote resources to making the UN a more effective organization.
- The United States should help strengthen the UN’s capacity to identify and resolve potential genocides before they get underway.

**Option 2 is based on the following beliefs and assumptions**

- The United Nations is the world’s best hope for resolving international problems. A nation acting alone has neither the moral authority nor the capacity to right the world’s wrongs.
- International law is the best way to resolve international problems. Only the UN has the legitimacy to authorize the measures needed to stop or prevent genocide.
- Most, if not all, nations want to prevent genocide.
- A strong UN is the best hope for peace, stability, and justice in the world.
ARGUMENTS FOR

• All nations will share the costs of helping to prevent genocide.

• Nothing can go further to prevent genocide than a clear international commitment to upholding the rule of law.

• Making the prevention of genocide a priority of the UN will reinvigorate the role of the UN in the world. Prioritizing genocide is a clear goal that many nations can get behind.

• Preventing genocide is an issue that nations can agree on. Success in this area could help improve international cooperation on other issues.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

• The UN operates too slowly and inefficiently to be relied on in such an important matter.

• There are too many political divisions on the UN Security Council to ensure that it would act to prevent genocide.

• The UN has proven itself incapable of preventing genocide even when it was happening right under its nose.

• Giving jurisdiction to the International Criminal Court and other international judicial bodies will subject American citizens and soldiers to politically motivated prosecutions.

• Intervening in a sovereign state’s affairs will undermine, if not completely destroy, the necessary and established structures of state sovereignty.

• Focusing too much attention on preventing genocide will take away resources from other more important U.S. foreign policy issues such as preventing terrorism.
Option 3

**SPEAK OUT, BUT PRESERVE STATE SOVEREIGNTY**

Genocide is a terrible crime and we must speak out against it. However, directly meddling in other countries’ affairs will only set us up for disaster in the future. The principle of state sovereignty has been central to the international system for hundreds of years and it remains an integral part of the United Nations today. Intervening, alone or as part of a multinational initiative, in the internal affairs of another country—even in the face of genocide—will undermine the concept of state sovereignty and erode the long-established structures of the international system.

We must recognize that the peace and stability of the world is best served by respecting the principles of state sovereignty and territorial integrity. Failing to respect these principles will do irreparable harm to the current international system—with far greater consequences than the wrong that the international community is trying to prevent. Eroding the principles of state sovereignty could significantly weaken the United Nations. Very few countries will be willing to remain part of the UN if their right to govern themselves is significantly decreased. Failing to protect the principle of state sovereignty will also open the door to international meddling in the affairs of the United States. If we accept that international officials can decide what countries are permitted to do inside their borders, it is just a matter of time before our own Constitution is challenged. We should free ourselves from the Genocide Convention, and encourage others to do the same. Additionally, we should not sign on to the International Criminal Court. Both of these structures would subject us to the political whims of other nations. The right of nations to govern themselves must be preserved.

**What should we do?**

- The United States should reaffirm the rights of states to govern themselves according to their own values free from outside interference. We should not engage in any activities that could lead to the demise of the international community’s commitment to state sovereignty.

- The United States should promote the UN and other organizations in their role as respondents to humanitarian needs.

- The United States should withdraw from the Genocide Convention and refuse to sign onto the International Court. We should encourage other nations to do the same.

- While declaring our commitment to the principle of state sovereignty, the United States should speak out against genocide and encourage nations to prevent it within their own borders.

**Option 3 is based on the following beliefs and assumptions**

- State sovereignty is an integral part of the international system. Its erosion would lead to the deterioration of the United Nations.

- Multilateral institutions or organizations that threaten the sovereignty of individual states have the potential to do more harm than good.

- International courts and agreements threaten all Americans’ constitutional rights to due process and a trial by one’s peers.

- Each nation must retain the right to decide the laws that govern its people.
PROS

ARGUMENTS FOR

• Intervening in the internal affairs of another country will erode the structures of state sovereignty. The consequences of such actions will be greater than the wrong we are trying to address.

&

• Resisting “feel-good” but flawed ideas like the Genocide Convention or the International Criminal Court will minimize politically motivated prosecutions and unwise obligations to meddle in other countries’ affairs.

• The international system is founded on the principle of state sovereignty. Preserving this principle will help foster stability and predictability in the world.

• The United States will be a more effective force for good in the world if it remains unconstrained by unworkable and flawed international agreements.

CONS

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

• Preserving state sovereignty even when states do not meet their responsibility for protecting civilians reaffirms the belief of tyrants that they can act without fear of consequences.

• State sovereignty can be preserved up to a point, but not at the expense of looking the other way if a genocide is occurring. Human lives are more important than abstract principles. What happened to “never again”?

• Refusing to sign international agreements angers the rest of the world and makes preventing genocide more difficult.

• Arguing that preserving our sovereignty is more important than working with other nations to eradicate the evil of genocide makes the United States appear callous and selfish.

• A genocide’s effects have never been completely contained within the country in which the genocide was actually committed. The cross-border refugee movement alone makes it an international issue.
Confronting Genocide: Never Again?

INTERVENE ONLY WHEN U.S. INTERESTS ARE DIRECTLY THREATENED

Genocide is a sad reality of human nature. There have been many genocides in the past century alone, and there will be many more to come. It is unrealistic to think that the United States can stop them all. We must be pragmatic in today’s difficult world. Acting as the world’s police officer or as a crusading idealist will only continue to get us into trouble and drain valuable resources that are needed here at home and for the war on terror. More resentment will build against us, and our own economy, security, and stability will suffer if we continue meddling in other people’s affairs. Our country’s founders sought to make the United States a model for the world, not its police officer. The danger and economic sacrifices associated with a campaign to eliminate genocide are enormous. We must protect ourselves and concentrate on issues that are of vital importance to us, rather than devoting our time and energy to trying in vain to stop intractable killing campaigns around the world.

The first priority of our foreign policy must be to make our country stronger and safer, not seek to change the world. We cannot afford to sacrifice our economic interests or risk creating resentment abroad by sticking our noses into other people’s problems. We can speak out against human rights abuses and encourage the UN and our allies to do the same, but unless genocide directly threatens our stability, our involvement should be limited to diplomatic initiatives. Risking American lives and spending huge sums of money to try to prevent genocide is not sensible unless it is done to protect our economic and security interests.

What should we do?

- In the case of genocide, the United States should only intervene if our national security is at stake.
- We should not risk American lives to stop intractable killing campaigns around the world unless we are protecting our economic or security interests.
- Our government should shift its focus away from international peacekeeping and humanitarian operations and focus more on protecting our country and its interests.
- We should work to strengthen regional organizations and encourage them to deal with their own regional problems.

Option 4 is based on the following beliefs and assumptions

- Our government’s resources are limited and must be devoted to protecting the interests of the United States.
- We cannot expect other nations to share the same sets of interests or values as the United States.
- It is idealistic and unwise to think that the United States can or should change the world.
- Neighboring states and regional organizations have the primary responsibility and the interest for intervening in genocides taking place in their own regions.
PROS  ARGUMENTS FOR

• Basing decisions on a clear calculation of U.S. interests will enable our country to concentrate American resources on issues that matter most to the United States.

• By establishing a clear standard by which we judge when the U.S. should respond to genocide, we will allow U.S. leaders to correctly allocate diplomatic, economic, and military resources.

&

• Encouraging other nations to take more responsibility for the world’s peace and security lessens the burden on the United States.

CONS  ARGUMENTS AGAINST

• The United States is the only country with the diplomatic and military clout to prevent or stop a genocide.

• True international cooperation is needed when confronting genocide. If all countries only acted in their own immediate interests, there would be few countries willing or able to intervene.

• Intervention in the internal affairs of any state, even if our interests are affected, is a dangerous way to conduct international relations. The principles of state sovereignty are intrinsic to our international system.

• Working with other countries to prevent genocide even when traditional U.S. economic and security interests are not affected can help build a more cooperative international community. In the long run, this would benefit the United States.

• Prioritizing economic or security interests over the lives of innocent people repeats the tragic mistakes of history. What happened to “never again”? 
In the previous sections you read about some of the reasons why so many countries and the international community as a whole did not always stand up against genocide. In this section you will read about individuals who did stand up and resist, in one way or another, the injustices unfolding before them. Nations and the individuals who live in them often have different concerns and responsibilities; sometimes individuals feel they have more freedom to act than their governments do.

Most people are not directly confronted with genocide. In the United States, for example, two oceans have insulated most Americans from direct confrontation with genocides around the world. All of the individuals whose stories you are about to read did not have the luxury of that distance; they were forced to deal directly with genocide—they were either in its midst or involved through their work. Thrust into the heart of the events, every person in the following section was forced to make a choice. In many cases the choice was a difficult one as these individuals grappled with complex situations. Usually, all the options had drawbacks. Often, the individuals were not acting out of a broad moral conviction but simply as a neighbor or a friend.

**ARMENIA**

Ambassador Henry Morgenthau, Sr.: Henry Morgenthau Sr., a German-born Jew, came to the United States in 1866 when he was ten years old. He became the U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire during the Armenian Genocide. Upon learning of the Turkish massacres against the Armenian people, he began contacting Washington, emphasizing the gravity of the situation and the need for intervention. He also pushed the issue with Talaat, the Turkish Minister of the Interior, each time he met with him. President Wilson and Minister Talaat stayed their course despite Morgenthau’s persistence. President Wilson, determined to stay out of World War I, felt that getting involved in what he saw as an internal conflict would thrust the United States into the war. He refused to take the chance. Talaat did not understand Morgenthau’s concern with the Armenians.

> “Why are you so interested in the Armenians, anyway? You are a Jew, these people are Christians.... What have you to complain of? Why can’t you just let us do with these Christians as we please?”
> — Turkish Minister of the Interior Talaat

> “You don’t seem to realize that I am not here as a Jew but as the American Ambassador.... I do not appeal to you in the name of any race or religion but merely as a human being.”
> — Ambassador Henry M. Morgenthau, Sr.

Ambassadorial codes of conduct indicate that ambassadors should respect a nation’s sovereignty, staying out of all matters that do not directly affect their native country’s national interests. This rule, coupled with apathy in the U.S., left Morgenthau feeling frustrated and useless in his position. He resigned from his Ambassadorship in 1916 and moved back to the United States, where he continued to lobby Washington as well as raise money and develop programs to help the surviving Armenians. The social programs he established and the funds he raised are largely responsible for saving the lives of those Armenians who escaped death during the genocide.

**THE HOLOCAUST**

Pastor Martin Niemoller: Originally a great supporter of the Nazi party and a German submarine commander during World War I, Martin Niemoller became a pastor, a pacifist, and a staunch opponent of Hitler. In response to the Nazi regime, its anti-Semitic policies, and its attempt to co-opt the Protestant Church into aiding the “Final Solution,” Niemoller founded the Pastor’s Emergency League and openly preached about the need to stand up against Nazi injustices against fellow human beings.
"First they came for the socialists, and I did not speak out because I am not a socialist. Then they came for the trade unionists, but I did not speak out because I am not a trade unionist. Then they came for the Jews, but I did not speak out because I was not a Jew. Then they came for me—and there was no one left to speak for me."
—Martin Niemoller

The Gestapo arrested Niemoller in 1937 for his acts of resistance. Released after serving a short sentence, he was arrested again and imprisoned in a concentration camp. Escaping death for six years, he was liberated by the Allies at the end of World War II. After his liberation, he worked to restore the German Protestant churches, served as president of the World Council of Churches, encouraged nuclear disarmament and reconciliation between Communist and Capitalist nations, and continued to speak about the injustices that plagued his country and other parts of the world.

Gitta Bauer: Gitta Bauer was born in Berlin, Germany in 1919. Her parents opposed the Nazis, telling her as a young child that “Jews are people like you and me only with a different religion. And that’s it.” Her family had many Jewish friends. When Bauer was twenty-four and living with her sister in Berlin, a Jewish acquaintance came to her because her daughter was in trouble. Without hesitating, Bauer told the woman that she would take the girl, Ilse Baumgart, into her home.

“This was no big moral or religious decision. She was a friend and she needed help. We knew it was dangerous, and we were careful, but we didn’t consider not taking her."
—Gitta Bauer

Baumgart lived with Bauer until the end of the war. Had the SS discovered Baumgart in Bauer’s home, both young women would have been killed. In 1984 one of Bauer’s friends nominated her for the Yad Vashem medal. This medal reads: “Who saves one life, it is as if they saved the world entire.” Bauer did not want to accept the medal because she felt ashamed of her heritage, of atrocities that had been committed in the name of her country, and of the fact that she had not done more. In the end, Bauer reluctantly accepted the Yad Vashem medal. Ilse Baumgart went on to have children and grandchildren.

“You know, there are so few people in the world who know that not all Germans were bad."
—Gitta Bauer

CAMBODIA

Dith Pran and Sydney Schanberg: Dith Pran was born in Cambodia in 1942. When the Cambodian civil war spread across the border with Vietnam, Pran joined forces with The New York Times correspondent Sydney Schanberg as his photographer and translator. Together they covered the Cambodian war from 1972-1975, including coverage of the fall of Phnom Penh.

Arrested by the Khmer Rouge, Pran, Schanberg, and two other international correspondents were nearly executed. Pran was able to convince the Khmer Rouge soldiers that the others were French journalists, covering the Khmer Rouge victory, and therefore should be set free. He narrowly escaped execution himself and was sent to a forced labor camp in the country. Starvation and execution loomed, yet Pran managed to escape to a refugee camp in Thailand in 1975 and eventually made his way to the United States. The great majority of his family members were not so fortunate.

Schanberg won a Pulitzer Prize for his coverage of the Cambodian civil war. He accepted the prize in Dith Pran’s name. Pran became an outspoken advocate for justice in the face of the Cambodian Genocide. His advocacy contributed significantly to the passing of the Cambodian Genocide Justice Act by the United States Senate. Largely due to his efforts, Congress also provided five hundred thousand dollars to Yale University for the construction of the Cambodian Genocide Project. He went on to found The Dith Pran Holocaust Awareness Project to help inform the U.S. and the world about the Cambodian Genocide.
“Part of my life is saving life. I don’t consider myself a politician or a hero. I’m a messenger. If Cambodia is to survive, she needs many voices.”
— Dith Pran

BOSNIA

State Department Resignations: The largest string of resignations in United States State Department history occurred during the Bosnian Genocide. After working relentlessly to no avail to change U.S. policy toward Bosnia, Marshall Harris, the Bosnia Desk Officer, was the first to resign.

“I can no longer serve in a department of state that accepts the forceful dismemberment of a European state and that will not act against genocide and the Serbian officials who perpetrate it. When you are in a bureaucracy, you can either put your head down and become cynical, tired and inured, or you can stick your head up and try to do something.”
— Bosnia Desk Officer Marshall Harris

Following Harris’s departure by only a few hours, Jon Western, a State Department intelligence analyst, turned in his letter of resignation, cleaned out his office, and left.

“I am personally and professionally heartsick by the unwillingness of the United States to make resolution of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia a foreign policy priority.”
— Intelligence Analyst Jon Western

Just two weeks later Steve Walker, the Croatia Desk Officer, tendered his resignation.

“I can no longer countenance U.S. support for a diplomatic process that legitimizes aggression and genocide.”
— Croatia Desk Officer Steve Walker

He was the third U.S. diplomat to resign from the State Department that month.

All three former members of the State Department continued to work on promoting peace and democracy in the Balkans. Marshall Harris and Steve Walker worked in non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to provide assistance to people in the area and advice to leaders, and Jon Western joined the U.S. Institute for Peace, which is committed to preventing conflict worldwide. Western is now a professor of international relations in Massachusetts.

RWANDA

Alison Des Forges: Alison Des Forges is a member of Human Rights Watch (HRW), an NGO that focuses on publicizing and working to change human rights violations around the world. She worked to accurately inform the world of the events happening in Rwanda. Much more acquainted with the people and history of Rwanda than any U.S. government official, Des Forges gathered and publicized as much information as possible. She believed, as did HRW, that if the world was accurately informed of the events taking place in Rwanda, then prompt, firm action would be taken. Des Forges worked tirelessly, digging up possible grave sites in search of previous killings, talking to Hutu and Tutsi friends, and attempting to persuade the Rwandan government to stop the genocide, among other things. After the genocide ended, Des Forges continued to write about the genocide and the international community’s response, in hopes of ensuring that a similar situation would never happen again. Des Forges still works for HRW.

Romeo Dallaire: Romeo Dallaire was the Commander of the UN Peacekeeping Mission in Rwanda. He arrived in Rwanda shortly before the genocide began with the idea that he was there to help uphold the recently signed Arusha Peace Accords. He ended up trying to stop the fastest killing spree in history. His efforts were assisted by too few troops and very little international support. He was unable to stop the genocide.

After eleven Belgian peacekeepers were murdered in the Rwandan capital of Kigali, countries began to pull their troops from Rwanda. Dallaire was asked to leave Rwanda three times. He chose to stay,
exerting untiring personal and professional efforts to save human lives.

After the genocide ended, Dallaire testified over and over at the International Criminal Tribunals, exposing the international community’s inadequate response. He was told by Canadian officials that he had to abandon the “Rwandan business” and stop testifying or he would be discharged from the armed services.

The genocides of the past century were marked by repeated instances of inaction. They left in their wake countless dead. Though the number of “individuals of conscience” was very small, their contributions and importance transcend their numbers. They demonstrate that even in times of extreme fear and horror, people still have a choice. These individuals, although few and far between, often demonstrated great strength and courage. Reading their stories provides insight into the exception and is important in your quest to understand how genocide is confronted not only by nations but by individuals.

“I will never leave Rwanda. I was the force commander and I [will] complete my duty, testifying and doing whatever it takes to bring these guys to justice.”

— Romeo Dallaire

Dallaire was discharged from the Canadian armed services in April 2000.
Excerpt from the Moscow Declaration, 1943 Statement on Atrocities
Signed by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin

The United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union have received from many quarters evidence of atrocities, massacres and cold-blooded mass executions which are being perpetrated by Hitlerite forces in many of the countries they have overrun and from which they are now being steadily expelled. The brutalities of Nazi domination are no new thing, and all peoples or territories in their grip have suffered from the worst form of government by terror. What is new is that many of the territories are now being redeemed by the advancing armies of the liberating powers, and that in their desperation the recoiling Hitlerites and Huns are redoubling their ruthless cruelties. This is now evidenced with particular clearness by monstrous crimes on the territory of the Soviet Union which is being liberated from Hitlerites, and on French and Italian territory.

Accordingly, the aforesaid three Allied powers, speaking in the interest of the thirty-two United Nations, hereby solemnly declare and give full warning of their declaration as follows:

At the time of granting of any armistice to any government which may be set up in Germany, those German officers and men and members of the Nazi party who have been responsible for or have taken a consenting part in the above atrocities, massacres and executions will be sent back to the countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be judged and punished according to the laws of these liberated countries and of free governments which will be erected therein. Lists will be compiled in all possible detail from all these countries having regard especially to invaded parts of the Soviet Union, to Poland and Czechoslovakia, to Yugoslavia and Greece including Crete and other islands, to Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, France and Italy.

Thus, Germans who take part in wholesale shooting of Polish officers or in the execution of French, Dutch, Belgian or Norwegian hostages of Cretan peasants, or who have shared in slaughters inflicted on the people of Poland or in territories of the Soviet Union which are now being swept clear of the enemy, will know they will be brought back to the scene of their crimes and judged on the spot by the peoples whom they have outraged.

Let those who have hitherto not imbrued their hands with innocent blood beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty, for most assuredly the three Allied powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done.

The above declaration is without prejudice to the case of German criminals whose offenses have no particular geographical localization and who will be punished by joint decision of the government of the Allies.
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Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide

Adopted by Resolution 260 (III) A of the U.N. General Assembly 9 December 1948

Article 1
The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

Article 2
In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:
(a) Killing members of the group;
(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Article 3
The following acts shall be punishable:
(a) Genocide;
(b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;
(c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;
(d) Attempt to commit genocide;
(e) Complicity in genocide.

Article 4
Persons committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article 3 shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals.

Article 5
The Contracting Parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective Constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article 3.

Article 6
Persons charged with genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article 3 shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the State in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those Contracting Parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction.

Article 7
Genocide and the other acts enumerated in Article 3 shall not be considered as political crimes for the purpose of extradition.
The Contracting Parties pledge themselves in such cases to grant extradition in accordance with their laws and treaties in force.

Article 8
Any Contracting Party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the Charter of the United Nations as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article 3.

Article 9
Disputes between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfillment of the present Convention, including those relating to the responsibility of a State for genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article 3, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.
Article 10
The present Convention, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authen-
tic, shall bear the date of 9 December 1948.

Article 11
The present Convention shall be open until 31 December 1949 for signature on behalf of any Member of the
United Nations and of any non-member State to which an invitation to sign has been addressed by the General
Assembly.

The present Convention shall be ratified, and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Sec-
retary-General of the United Nations.

After 1 January 1950, the present Convention may be acceded to on behalf of any Member of the United Na-
tions and of any non-member State which has received an invitation as aforesaid.

Instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 12
Any Contracting Party may at any time, by notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United
Nations, extend the application of the present Convention to all or any of the territories for the conduct of whose
foreign relations that Contracting Party is responsible.

Article 13
On the day when the first twenty instruments of ratification or accession have been deposited, the Secretary-
General shall draw up a proces-verbal and transmit a copy of it to each Member of the United Nations and to each
of the non-member States contemplated in Article 11.

The present Convention shall come into force on the ninetieth day following the date of deposit of the twen-
tieth instrument of ratification or accession.

Any ratification or accession effected subsequent to the latter date shall become effective on the ninetieth day
following the deposit of the instrument of ratification or accession.

Article 14
The present Convention shall remain in effect for a period of ten years as from the date of its coming into force.
It shall thereafter remain in force for successive periods of five years for such Contracting Parties as have not
denounced it at least six months before the expiration of the current period.

Denunciation shall be effected by a written notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United
Nations.

Article 15
If, as a result of denunciations, the number of Parties to the present Convention should become less than six-
teen, the Convention shall cease to be in force as from the date on which the last of these denunciations shall become
effective.

Article 16
A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any Contracting Party by
means of a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General.

The General Assembly shall decide upon the steps, if any, to be taken in respect of such request.

Article 17
The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall notify all Members of the United Nations and the non-
member States contemplated in Article 11 of the following:
(a) Signatures, ratifications and accessions received in accordance with Article 11;
(b) Notifications received in accordance with Article 12;
(c) The date upon which the present Convention comes into force in accordance with Article 13;
(d) Denunciations received in accordance with Article 14;
(e) The abrogation of the Convention in accordance with Article 15;
(f) Notifications received in accordance with Article 16.

**Article 18**

The original of the present Convention shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations.

A certified copy of the Convention shall be transmitted to all Members of the United Nations and to the non-member States contemplated in Article 11.

**Article 19**

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the date of its coming into force.

---

**The Nuremberg Principles**

Text adopted by the International Law Commission of the United Nations in 1950, and submitted to the General Assembly

**Principle I.** Any person who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible therefore and liable to punishment.

**Principle II.** The fact that internal law does not impose a penalty for an act which constitutes a crime under international law does not relieve the person who committed the act from responsibility under international law.

**Principle III.** The fact that a person who committed an act which constitutes a crime under international law acted as Head of State or responsible government official does not relieve him from responsibility under international law.

**Principle IV.** The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him.

**Principle V.** Any person charged with a crime under international law has the right to a fair trial on the facts and law.

**Principle VI.** The crimes hereinafter set out are punishable as crimes under international law:

(a) Crimes against peace:

   (i) Planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances;

   (ii) Participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the acts mentioned under (i).

(b) War Crimes:

Violations of the laws or customs of war which include, but are not limited to, murder, ill-treatment or deportation of slave-labour or for any other purpose of the civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war or persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns, or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity.

(c) Crimes against humanity:

Murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhumane acts done against any civilian population, or persecutions on political, racial, or religious grounds, when such acts are done or such persecutions are carried on in execution of or in connection with any crime against peace or any war crime.

**Principle VII.** Complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity as set forth in Principle VI is a crime under international law.
Universal Declaration of Human Rights
Proclaimed and adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations December 10, 1948

PREAMBLE
Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,
Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,
Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,
Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,
Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,
Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,
Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

Now, Therefore, THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY proclaims:

THIS UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

Article 1.
All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2.
Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3.
Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4.
No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5.
No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6.
Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7.
All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All
are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incite-ment to such discrimination.

Article 8.

Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the funda-mental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9.

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 10.

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11.

(1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty accord-ing to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.

(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not consti-tute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

Article 12.

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interfer-ence or attacks.

Article 13.

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14.

(1) Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

(2) This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15.

(1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16.

(1) Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolu-tion.

(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

(3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17.

(1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18.

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.
Article 19.
Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20.
(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
(2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21.
(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.
(2) Everyone has the right to equal access to public service in his country.
(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22.
Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23.
(1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.
(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.
(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.
(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24.
Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25.
(1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.
(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26.
(1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.
(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.
(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.
Article 27.
(1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.
(2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28.
Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29.
(1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.
(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.
(3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 30.
Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

Dallaire Fax
Sent by Romeo Dallaire, Commander of the UN troops in Rwanda on 11 January 1994 to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations at UN Headquarters in New York. Dallaire warns of planned massacres revealed by a top militia informer.

OUTGOING CODE CABLE

DATE: 11 JANUARY 1994
TO: BARIL/DPKO/UNATIONS NEW YORK
FROM: DALLAIRE/UNAMIR/KIGALI
FAX NO: MOST IMMEDIATE-CODE  FAX NO: 011-250-84273
CABLE: 212-963-4657
INMARSAT:
SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PROTECTION OF INFORMANT
ATTN: MGEN BARIL ROOM NO: 2052
TOTAL NUMBER OF TRANSMITTED PAGES INCLUDING THIS ONE: 2

1. Force commander put in contact with informant by very very important government politician. Informant is a top level trainer in the cadre of interhamwe-armed militia of MRND.

2. He informed us he was in charge of last Saturday’s demonstrations which aims were to target deputies of opposition parties coming to ceremonies and Belgian soldiers. They hoped to provoke the RPF BN to engage (being fired upon) the demonstrators and provoke a civil war. Deputies were to be assassinated upon entry or exit from Parliament. Belgian troops were to be provoked and if Belgians soldiers restored to force a number of them were to be killed and thus guarantee Belgian withdrawal from Rwanda.
3. Informant confirmed 48 RGF PARA CDO and a few members of the gendarmerie participated in demonstrations in plain clothes. Also at least one Minister of the MRND and the sous-prefect of Kigali were in the demonstration. RGF and Interhamwe provided radio communications.

4. Informant is a former security member of the president. He also stated he is paid RF150,000 per month by the MRND party to train Interhamwe. Direct link is to chief of staff RGF and president of the MRND for financial and material support.

5. Interhamwe has trained 1700 men in RGF military camps outside the capital. The 1700 are scattered in groups of 40 throughout Kigali. Since UNAMIR deployed he has trained 300 personnel in three week training sessions at RGF camps. Training focus was discipline, weapons, explosives, close combat and tactics.

6. Principal aim of Interhamwe in the past was to protect Kigali from RPF. Since UNAMIR mandate he has been ordered to register all Tutsi in Kigali. He suspects it is for their extermination. Example he gave was that in 20 minutes his personnel could kill up to 1000 Tutsis.

7. Informant states he disagrees with anti-Tutsi extermination. He supports opposition to RPF but cannot support killing of innocent persons. He also stated that he believes the president does not have full control over all elements of his old party/ faction.

8. Informant is prepared to provide location of major weapons cache with at least 135 weapons. He already has distributed 110 weapons including 35 with ammunition and can give us details of their location. Type of weapons are G3 and AK47 provided by RGF. He was ready to go to the arms cache tonight—if we gave him the following guarantee. He requests that he and his family (his wife and four children) be placed under our protection.

9. It is our intention to take action within the next 36 hours with a possible H HR of Wednesday at dawn (local). Informant states that hostilities may commence again if political deadlock ends. Violence could take place day of the ceremonies or the day after. Therefore Wednesday will give greatest chance of success and also be most timely to provide significant input to on-going political negotiations.

10. It is recommended that informant be granted protection and evacuated out of Rwanda. This HQ does not have previous UN experience in such matters and urgently requests guidance. No contact has as yet been made to any embassy in order to inquire if they are prepared to protect him for a period of time by granting diplomatic immunity in their embassy in Kigali before moving him and his family out of the country.

11. Force commander will be meeting with the very very important political person tomorrow morning in order to ensure that this individual is conscious of all parameters of his involvement. Force commander does have certain reservations on the suddenness of the change of heart of the informant to come clean with this information. Recce of armed cache and detailed planning of raid to go on late tomorrow. Possibility of a trap not fully excluded, as this may be a set-up against this very very important political person. Force commander to inform SRSG first thing in morning to ensure his support.

Confronting Genocide: Never Again?

President Clinton’s Apology to the People of Rwanda
Kigali, 25 March 1998

Thank you, Mr. President. First, let me thank you, Mr. President, and Vice President Kagame, and your wives for making Hillary and me and our delegation feel so welcome. I’d also like to thank the young students who met us and the musicians, the dancers who were outside. I thank especially the survivors of the genocide and those who are working to rebuild your country for spending a little time with us before we came in here.

I have a great delegation of Americans with me, leaders of our government, leaders of our Congress, distinguished American citizens. We’re all very grateful to be here. We thank the diplomatic corps for being here, and the members of the Rwandan government, and especially the citizens.

I have come today to pay the respects of my nation to all who suffered and all who perished in the Rwandan genocide. It is my hope that through this trip, in every corner of the world today and tomorrow, their story will be told; that four years ago in this beautiful, green, lovely land, a clear and conscious decision was made by those then in power that the peoples of this country would not live side by side in peace.

During the 90 days that began on April 6 in 1994, Rwanda experienced the most intensive slaughter in this blood-filled century we are about to leave. Families murdered in their home, people hunted down as they fled by soldiers and militia, through farmland and woods as if they were animals.

From Kibuye in the west to Kibungo in the east, people gathered seeking refuge in churches by the thousands, in hospitals, in schools. And when they were found, the old and the sick, women and children alike, they were killed—killed because their identity card said they were Tutsi or because they had a Tutsi parent, or because someone thought they looked like a Tutsi, or slain like thousands of Hutus because they protected Tutsis or would not countenance a policy that sought to wipe out people who just the day before, and for years before, had been their friends and neighbors.

The government-led effort to exterminate Rwanda’s Tutsi and moderate Hutus, as you know better than me, took at least a million lives. Scholars of these sorts of events say that the killers, armed mostly with machetes and clubs, nonetheless did their work five times as fast as the mechanized gas chambers used by the Nazis.

It is important that the world know that these killings were not spontaneous or accidental. It is important that the world hear what your president just said—they were most certainly not the result of ancient tribal struggles. Indeed, these people had lived together for centuries before the events the president described began to unfold.

These events grew from a policy aimed at the systematic destruction of a people. The ground for violence was carefully prepared, the airwaves poisoned with hate, casting the Tutsis as scapegoats for the problems of Rwanda, denying their humanity. All of this was done, clearly, to make it easy for otherwise reluctant people to participate in wholesale slaughter.

Lists of victims, name by name, were actually drawn up in advance. Today the images of all that haunt us all: the dead choking the Kigara River, floating to Lake Victoria. In their fate we are reminded of the capacity in people everywhere—not just in Rwanda, and certainly not just in Africa—but the capacity for people everywhere to slip into pure evil. We cannot abolish that capacity, but we must never accept it. And we know it can be overcome.

The international community, together with nations in Africa, must bear its share of responsibility for this tragedy, as well. We did not act quickly enough after the killing began. We should not have allowed the refugee camps to become safe haven for the killers. We did not immediately call these crimes by their rightful name: genocide. We cannot change the past. But we can and must do everything in our power to help you build a future without fear, and full of hope.

We owe to those who died and to those who survived who loved them, our every effort to increase our vigilance and strengthen our stand against those who would commit such atrocities in the future—here or elsewhere.
Indeed, we owe to all the peoples of the world who are at risk—because each bloodletting hastens the next as the value of human life is degraded and violence becomes tolerated, the unimaginable becomes more conceivable—we owe to all the people in the world our best efforts to organize ourselves so that we can maximize the chances of preventing these events. And where they cannot be prevented, we can move more quickly to minimize the horror.

So let us challenge ourselves to build a world in which no branch of humanity, because of national, racial, ethnic or religious origin, is again threatened with destruction because of those characteristics, of which people should rightly be proud. Let us work together as a community of civilized nations to strengthen our ability to prevent and, if necessary, to stop genocide.

To that end, I am directing my administration to improve, with the international community, our system for identifying and spotlighting nations in danger of genocidal violence, so that we can assure worldwide awareness of impending threats. It may seem strange to you here, especially the many of you who lost members of your family, but all over the world there were people like me sitting in offices, day after day after day, who did not fully appreciate the depth and the speed with which you were being engulfed by this unimaginable terror.

We have seen, too—and I want to say again—that genocide can occur anywhere. It is not an African phenomenon and must never be viewed as such. We have seen it in industrialized Europe; we have seen it in Asia. We must have global vigilance. And never again must we be shy in the face of the evidence.

Secondly, we must as an international community have the ability to act when genocide threatens. We are working to create that capacity here in the Great Lakes region, where the memory is still fresh.

This afternoon in Entebbe, leaders from central and eastern Africa will meet with me to launch an effort to build a coalition to prevent genocide in this region. I thank the leaders who have stepped forward to make this commitment. We hope the effort can be a model for all the world, because our sacred task is to work to banish this greatest crime against humanity.

Events here show how urgent the work is. In the northwest part of your country, attacks by those responsible for the slaughter in 1994 continue today. We must work as partners with Rwanda to end this violence and allow your people to go on rebuilding your lives and your nation.

Third, we must work now to remedy the consequences of genocide. The United States has provided assistance to Rwanda to settle the uprooted and restart its economy, but we must do more. I am pleased that America will become the first nation to contribute to the new Genocide Survivors Fund. We will contribute this year $2 million, continue our support in the years to come, and urge other nations to do the same, so that survivors and their communities can find the care they need and the help they must have.

Mr. President, to you, and to you, Mr. Vice President, you have shown great vision in your efforts to create a single nation in which all citizens can live freely and securely. As you pointed out, Rwanda was a single nation before the European powers met in Berlin to carve up Africa. America stands with you, and we will continue helping the people of Rwanda to rebuild their lives and society.

You spoke passionately this morning in our private meeting about the need for grassroots effort in this direction. We will deepen our support for those grassroots efforts, for the development projects which are bridging divisions and clearing a path to a better future. We will join with you to strengthen democratic institutions, to broaden participation, to give all Rwandans a greater voice in their own governance. The challenges you face are great, but your commitment to lasting reconciliation and inclusion is firm.

Fourth, to help ensure that those who survived in the generations to come never again suffer genocidal violence, nothing is more vital than establishing the rule of law. There can be no peace in Rwanda that lasts without a justice system that is recognized as such.

We applaud the efforts of the Rwandan government to strengthen civilian and military justice systems.

I am pleased that our Great Lakes Justice Initiative will invest $30 million to help create throughout the re-
gion judicial systems that are impartial, credible and effective. In Rwanda these funds will help to support courts, prosecutors, and police, military justice and cooperation at the local level.

We will also continue to pursue justice through our strong backing for the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. The United States is the largest contributor to this tribunal. We are frustrated, as you are, by the delays in the tribunal’s work. As we know, we must do better. Now that administrative improvements have begun, however, the tribunal should expedite cases through group trials, and fulfill its historic mission.

We are prepared to help, among other things, with witness relocation, so that those who still fear can speak the truth in safety. And we will support the War Crimes Tribunal for as long as it is needed to do its work, until the truth is clear and justice is rendered.

Fifth, we must make it clear to all those who would commit such acts in the future that they too must answer for their acts, and they will. In Rwanda, we must hold accountable all those who may abuse human rights, whether insurgents or soldiers. Internationally, as we meet here, talks are underway at the United Nations to establish a permanent international criminal court. Rwanda and the difficulties we have had with this special tribunal underscores the need for such a court. And the United States will work to see that it is created.

I know that in the face of all you have endured, optimism cannot come easily to any of you. Yet I have just spoken, as I said, with several Rwandans who survived the atrocities, and just listening to them gave me reason for hope. You see countless stories of courage around you every day as you go about your business here—men and women who survived and go on, children who recover the light in their eyes remind us that at the dawn of a new millennium there is only one crucial division among the peoples of the Earth. And believe me, after over five years of dealing with these problems I know it is not the division between Hutu and Tutsi, or Serb and Croatian and Muslim in Bosnia, or Arab and Jew, or Catholic and Protestant in Ireland, or black and white. It is really the line between those who embrace the common humanity we all share and those who reject it.

It is the line between those who find meaning in life through respect and cooperation and who, therefore, embrace peace, and those who can only find meaning in life if they have someone to look down on, someone to trample, someone to punish and, therefore, embrace war. It is the line between those who look to the future and those who clung to the past. It is the line between those who give up their resentment and those who believe they will absolutely die if they have to release one bit of grievance. It is the line between those who confront every day with a clenched fist and those who confront every day with an open hand. That is the only line that really counts when all is said and done.

To those who believe that God made each of us in His own image, how could we choose the darker road? When you look at those children who greeted us as we got off that plane today, how could anyone say they did not want those children to have a chance to have their own children? To experience the joy of another morning sunrise? To learn the normal lessons of life? To give something back to their people?

When you strip it all away, whether we're talking about Rwanda or some other distant troubled spot, the world is divided according to how people believe they draw meaning from life.

And so I say to you, though the road is hard and uncertain, and there are many difficulties ahead, and like every other person who wishes to help, I doubtless will not be able to do everything I would like to do, there are things we can do. And if we set about the business of doing them together, you can overcome the awful burden that you have endured. You can put a smile on the face of every child in this country, and you can make people once again believe that they should live as people were living who were singing to us and dancing for us today.

That's what we have to believe. That is what I came here to say. That is what I wish for you.

Thank you and God bless you.
Supplementary Resources


World Wide Web

Armenian Articles <http://www.cilicia.com/ armo10c.html> contains newspaper articles covering the Armenian Genocide

Frontline: The Triumph of Evil <http://www.pbs.org/ wgbh/ pages/ frontline/ shows/ evil/> a PBS website addressing the Rwandan Genocide and the role of the West

International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) <http://www.icty.org> the official website of the ICTY

International Criminal Tribunal Rwanda (ICTR) <http://www.ictr.org> the official website of the ICTR

The US and Genocide in Rwanda 1994 <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/ NSAEBB/ NSAEBB53/> The National Security Archive’s database of faxes, government documents etc. concerning the Rwandan Genocide

Prevent Genocide International <http://www.preventgenocide.org> a global education and action network working to prevent the crime of genocide

The Forgotten <http://www.theforgotten.org/ intro.html> an on-line memorial to the Armenian Genocide

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum <http://www.ushmm.org> documents, photos, virtual tours, educational resources, and other information.

Yale Center for International Genocide Studies <http://www.yale.edu/ gsp> background and resources on various genocides
Confronting Genocide: Never Again?

Confronting Genocide: Never Again? addresses the causes of genocide in the twentieth century and the various ways in which the international community has attempted to deal with the problem. Students are drawn into consideration of the definition of genocide and the possible responses to genocide the United States could take in the future.

Confronting Genocide: Never Again? is part of a continuing series on current and historical international issues published by the Choices for the 21st Century Education Program at Brown University. Choices materials place special emphasis on the importance of educating students in their participatory role as citizens.
SUGGESTED FIVE-DAY LESSON PLAN

About the Choices Approach

Note to Teachers

Integrating This Unit into Your Classroom

DAY ONE — Introduction to Genocide

Homework (before Day One): Introduction & Part I of the background reading and “Study Guide — Part I”

Homework (after Day One): Part II of the background reading and “Study Guide — Part II”

DAY TWO — Genocide Reported in the Media

Homework: “Options in Brief”

DAY THREE — Role Playing the Four Options: Organization and Preparation

Homework: complete preparations for the simulation

DAY FOUR — Role Playing the Four Options: Debate and Discussion

Homework: Part III, “Focusing Your Thoughts,” and “Your Option Five”

DAY FIVE — Joining the Debate on U.S. Policy

OPTIONAL LESSON — Building a Memorial

Key Terms and Issues

Making Choices Work in Your Classroom

Alternative Three-Day Lesson Plan

THE CHOICES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY EDUCATION PROGRAM is a program of the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University. CHOICES was established to help citizens think constructively about foreign policy issues, to improve participatory citizenship skills, and to encourage public judgment on policy priorities.

THE WATSON INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES was established at Brown University in 1986 to serve as a forum for students, faculty, visiting scholars, and policy practitioners who are committed to analyzing contemporary global problems and developing initiatives to address them.

© Copyright October 2003. First edition. Choices for the 21st Century Education Program. All rights reserved. Teacher sets (consisting of a student text and a teacher resource book) are available for $15 each. Permission is granted to duplicate and distribute the student text and handouts for classroom use with appropriate credit given. Duplicates may not be resold. Classroom sets (15 or more student texts) may be ordered at $7 per copy. A teacher resource book is included free with each classroom set. Orders should be addressed to: Choices Education Program, Watson Institute for International Studies, Box 1948, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912. Please see the order form in the back of this unit or visit our website at <www.choices.edu> ISBN 1-891306-63-4-TRB
About the Choices Approach

Choices for the 21st Century curricula are designed to make complex international issues understandable and meaningful for students. Using an innovative approach to student-centered instruction, Choices units develop critical thinking and civic judgment—essential ingredients of responsible citizenship.

Understanding the Significance of History: Each Choices unit provides students with a thorough introduction to the topic under consideration. Students gain an understanding of the historical background and the status of current issues. In this way, they see how history has shaped our world. With this foundation, students are prepared to thoughtfully consider a variety of perspectives on public policy.

Exploring Policy Alternatives: Each Choices unit is built around a framework of alternative policy options that challenges students to consider multiple perspectives and to think critically about the issue at hand. Students are best able to understand and analyze the options through a cooperative learning/role-play activity. In groups, students explore their assigned options and plan short presentations. The setting of the role-play may be a Congressional hearing, meeting of the National Security Council, or an election campaign forum. Student groups defend their policy options and, in turn, are challenged with questions from their classmates. The ensuing debate demands analysis and evaluation of the many conflicting values, interests, and priorities reflected in the options.

Exercising Civic Judgment: Armed with fresh insights from the role-play and debate, students are challenged to articulate original, coherent policy options that reflect their own values, priorities, and goals as individuals and citizens. Students' views can be expressed in letters to Congress or the White House, editorials for the school or community newspaper, persuasive speeches, or visual presentations.

Why Use the Choices Approach? Choices curricula are informed by current educational research about how students learn best. Studies have consistently demonstrated that students of all abilities learn best when they are actively engaged with the material rather than listening passively to a lecture. Student-centered instructional activities motivate students and develop higher-order thinking skills. However, some high school educators find the transition from lecture format to student-centered instruction difficult. Lecture is often viewed as the most efficient way to cover the required material. Choices curricula offer teachers a flexible resource for covering course material while actively engaging students and developing skills in critical thinking, persuasive writing, and informed citizenship. The instructional activities that are central to Choices units can be valuable components in any teacher's repertoire of effective teaching strategies. Each Choices unit includes student readings, a framework of policy options, suggested lesson plans, and resources for structuring cooperative learning, role-plays, and simulations. Students are challenged to:

- recognize relationships between history and current issues
- analyze and evaluate multiple perspectives on an issue
- understand the internal logic of a viewpoint
- engage in informed debate
- identify and weigh the conflicting values represented by different points of view
- reflect upon personal values and priorities surrounding an issue
- develop and articulate original viewpoints on an issue
- communicate in written and oral presentations
- collaborate with peers

Teachers who use Choices units say the collaboration and interaction that take place are highly motivating for students. Opportunities abound for students to contribute their individual talents to the group presentations in the form of political cartoons, slogans, posters, or characterizations. These cooperative learning lessons invite students to take pride in their own contributions and the group product, enhancing students' self-esteem and confidence as learners. Choices units offer students with diverse abilities and learning styles the opportunity to contribute, collaborate, and achieve.
Note to Teachers

The genocides of the twentieth century elicited feelings of horror and revulsion throughout the world. Yet both the international community and the United States have struggled to respond to this recurring problem. Confronting Genocide: Never Again? allows students to wrestle with the reasons why the international community and the United States responded as they did to various cases of genocide in the twentieth century. Part I of the reading traces the development of the United Nations and the Genocide Convention. Part II examines five case studies of genocides from the twentieth century. Part III introduces students to several “individuals of conscience” who took action against genocides. The evaluation of multiple perspectives, informed debate, and problem solving strategies that comprise this unit enable students to develop their own policy suggestions concerning America’s response to future genocide.

At the core of Confronting Genocide: Never Again? is a framework of choices for U.S. foreign policy concerning genocide. These choices, or Options, reflect four fundamentally different ways of confronting genocide. By exploring four clearly defined alternatives and the beliefs underlying them, students will gain a deeper understanding of the values underlying specific policy recommendations and the trade-offs that accompany each of the choices.

Suggested Five-Day Lesson Plan: The Teacher Resource Book accompanying Confronting Genocide: Never Again? contains a day-by-day lesson plan and student activities. Day One's lesson helps students to define genocide. The second day of the lesson plan asks students to examine five different cases of genocide from the twentieth century, followed by a class activity on The New York Times coverage of the Armenian Genocide in 1915. The third and fourth days are devoted to a simulation in which students act as advocates of the four options or take on the role of members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. On the fifth day, students design their own “Option Five” and apply their views to hypothetical cases. An optional lesson is also included in the unit which asks students to construct a model of a public memorial to a genocide. You may also find the “Alternative Three-Day Lesson Plan” useful.

• Alternative Study Guides: Part I of the background reading is accompanied by two distinct study guides. The standard study guide is designed to help students harvest the information provided in the readings in preparation for tackling analysis and synthesis within classroom activities. The advanced study guide requires analysis and synthesis prior to class activities. Part II’s study guide is a chart which students can use to represent graphically the material presented.

• Vocabulary and Concepts: The background reading in Confronting Genocide: Never Again? addresses subjects that are complex and challenging. To help your students get the most out of the text, you may want to review with them “Key Terms” found in the Teacher Resource Book (TRB) on page TRB-27 before they begin their assignment. An “Issues Toolbox” is also included on page TRB-28. This provides additional information on key concepts.

The lesson plans offered in Confronting Genocide: Never Again? are provided as a guide. They are designed for traditional class periods of approximately 50 minutes. Those on block schedules will need to make adaptations. Many teachers choose to devote additional time to certain activities. We hope that these suggestions help you in tailoring the unit to fit the needs of your classroom.
Integrating This Unit into Your Curriculum

Units produced by the Choices for the 21st Century Education Program are designed to be integrated into a variety of social studies courses. Below are a few ideas about where Confronting Genocide: Never Again? might fit into your curriculum.

World History
Atrocity marked the twentieth century on a massive scale: nearly 170 million people were killed by their governments, over 40 million of them in genocides. While a world history class devoted exclusively to the study of atrocities would be inappropriate, an investigation into the similarities of genocides across the globe can help students to grasp the interconnected nature of the world, the effect of international law on individual countries, and the difficulties inherent in dealing with a complex and morally charged problem that often crosses state boundaries. Through an investigation of the advent of international justice, including events such as the Nuremberg Trials and the establishment of the International Criminal Court, students can understand how the world has attempted to respond to genocide over the past one hundred years.

U.S. History/Government
The United States has repeatedly said that genocide must not happen again, but has also failed to act, in most cases, to prevent genocide. Why have leaders been reluctant to take a stand? Limited resources often force leaders to choose whom, how, and when to help. Confronting Genocide: Never Again? allows students to examine U.S. policy of the past one hundred years in light of some of the worst tragedies in history. The unit looks critically at the influence of the United States in five genocides. The role of ethics in decision-making, the media’s influence, and the American public’s awareness are also all addressed in the unit.

International Studies/Current Issues
It seems likely that despite the effort of international organizations genocide will happen again. Confronting Genocide: Never Again? helps students to understand why such atrocities are so difficult for the international community to prevent. The unit introduces students to the various international bodies which have attempted to deal with the problem, and to the conventions and laws they have written in response. As students craft their Option Five, they will understand the difficulties inherent in reconciling the competing interests of the international community when dealing with genocide.

Psychology
Students often wonder how genocides can possibly happen: why would people kill each other on such a scale? Why don’t more people stand up to protest? Confronting Genocide: Never Again? places students in the powerful role of leader in the U.S. Senate, and presents them with the challenges of that position. Students also learn about some “individuals of conscience” who did speak out, and what kind of courage is required to do so. Finally, the lesson on media reporting helps students to understand the influence of the printed word on individual decision-making.
Introduction to Genocide

Objectives: Students will:
- Explore the extent of reputed cases of genocide around the world.
- Examine the definition of genocide as defined in the Convention.
- Explore the possibilities for misinterpretation of the definition.

Required Reading: Before beginning the unit, students should have read the Introduction and Part I of the background reading (pages 1-8) and completed “Study Guide” (TRB 4-5) or “Advanced Study Guide” (TRB-6).

Handouts:
- “Genocide Map” (Student Text page ii)
- “Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide” (TRB-7-8)

In the Classroom:
1. “The Wall” — Begin the class by writing the word “genocide” in the center of the blackboard or on a large piece of paper. Give students 5-10 minutes to approach the board and write whatever comes to mind when they think of genocide—statements, words, questions, countries, etc. Instruct the class to do the exercise in silence. Encourage students to add to each other’s postings as well as write their own independent postings.

2. Defining Genocide— Distribute the Genocide Convention handout. Divide students into small groups and have them read the articles out loud within their groups, paying special attention to Article II. Have one member of each group record their group’s responses to the questions.

3. Sharing Conclusions— After the groups have completed the worksheet, invite groups to share their conclusions. Are there points of agreement? Disagreement? How might the disagreements in the classroom mirror those policy-makers might have? What difficulties would those disagreements present for policy-makers? A challenging question for students might be to consider whether various other historical events might be defined as genocide. Was the institution of slavery in the U.S. a genocide? The treatment of Native Americans? What about the events at the Branch Davidian complex in Waco, Texas? China’s relationship with Tibet? Urge students to look carefully at the definition in the Convention as they consider whether these events would meet the definition. You may find it useful with provide students with background reading on these events.

4. Exploring Genocide’s Extent—Distribute the genocide map to students. Call on students to make observations based on what they see on the map. Fuel the discussion by asking students how many represented genocides they have ever heard of. Explain that not all scholars agree that each of the dots represents an authentic genocide. Ask students to consider why scholars would have differing viewpoints.

Homework: Students should read Part II of the background reading in the student text (pages 9-25) and complete “Study Guide—Part II” (TRB-10). If necessary, split up the reading and assign each student “The Armenian Genocide” (pages 9-12) and one other case study. Have each student fill out the Armenian Genocide section of the chart as well as the section that corresponds to the other case study they read.
Study Guide—Part I

1. Define genocide.

2. Why did the lawyers at the Madrid Conference fail to support the law proposed by Lemkin?

3. List two incidences of cooperation by the international community which occurred directly after World War II.
   a. 
   b. 

4. What crimes were the defendants accused of at the Nuremberg Trials?

5. List the four legal principles that emerged from the Nuremberg Trials.
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 
   d. 

6. Explain what is meant by “state sovereignty.”
7. Identify three major points of the Genocide Convention.
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

8. What problems did the United States initially see with the Genocide Convention?

9. Why did some countries criticize the U.S.-led interventions in northern Iraq and in Kosovo?

10. The U.S. has not ratified the treaty to participate in the International Criminal Court (ICC). Why not?

11. What mechanism do supporters of the ICC say is in place to prevent some of the problems the United States believes are in the ICC treaty?
Advanced Study Guide—Part I

1. How did Raphael Lemkin contribute to the issue of genocide?

2. How did principles of international relations change after the Nuremburg Trials?

3. Why did the United States refuse to ratify the Genocide Convention initially, and how did the U.S. Senate later modify the Convention to enable its approval?

4. Explain the arguments for and against the ratification of the International Criminal Court (ICC).
**Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide**

*Adopted by Resolution 260 (III) A of the United Nations General Assembly on 9 December 1948*

**Preamble:**
The Contracting Parties,

Having considered the declaration made by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution 96 (I) dated 11 December 1946 that genocide is a crime under international law, contrary to the spirit and aims of the United Nations and condemned by the civilized world,

Recognizing that at all periods of history genocide has inflicted great losses on humanity, and

Being convinced that, in order to liberate mankind from such odious scourge, international co-operation is required,

Hereby agree as hereinafter provided:

**Article I**
The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and punish.

**Article II**
In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, such as:

(a) Killing members of the group;
(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

**Article III**
The following acts shall be punishable:

(a) Genocide;
(b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;
(c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;
(d) Attempt to commit genocide;
(e) Complicity in genocide.

**Article IV**
Persons committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rules, public officials or private individuals.

Articles 5-19 can be found in the complete text of the Convention, Student Text pages 40-42.
Defining Genocide

The United Nations drew up the Convention on the Crime and Punishment of Genocide so that genocide could be treated as a crime subject to punishment. Not everyone agrees on which situations should be labeled “genocide,” however. Underline key words in the Convention text, and look closely at Article II and the five parts of the definition.

1. How many people of a group must be killed in order for an event to be called a genocide? Or is it not a question of numbers?

2. What is “serious mental harm”? Give examples.

3. Define “conditions of life calculated to bring about...physical destruction.”

4. What kinds of problems arise from the language and wording of Article II of the Convention?
Genocide Reported in the Media

Objectives: Students will:
• Assess The New York Times coverage of the Armenian genocide.
• Think critically about the impact of media reporting on policy decisions.

Required Reading: Students should have read their assigned portions in Part II of the background reading in the student text and completed the appropriate part of “Study Guide—Part II” (TRB-10).

Handouts: • “Articles about the Armenian Genocide” (TRB-11-14)

In the Classroom:
1. Report on Case Studies— Form groups of three to five students each. If, in addition to Armenia, students read only one case study, organize the groups so that there is at least one student per case study in each group. Have the students fill in the chart as each case is reported on by its reader.

2. Working with the Reports— Give students the packet of articles from The New York Times. Have students read the articles in their groups and answer the questions which appear on the handout.

3. Making Connections— Ask students to share their groups’ conclusions with the class. Then encourage students to consider the role of media reporting today. Ask them to imagine that the Armenian Genocide was being reported today. How might the media coverage differ? What effect would technology have? What effect would the changes in the international community have on the reporting, for instance the advent of the UN, the Genocide Convention, and state sovereignty’s reduction in importance? Where in the newspaper might the articles appear? What else might be in the news? Do students think the U.S. would respond differently to such accounts today?

Extra Challenge: Have students research the media coverage of another genocide discussed in the unit and compare it to that of the Armenian Genocide.

Homework: Students should read “Options in Brief” in the student text (page 26).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Guide—Part II: The Five Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events Leading to Genocide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holocaust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Articles about the Armenian Genocide

The Turkish actions against the Armenians were extensively covered in American newspapers throughout the genocide. One hundred and forty-five stories about the Armenian Genocide were published in The New York Times alone in 1915. After reading the selections from these articles with your group, answer the questions at the end.

The New York Times

- Appeal to Turks to Stop Massacres: April 28, 1915
- Morgenthau Intercedes: April 29, 1915
- 6,000 Armenians Killed: May 17, 1915
- Allies to Punish Turks Who Murder: May 24, 1915
- Wholesale Massacres of Armenians by Turks: July 29, 1915
- Report Turks Shot Women and Children: August 4, 1915
- Burn 1,000 Armenians: August 20, 1915
- Armenians Sent to Desert to Perish: August 18, 1915
- Turks Depopulated Towns of Armenia: August 27, 1915
- Answer Morgenthau by Hanging Armenians: September 16, 1915
- Mission Board Told of Turkish Horrors: September 17, 1915
- 500,000 Armenians Said to Have Perished: September 24, 1915
- The Depopulation of Armenia: September 27, 1915
- Armenian Women Put Up at Auction: September 29, 1915
- 800,000 Armenians Counted Destroyed: September 29, 1915
- Spare Armenians Pope Asks Sultan: October 11, 1915
- Only 200,000 Armenians Left in Turkey: October 22, 1915
- Aid for Armenians Blocked by Turkey: November 1, 1915
- Million Armenians Killed or in Exile: December 15, 1915
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**Document 1**

**The New York Times**

**TURKS ARE EVICTING NATIVE CHRISTIANS**
**Greeks and Armenians Driven from Homes and Converted by the Sword, Assert Americans.**

**ATHENS, JULY 11, 1915.**

American travelers coming from Turkey have given such eyewitness accounts of the treatment of the Christian populations as fully bear out reports received here from native sources to the effect that the Christians in the Ottoman Empire have never been in such stress and peril since the Turks first invaded the Byzantine Empire. Both Armenians and Greeks, the two native Christian races of Turkey, are being systematically uprooted from their homes en masse and driven forth summarily to distant provinces, where they are scattered in small groups among Turkish Villages and given the choice between immediate acceptance of Islam or death by the sword or starvation. Their homes and property meanwhile are being immediately taken possession of by immigrants from Macedonia....The Armenians have been pitilessly evicted by tens of thousands and driven off to die in the desert....The figures do not include thousands massacred by the Kurds or hanged without trial by the Turkish authorities all over Armenia....Greeks are faring little better, except that they are not being massacred.

**Document 2**

**The New York Times**

**REPORT TURKS SHOT WOMEN AND CHILDREN**
**Nine Thousand Armenians Massacred and Thrown into Tigris, Socialist Committee Hears.**

**PARIS, AUG. 3, 1915.**

B. Varazdate, a member of the Executive Committee of the Armenian Social Democratic Party, writing to L’Humanite, the Social Daily, says the committee has received word to the effect that the Turks, after massacring all the males of the population in the region of Bitlis, Turkish Armenia, assembled 9,000 women and children and drove them to the banks of the Tigris, where they shot them and threw the bodies into the river. These advices have not been substantiated by any other source.

**Document 3**

**The New York Times**

**BURN 1,000 ARMENIANS**
**Turks Lock Them in a Wooden Building and Then Apply the Torch.**

**LONDON, AUG. 20, 1915.**

A Reuter dispatch from Petrograd (Russia) says: “Almost unbelievable details of Turkish massacres of Armenians in Bitlis have reached Petrograd. In one village, 1,000 men, women and children are reported to have been locked in a wooden building and burned to death. In another large village only thirty-six persons, it is said, escaped massacre. In still another instance, it is asserted, several scores of men and women were tied together by chains and thrown into Lake Van.”
Document 5

The New York Times

ARMENIANS DYING IN PRISON CAMPS

HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS STILL IN DANGER FROM TURKS, REFUGEES FUND SECRETARY SAYS. GERMAN WOHN'T INTERFERE. ABOUT 1,000,000 VICTIMS DEPORTED AND 500,000 MASSACRED, THE REV. HAROLD BUXTON REPORTS.

LONDON, AUG. 21, 1915.

The Rev. Harold Buxton, Secretary of the Armenian Refugees Fund, has just returned to England after devoting three months to relief work in the devastated villages. In an interview the Rev. Mr. Buxton gave details which entirely confirm the grave statements made by Lord Bryce some months ago in the House of Lords.... "I don't think there has been any exaggeration as to losses as published in England. The Armenian race numbered over 4,000,000, of whom 2,000,000 were Turkish Armenians, and of these perhaps 1,000,000 have been deported and 500,000 massacred.

Document 6

The New York Times

MISSION BOARD TOLD OF TURKISH HORRORS

COMMITTEE ON ATROCITIES SAYS 1,500,000 VICTIMS HAVE SUFFERED ALREADY.

SEPT. 27, 1915.

Professor Samuel Train Dutton, Secretary of the Committee on Atrocities on Armenians, made public yesterday a preliminary statement of the committee outlining the result of its investigation of the terrible conditions existing among the Armenians. The committee says that the reports concerning the massacre, torture, and other maltreatment of Armenians of all ages abundantly are confirmed by its investigation.... "Written testimonies of eyewitnesses whose names are known to the committee, but which obviously cannot now be made public, have been examined with utmost care. This testimony covers hundreds of pages, and the character and position of the authors and the positiveness of utterance carry absolute conviction. The witnesses examined include Armenians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Italians, Germans, Turks, Englishmen, Americans, business men, travelers and officials of great variety and rank.....The statements examined, many of which are in the possession of the committee, cover hundreds of town and cities in which in many instances all of the Armenians have been killed outright, often after horrible torture, or sent to the desert to die of starvation, and that too, with diabolical cruelty."
**The New York Times**

**ARMENIAN WOMEN PUT UP FOR AUCTION**

**REFUGEE TELLS OF THE FATE OF THOSE IN TURKISH HANDS**

**SEPT. 29, 1915.**

Speaking yesterday, his remarks being based on the authenticated data in his possession, Professor Dutton said he does not believe anything had happened in many centuries so terrible as is the studied and systematized effort on the part of a political coterie in Turkey—the Young Turks, led by Enver Pasha—to exterminate a whole race of people. The whole plan involves the wiping out of the Armenians. Only a day or two ago, added Professor Dutton, a young girl who left Turkey on Aug. 18 called here to see him. She told of the fate of the 100 girls who were attending a mission school in Anatolia. These girls, who were of course Armenians, were divided into groups and those that were the best looking in the opinion of the Turkish officers were taken over by those officers. Those considered not quite so good looking were given over to the soldiers, while those still less attractive were put up for sale to the highest bidders. Several Americans who have been in Turkey for many years have arrived here within the last few days. They all testify to the truthfulness of the reports that have come out of Turkey concerning the treatment of the Armenians....

**The New York Times**

**800,000 ARMENIANS COUNTED DESTROYED**

**LONDON, OCT. 6, 1915.**

Viscount Bryce, former British Ambassador to the United States, in the House of Lords today said that such information as had reached him from many quarters showed that the figure of 800,000 Armenians destroyed since May was quite a possible number. Virtually the whole nation had been wiped out, he declared, and he did not suppose there was any case in history of a crime “so hideous and on so large a scale.... The death of these people,” said Lord Bryce, “resulted from the deliberate and premeditated policy of the gang now in possession of the Turkish government. Orders for the massacre came in every case direct from Constantinople. In some instances local Governors, being humane, pious men, refused to carry out the orders and at least two Governors were summarily dismissed for this reason.

**Questions:**

1. What kinds of events are the articles reporting?
2. What makes you think the accounts are reliable?
3. What other events are taking place at this time and might also be in the newspaper?
4. If the Armenian Genocide happened today, would the media coverage be different? Why or why not?
Role Playing the Four Options: Organization and Preparation

Objectives: Students will:
• Analyze the issues that frame the debate on the U.S. role in the world.
• Identify the core underlying values of the Options.
• Integrate the arguments and beliefs of the Options and the background reading into a persuasive, coherent presentation.
• Work cooperatively within groups to organize effective presentations.

Handouts: • “Presenting Your Option” (TRB-16) for Option groups
• “Expressing Key Values” (TRB-17) for Option groups
• “Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate” (TRB-18) for committee members

In the Classroom:
1. Planning for Group Work — In order to save time in the classroom, form student groups before beginning Day Three. During the class period of Day Three, students will be preparing for the Day Four simulation. Remind them to incorporate the background reading into the development of their presentations and questions.

2a. Option Groups — Form four groups of five students each. Assign an Option to each group. Distribute “Presenting Your Option” (TRB-16) and “Expressing Key Values” (TRB-17) to the four Option groups. Inform students that each Option group will be called upon in Day Four to present the case for its assigned Option to members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate. Explain that Option groups should follow the instructions in “Presenting Your Option.” Note that the Option groups should begin by assigning each member a role.

2b. Committee Members — The remainder of the class will serve as members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate. Distribute “Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate” (TRB-18) to each committee member. While the Option groups are preparing their presentations, members of the Committee on Foreign Relations should develop cross-examination questions for Day Four. (See “Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate.”) Remind committee members that they are expected to turn in their questions at the end of the simulation.

Suggestions: In smaller classes, other teachers or administrators may be invited to serve as members of the committee. In larger classes, additional roles—such as those of newspaper reporter or lobbyist—may be assigned to students.

Extra Challenge: Ask the Options groups to design a campaign poster or a political cartoon illustrating the best case for their Option.

Homework: Students should complete preparations for the simulation.
Presenting Your Option

Preparing Your Presentation

Your assignment: Your group has been called upon to appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate. Your assignment is to persuade the committee members that your Option should serve as the basis for our country’s foreign policy concerning genocide. You will be judged on how well you present your Option.

Organizing your group: Each member of your group will take a specific role. Below is a brief explanation of the responsibilities for each role. Before preparing your section of the presentation, work together to address the questions on the “Expressing Key Values” worksheet.

1. Spokesperson: Your job is to organize your group’s three-to-five minute presentation of its Option to the Committee on Foreign Relations. In preparing your presentation, you will receive help from the other members of your group. You should include arguments from their areas of expertise, and your group should make the presentation together. Read your Option and review the background readings to build a strong case for your Option.

2. Legal Adviser: Your job is to explain why your group’s Option best addresses the legal challenges in responding to genocide. Carefully read your Option and then review the background reading. Make sure that your expertise is represented in the presentation.

3. Military Expert: Your job is to explain why your group’s Option best addresses the military challenges in responding to genocide. Pay special attention to the “What should we do?” section of your option. Review the background reading to build a strong case for your Option. Make sure that your expertise is represented in the presentation.

4. Economics Expert: Your job is to explain why your group’s Option best addresses the economic challenges in responding to genocide. Pay special attention to the “What should we do?” section of your Option. Review the background reading to build a strong case for your Option. Make sure that your expertise is represented in the presentation.

5. Historian: What lessons can be drawn from history to support your group’s position? Carefully read your Option and then review the background reading with this question in mind. Make sure that your expertise is represented in the presentation.

Making Your Case

After your preparations are completed, your group will deliver a three-to-five minute presentation to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The “Expressing Key Values” worksheet and other notes may be used, but group members must speak clearly and convincingly. During the presentations of the other groups, you should try to identify the weak points of the competing Options. After all of the groups have presented their Options, members of the Committee on Foreign Relations will ask you cross-examination questions. Any member of your group may respond during the cross-examination period.
Expressing Key Values

Values play a key role when defining the broad parameters of public policy. What do we believe about ourselves? What matters most to us? When strongly held values come into conflict, which is most important?

The term “values” is not easy to define. Most often, we think of values in connection with our personal lives. Our attitudes toward our families, friends, and communities are a reflection of our personal values. Values play a critical role in our civic life as well. In the United States, our country’s political system and foreign policy have been shaped by a wide range of values. Since our nation’s beginnings a commitment to freedom, democracy, and individual liberty have been a cornerstone of our national identity. At the same time, the high value many Americans place on justice, equality, and respect for the rights of others rings loudly throughout U.S. history.

For most of our country’s existence, the impulse to spread American values beyond our borders was outweighed by the desire to remain independent of foreign entanglements. Since World War II, however, the United States has played a larger role in world affairs than any other single nation. At times, American leaders have emphasized the values of human rights and cooperation. On other occasions, the values of stability and security have been stressed.

Some values fit together well. Others are in conflict. Americans are constantly being forced to choose among competing values in our ongoing debate about foreign policy. Each of the four options in this unit revolves around a distinct set of values. The opening paragraphs of your assigned option offer a description of a policy direction grounded in distinct values. Your job is to identify and explain the most important values underlying your option. These values should be clearly expressed by every member of your group. This worksheet will help you organize your thoughts.

1. What are the two most important values underlying your option?
   a.
   b.

2. According to the values of your option, what should be the role of the United States in the world?

3. Why should the values of your option be the guiding force for U.S. policy toward genocide?
Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate
Hearing on U.S. Foreign Policy

Your Role

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate, you consider issues relating to our country’s foreign policy. These hearings will introduce you to four distinct positions our country could take to address genocide.

Your Assignment

While the four Option groups are organizing their presentations, you should prepare two questions regarding each of the Options. Your teacher will collect these questions at the end of Day Four.

Your questions should be challenging and critical. For example, a good question for Option 1 might be:

Wouldn’t intervening in the internal affairs of another country violate the sovereignty of that nation?

On Day Four, the four Option groups will present their positions. After their presentations are completed, your teacher will call on you and your fellow committee members to ask questions. The “Evaluation Form” you receive is designed for you to record your impressions of the Option groups. Part I should be filled out in class after the Option groups make their presentations. Part II should be completed as homework. After the hearings are concluded, you may be called upon to explain your evaluation of the Option groups.
Role Playing the Four Options: Debate and Discussion

Objectives: Students will:
- Articulate the leading values that frame the debate on U.S. foreign policy regarding genocide.
- Explore, debate, and evaluate multiple perspectives on U.S. foreign policy regarding genocide.
- Sharpen rhetorical skills through debate and discussion.
- Cooperate with classmates in staging a persuasive presentation.

Handouts:
- “Evaluation Form” (TRB-20) for committee members

In the Classroom:
1. Setting the Stage —Organize the room so that the four Option groups face a row of desks reserved for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Distribute “Evaluation Form” to the committee members. Instruct members of the committee to fill out the first part of their “Evaluation Form” during the course of the period. The second part of the worksheet should be completed as homework.

2. Managing the Simulation —Explain that the simulation will begin with three- to-five minute presentations by the spokespersons for the Option groups. Encourage the spokespersons to speak clearly and convincingly.

3. Guiding Discussion —Following the presentations, invite members of the Committee on Foreign Relations to ask cross-examination questions. Make sure that each committee member has an opportunity to ask at least one question. The questions should be evenly distributed among all four Option groups. If time permits, encourage members of the Option groups to challenge the positions of the other groups. During cross-examination, allow any Option group member to respond. (As an alternative approach, permit cross-examination following the presentation of each Option.)

Homework: Students should read Part III in the student text (pages 35-38). They should also read each of the four Options in the student text (pages 27-34), then moving beyond these Options they should fill out “Focusing Your Thoughts” (TRB-22) and complete “Your Option Five” (TRB-23).
# Evaluation Form
Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate

## Part I
What was the most persuasive argument presented in favor of this Option?  
What was the most persuasive argument presented against this Option?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>Option 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Part II
Which group presented its Option most effectively? Explain your answer.
Joining the Debate on U.S. Policy

Objectives: Students will:
- Identify the most appealing arguments and values of the Options.
- Deepen their understanding of the underlying values and potential consequences of each of the Options.
- Apply the values and principles of the Options to hypothetical crises.

Required Reading: Students should have read each of the four Options in the student text (pages 27-34) and completed “Focusing Your Thoughts” (TRB-22) and “Your Option Five” (TRB-23).

In the Classroom:
1. Sharing Assessments — Call on members of the Committee on Foreign Relations to share their evaluations of the Option groups. Which arguments were most convincing? Which beliefs were most appealing? Which lessons from history were most relevant to the debate?
2. Applying Student Options — Invite them to share their policy recommendations with the class. Distribute “Coping with Crisis” to each student. Lead the class in reading the first hypothetical crisis. Call on students to respond to the scenario from the perspective of their options. Are they consistent with the principles that the students articulated earlier? What are the potential threats and opportunities posed by the crisis? How would U.S. leaders, past and present, respond to the crisis? Encourage other students to challenge the views of their classmates. Review the two remaining hypothetical crises, inviting participation from the entire class.
3. Discussing Individual Choices — In the remaining time, invite students to respond to the “Individuals of Conscience” reading. Which stories were most striking? Why? Conduct a large-group discussion which includes addressing some or all of the following questions: What is an individual of conscience? Is it possible for anyone to be an individual of conscience? Does such an individual have certain qualities or characteristics? Do individuals have a responsibility to act? Did the actions of the people described in the reading make a difference? Were their sacrifices worth the results? What factors contributed to the choices these people made? What choices do people have in times of war or distress? Does everyone have a choice? Some consider perpetrators and informed bystanders to be equally responsible for atrocities. Do your students agree? What can a high school student in the United States do about a problem happening on the other side of the world? Why are there so few individuals of conscience during genocides?

Suggestions: Allow students to work in pairs or small groups before sharing their responses to the hypothetical crises. Students will discuss each crisis in their small group but respond to each individually, as they will draw from their own Option to do so. After students have responded to each crisis, bring the class together to share responses.

Extra Challenge: As homework, instruct students to write a letter to a member of Congress or President Bush on their ideas for U.S. policy concerning genocide. The first part of the letter should summarize the ideas expressed in the first three questions of “Your Option Five.” In the second part, students should offer their recommendations for U.S. policy toward genocide.
Focusing Your Thoughts

Ranking the Options

Which of the Options below do you prefer? Rank the Options “1” to “4” with “1” being your first choice.

1. **Option 1: Lead the World in the Fight to Stop Genocide**
2. **Option 2: Stand with the International Community Against Genocide**
3. **Option 3: Speak Out, But Preserve State Sovereignty**
4. **Option 4: Intervene Only When American Interests are Directly Threatened**

Beliefs

Rate each of the statements according to your personal beliefs:

1 = Strongly Support 2 = Support 3 = Oppose 4 = Strongly Oppose

1. In today’s interconnected world, genocide can be addressed only through international cooperation.
2. America has too many problems at home to focus on those abroad.
3. Promoting human rights should be America’s most important foreign policy.
4. Trying to make deep changes in the way the world works is naive and dangerous.
5. Countries do not have a right to intervene in the internal affairs of other nations.
6. Using our military power around the world, even to stop genocide, creates more enemies than friends.
7. America has a moral obligation to try to stop injustices such as genocide around the globe.
8. Genocide is a problem that affects American interests and security.
9. Using violence, such as American military strikes, to stop violence is illogical.
10. The U.S. should remove itself from international agreements that threaten Americans’ constitutional rights.

Creating Your Own Option

Your next assignment is to create an Option that reflects your own beliefs and opinions. You may borrow heavily from one Option, combine ideas from two or three Options, or take a new approach altogether. There are, of course, no perfect solutions. And there is no right or wrong answer. Rather, you should strive to craft an Option that is logical and persuasive.

Be careful of contradictions and keep in mind that policies should logically follow beliefs. If you believe that the United States should closely cooperate with other countries in confronting genocide, you would support an increase in U.S. funding for the UN or other international organizations dedicated to preventing genocide.
Your Option Five

Instructions: In this exercise, you will offer your own recommendations for U.S. foreign policy concerning genocide. Your responses to “Focusing Your Thoughts” should help you identify the guiding values of your proposal.

1. What values and interests should guide U.S. policy concerning genocide?

2. What steps in the foreign policy arena should the United States take over the next ten years?

3. How would your Option impact the lives of Americans?

4. What are the two strongest arguments opposing your Option?
   a.
   b.

5. What are the two strongest arguments supporting your Option?
   a.
   b.
**Coping With Crisis**

**Instructions:**
In this exercise, you are asked to decide whether and how the United States should respond to three hypothetical crises. Are these events genocides? Consider whether the United States should respond militarily or diplomatically, and whether the U.S. should act multilaterally, unilaterally, or not at all. You should use your answers to “Your Option Five” worksheet as a guide in developing your recommendations.

**Case Study #1: Hundreds Dead in South-East Asia**
An impoverished, primarily agriculture- and fishing-based South-East Asian nation is home to five million people who belong to two ethnic groups approximately equal in number. One group works primarily in the agricultural area, and the other is made up of fishers. Reports from the Australian and Indian news agencies working in the country are becoming more disturbing. In the past few weeks hundreds of bodies of one ethnic group have washed up along the coastline, but reporters cannot locate anyone who has seen any attacks. The bodies clearly died as a result of mutilation and not drowning. Family members are now beginning to tell reporters that their loved ones have gone missing on their way home from the fields. In his investigation one Indian reporter found a small fishing vessel stocked with knives and other weapons. This country does not have any ties to the United States, but some members of the Australian Parliament are calling these deaths the first in what could become a massive genocide.

Should the United States respond? If so, how? If not, why not?

**Case Study #2: Ongoing Strife in Central Africa Intensifies**
For several years this central African nation has been undergoing a civil war. Reports are now reaching the State Department that as many as five thousand family members of one of the warring factions, made up entirely of members of one ethnic group, have been targeted by the ruling power. Hundreds of militiamen have returned to their villages and discovered that their homes have been burned and their families slaughtered. Members of other groups living in the same villages have not been harmed. The leader of this nation, who has been in power for twenty-five years, has said on the radio that this targeted ethnic group is responsible for all the problems of the country. This nation is very large, has a poor transportation system and infrastructure, and has a high prevalence of malaria and other tropical diseases. For years this nation has provided the Western world with diamonds and other minerals used in technology. In fact, the civil war is partly a result of this trade, which is very lucrative for those at the top of the trading system.

Should the United States respond? If so, how? If not, why not?

**Case Study #3: A Former Soviet Republic Erupts in Violence**
With the potential to surpass some Middle Eastern countries in oil production, this country has invited U.S. investment for years. Several U.S. and multinational energy companies have signed deals with the government of this nation. Ruled by a former Communist since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the country is 80 per cent Muslim, with nearly all of those Muslims following the Sunni sect. The remainder follow Shiite Islam. Shiite Muslims control much of the oil industry, and many Sunni Muslims feel that Shiites are unfairly represented in the government and the economy as a result. The government has been successful in the past at preventing violence between the groups. Ten days ago, however, a group of Sunnis attacked a predominately Shiite office building, firing automatic weapons into offices and killing sixteen people. Four hostages were taken. The U.S. ambassador received an unsigned message which called on her to cancel the energy deals or the hostages would be killed and Shiites throughout the country would be attacked.

Should the United States respond? If so, how? If not, why not?
Building a Memorial

Objectives: Students will:
• Explore the complex decision making processes behind designing a memorial.
• Understand the controversial nature of memorials.
• Try their skills at constructing a model of a memorial.

Handouts: • “Building a Memorial” (TRB-26)

In the Classroom:
1. Planning the Project—Distribute the handout to students and go over the parameters of the assignment. Depending on how much time is available for the project, you may want to provide students with interim due dates to complete sections of their memorial.

2. Design and Preparation—Encourage students to consider other memorials with which they are familiar. The Washington, Lincoln, and Vietnam monuments in Washington DC are all different from each other, for instance. Ask students to consider size, materials, and the message that each monument conveys. Some memorials act as spaces for people to remember events or revere leaders, while others try to teach lessons. Many memorials are controversial because of their location and their design. You might ask students to find articles which discuss the development or impact of a memorial.

3. Building and Construction—Students should develop a sketch of their plans before actually building. They should have a clear sense of why they are choosing particular materials. Students should be able to answer the questions on the handout before they begin the actual construction of their memorial.

4. Presentation—If time and space permits, students should showcase their work in a public space and invite comments from observers.

5. Evaluation—Ask students to write a one-paged “artist’s statement” about their experiences designing and constructing the memorial. The statement might also include the answers to the questions on the handout. These statements may be collected into a gallery book for visitors to peruse while viewing the models.

Suggestions: This assignment can be completed in the classroom or assigned as an outside project. Consider coordinating with the art department for supplies, work space, and assessment of the assignment.
Building a Memorial

Memorials exist around the world to commemorate people which have had an impact on their societies. You may be able to visualize memorials in your town, such as one for people who fought in our nation’s wars, or memorials in Washington, DC, such as to Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Roosevelt. Other memorials focus on events. There is a memorial to the Civil Rights movement in Montgomery, Alabama, and one to the Holocaust in Boston, Massachusetts, for example.

Many memorials were controversial when they were first unveiled. For instance, many visitors disliked the Vietnam Memorial in Washington, DC when it was first constructed. You may be able to find evidence of controversies surrounding the construction of memorials today. Before you begin your project, you should do some research about different kinds of memorials to get a sense of how people have used space and materials to convey their message.

In developing your memorial, consider the following:

Think about memorials with which you are familiar. Why do they strike you? How do they touch their audiences? What are they made of? What do they memorialize? What is their purpose?

Think about what aspect of genocide you would like to memorialize. You can memorialize an entire genocide from this unit or center your memorial around a particular aspect of that genocide or an individual of conscience. Your memorial will be more successful if you chose an event to which you feel especially attached.

Think about the different kinds of expressions available to you: poetry, short story, sculpture, painting, drawing, music, dance…. Choose the expression which fits your talents and best represents that which you are memorializing. Think about appropriate symbols.

Before you begin the construction of your memorial, you should be able to answer the following questions.

1. What is being remembered?

2. What mood am I trying to create? What is the message of the memorial?

3. How do the materials and symbols I use convey the intended message?

4. Why is it being remembered? Is it meant to preserve history? Is it meant to teach a lesson for the future?
Key Terms

Introduction and Part I

- ethnic origin
- convention
- international community
- jurisdiction
- self-determination
- open diplomacy
- crimes against peace
- crimes against humanity
- sovereign states
- impunity
- ratification
- humanitarian relief
- economic sanctions

Part II

- propaganda
- nationalism
- deportation
- annihilation
- official discrimination
- intervention
- non-intervention
- neutrality
- resettlement
- restitution
- boycott
- Jewish ghettos
- perpetrator
- refugee
- displaced person
- economic embargo
**Genocide Issues Toolbox**

**Cold War:** The Cold War was the dominant foreign policy problem for the United States and Russia between the late 1940s and the late 1980s. Following the defeat of Hitler in 1945, Soviet-U.S. relations began to deteriorate. The United States adopted a policy of containing the spread of Soviet communism around the world, which led to, among other things, U.S. involvement in Vietnam. During this period both Russia and the United States devoted vast resources to their military, but never engaged in direct military action against each other. Because both the Soviet Union and the United States had nuclear weapons and were in competition around the world, nearly every foreign policy decision was intricately examined for its potential impact on U.S.-Soviet relations. The end of the Cold War forced policy makers to struggle to define a new guiding purpose for their foreign policy.

**Human Rights:** Equal and inalienable rights for all members of the human family. After the horrors of World War II, nations initiated efforts to develop international standards to protect people from individuals, groups, or nations. There is debate at home and abroad about the nature and scope of human rights. Some believe that human rights exist to protect individuals' civil and political freedoms. Civil and political rights include the right to life, liberty and personal security, freedom from slavery, torture and arbitrary arrest, as well as the rights to a fair trial, free speech, free movement, and privacy. Others have argued that there are economic, social, and cultural rights as well. These include economic rights related to work, fair pay, and leisure; social rights concerning an adequate standard of living for health, well-being and education; and the right to participate in the cultural life of the community. International consensus is growing that human rights should encompass the full spectrum spanned by these viewpoints.

**The United Nations:** The creation of the United Nations began in the midst of a world war. The United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and China agreed to create a new international organization in October 1943—only a few months after the tide had turned in the war against Germany and Japan. The four Allies that met in 1943, along with France, were largely responsible for the development of the UN’s structure. In June 1945, they were among the fifty-five nations that signed the UN Charter in San Francisco.

**The UN Security Council:** The United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and China are the permanent members of the UN’s Security Council, the UN’s executive body. The Security Council has the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. Each of the five permanent members of the Security Council has the right to veto UN decisions. The veto system was conceived as a safety valve that would allow the great powers to disagree without threatening the UN’s existence. The framers of the UN hoped that the permanent members of the Security Council would share a common interest in maintaining global peace and spelled out procedures for resolving conflict in the UN Charter. Chapters VI and VII of the UN Charter spelled out procedures for resolving conflict. Chapter VI outlined the role of the UN in the peaceful settlement of disputes, while Chapter VII described the means for enforcing UN efforts to stop conflict and aggression. Under Chapter VII, the Security Council had the authority to call upon UN members to cut their economic, transportation, communication, and diplomatic ties with an aggressive government. More significantly, Chapter VII empowered the Security Council to take military action “to maintain or restore international peace and security” and called for UN members to make forces available to carry out the Security Council’s decisions.
Making Choices Work in Your Classroom

This section of the Teacher Resource Book offers suggestions for teachers as they adapt Choices curricula to their classrooms. They are drawn from the experiences of teachers who have used Choices curricula successfully in their classrooms and from educational research on student-centered instruction.

**Managing the Choices Simulation**

**Recognize Time Limitations:** At the heart of the Choices approach is the role-play simulation in which students advocate different options, question each other, and debate. Just as thoughtful preparation is necessary to set the stage for cooperative group learning, careful planning for the presentations and debate can increase the effectiveness of the simulation. Time is the essential ingredient to keep in mind. A minimum of 45 to 50 minutes is necessary for the presentations and debate. Hence, if only one class period is available, student groups must be ready as soon as class begins. Teachers who have been able to schedule a double period or extend the length of class to one hour report that the extra time is beneficial. When necessary, the role-play simulation can be run over two days, but this disrupts the momentum of the debate. The best strategy for managing the role-play is to establish and enforce strict time limits, such as five minutes for each option presentation, ten minutes for questions and challenges, and the final five minutes of class for wrapping up the debate. It is crucial to make students aware of strict time limits as they prepare their presentations.

**Highlight the Importance of Values:** During the debate and debriefing, it is important to highlight the role of values in the options. Students should be instructed to identify the core values and priorities underlying the different options. The “Expressing Key Values” worksheet is designed to help students incorporate the values into their group presentations. You may also find the supplemental activity, Considering the Role of Values in Public Policy, available from the “Faculty Room” on the Choices web site <www.choices.edu> helpful.

**Moving Beyond the Options**

As a culminating activity of a Choices unit, students are expected to articulate their own views of the issue under consideration. An effective way to move beyond the options debate to creating individual options is to have students consider which values in the options framework they hold most dear. Typically, students will hold several of these values simultaneously and will need to prioritize them to reach a considered judgment about the issue at hand. These values should be reflected in their own options and should shape the goals and policies they advocate.

**Adjusting for Large and Small Classes**

Choices units are designed for an average class of twenty-five students. In larger classes, additional roles, such as those of newspaper reporter or member of a special interest group, can be assigned to increase student participation in the simulation. With larger option groups, additional tasks might be to create a poster, political cartoon, or public service announcement that represents the viewpoint of an option. In smaller classes, the teacher can serve as the moderator of the debate, and administrators, parents, or faculty can be invited to play the roles of congressional leaders. Another option is to combine two small classes.

**Assessing Student Achievement**

**Grading Group Assignments:** Research suggests that it is counterproductive to give students individual grades on cooperative group assignments. A significant part of the assignment given to the group is to cooperate in achieving a common goal, as opposed to looking out for individual interests. Telling students in advance that the group will receive one grade often motivates group members to hold each other accountable. This can foster group cohesion and lead to better group results. It may be useful to note that in addition to the cooperative group assignments, students complete individual assignments as well in every Choices unit. The “Assessment Guide for Oral Presentations” on the following page is designed to help teachers evaluate group presentations.
Requiring Self-Evaluation: Having students complete self-evaluations is an extremely effective way to make them think about their own learning. Self-evaluations can take many forms and are useful in a variety of circumstances. They are particularly helpful in getting students to think constructively about group collaboration. In developing a self-evaluation tool for students, teachers need to pose clear and direct questions to students. Two key benefits of student self-evaluation are that it involves students in the assessment process, and that it provides teachers with valuable insights into the contributions of individual students and the dynamics of different groups. These insights can help teachers to organize groups for future cooperative assignments.

Evaluating Student Options: The most important outcomes of a Choices unit are the original options developed and articulated by each student. These will differ significantly from one another, as students identify different values and priorities that shape their viewpoints. These options cannot be graded as right or wrong, but should be evaluated on clarity of expression, logic, and thoroughness. Did the student provide reasons for his/her viewpoint along with supporting evidence? Were the values clear and consistent throughout the option? Did the student identify the risks involved? Did the student present his/her option in a convincing manner?

Testing: In a formal evaluation of the Choices approach, it was demonstrated that students using Choices learned the factual information presented as well as or better than students who were taught in a more traditional lecture-discussion format. However, the larger benefits of the Choices approach were evident when students using Choices demonstrated significantly higher ability to think critically, analyze multiple perspectives, and articulate original viewpoints, compared to students who did not use this approach. Teachers should hold students accountable for learning historical information, concepts, and current events presented in Choices units. However, a simple multiple-choice examination will not allow students to demonstrate the critical thinking and communication skills developed through the Choices unit. If teachers choose to test students, they may wish to explore new models of test design that require students to do more than recognize correct answers. Tests should not replace the development of student options.

Assessment Guide for Oral Presentations

Group assignment: ____________________________________________________________

Group members: ______________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Assessment</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The group made good use of its preparation time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The presentation reflected analysis of the issues under consideration.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The presentation was coherent and persuasive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The group incorporated relevant sections of the background reading into its presentation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The group’s presenters spoke clearly, maintained eye contact, and made an effort to hold the attention of their audience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The presentation incorporated contributions from all the members of the group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Assessment

1. The student cooperated with other group members                                | 5         | 4    | 3       | 2                 | 1              |
| 2. The student was well-prepared to meet his or her responsibilities             | 5         | 4    | 3       | 2                 | 1              |
| 3. The student made a significant contribution to the group’s presentation       | 5         | 4    | 3       | 2                 | 1              |
Alternative Three-Day Lesson Plan

**Day 1:** See Day Two of the Suggested Five-Day Lesson Plan. (Students should have read the Introduction and Part II and completed the accompanying study guide before beginning the unit.)

**Day 2:** Assign each student one of the four options, and allow a few minutes for students to familiarize themselves with the mindsets of the options. Call on students to evaluate the benefits and trade-offs of their assigned options. How do the options differ in their assumptions about the U.S. role in the world? Moving beyond the options, ask students to imagine they are participating in a meeting of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Which values should guide the direction of U.S. foreign policy?

*Homework:* Students should complete “Focusing Your Thoughts” and “Your Option Five.”

**Day 3:** See Day Five of the Suggested Five-Day Lesson Plan.
# Order Form

## Global Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Student Texts*</th>
<th>Teacher Set*</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responding to Terrorism: Challenges for Democracy</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronting Genocide: Never Again?</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Environmental Problems: Implications for U.S. Policy</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Trade Policy: Competing in a Global Economy</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Immigration Policy in an Unsettled World</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemmas of Foreign Aid: Debating U.S. Priorities, Policies, &amp; Practices</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping the Peace in an Age of Conflict: Debating the U.S. Role</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The International System in the 21st Century: Considering the U.S. Role</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## World History and Area Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Student Texts*</th>
<th>Teacher Set*</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom in Our Lifetime: South Africa's Struggle</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Independence and the Question of Pakistan</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquest, Conflict, and Commerce: The Colonial Experience in the Congo</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis, Conscience, and Choices: Weimar Germany and the Rise of Hitler</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting Sands: Balancing U.S. Interests in the Middle East</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charting Russia's Future</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia's Uncertain Transition: Challenges for U.S. Policy</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China on the World Stage: Weighing the U.S. Response</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caught between Two Worlds: Mexico at the Crossroads</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## United States History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Student Texts*</th>
<th>Teacher Set*</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A More Perfect Union: Shaping American Government</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges to the New Republic: Prelude to the War of 1812</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant Colossus: America Enters the Age of Imperialism</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending the War against Japan: Science, Morality, and the Atomic Bomb</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coming to Terms with Power: U.S. Choices after World War II</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cuban Missile Crisis: Considering its Place in Cold War History</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Limits of Power: The United States in Vietnam</td>
<td>$7/copy</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Choices gives you a choice

**Teacher sets** include a reproducible student text and a teacher’s guide. You are welcome to make as many copies of the student text as you need for your students. The two-book set is available for $15. You may also **download** teacher sets for a fee at www.choices.edu.

With an order of a classroom set of student texts (15 or more of the same unit), the price per copy falls to $7 each. One teacher’s resource book is included free with each classroom set.

*Choices gives you a choice

**Teacher sets** include a reproducible student text and a teacher’s guide. You are welcome to make as many copies of the student text as you need for your students. The two-book set is available for $15. You may also download teacher sets for a fee at www.choices.edu.

With an order of a classroom set of student texts (15 or more of the same unit), the price per copy falls to $7 each. One teacher’s resource book is included free with each classroom set.

Make checks payable to: Brown University

Return to: Choices Education Program
Watson Institute for International Studies
Brown University, Box 1948
Providence, RI 02912

**PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE**
Confronting Genocide: Never Again?

Confronting Genocide: Never Again? addresses the causes of genocide in the twentieth century and the various ways in which the international community has attempted to deal with the problem. Students are drawn into consideration of the definition of genocide and the possible responses to genocide the United States could take in the future.

Confronting Genocide: Never Again? is part of a continuing series on current and historical international issues published by the Choices for the 21st Century Education Program at Brown University. Choices materials place special emphasis on the importance of educating students in their participatory role as citizens.