



# THE ISG NEWSLETTER

Number 50  
Helen Fein, editor  
Elisa von Joeden-Forgey, Associate Editor

FALL 2014

## LIVES AT RISK

- Central African Republic**
- Congo**
- Egypt**
- Myanmar**
- Nigeria**
- North Korea**
- South Sudan**
- Sudan**
- Syria**
- Ukraine**
- Uganda**

Note: Because of a gap between publication and events, we do not include descriptions .

## CONTENTS

GENOCIDE SCHOLARS TO USHMM ABOUT ABRAMS.....	2
DEALING WITH GENOCIDAIRES: NEGOTIATION IS OFTEN CALLED FOR BUT SO IS ACTION by Samuel Totten and Herb Hirsch .....	6
GENOCIDE STUDIES INTERNATIONAL.....	9
CALL FOR PAPERS: The Twelfth Meeting of IAGS, Yerevan, Armenia .....	12
PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE .....	14
HOW TO JOIN THE ISG .....	15

*The ISG Newsletter* is published by the  
**INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF GENOCIDE**  
Joyce Apsel, President

For more information on ISG, see our website at:  
[www.instituteforthestudyofgenocide.org](http://www.instituteforthestudyofgenocide.org)

## GENOCIDE SCHOLARS TO USHMM ABOUT ABRAMS

October 14, 2014

Ms. Sara J. Bloomfield, Director  
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM)  
100 Raoul Wallenberg Place, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20024

and

Mr. Michael Abramowitz  
Director of the Committee on Conscience (CoC)  
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

Dear Ms. Bloomfield and Mr. Abramowitz:

We, scholars of genocide studies, are writing to voice our deep concern that Mr. Elliot Abrams has recently been appointed to a second term on the USHMM'S Committee on Conscience's advisory board. (In fact, we are vastly disappointed that he was appointed to a first term, but this matter just came to our attention.)

During the Reagan Administration, Abrams first served as Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs in the early 1980s and later as Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. In those positions, he essentially served as President Reagan's main advisor vis-à-vis major political and human rights issues in Central and South America. This was during a period when the Government of Guatemala carried out a genocidal counterinsurgency program against the Mayans of the Guatemala Highlands.

Throughout his tenure, Abrams regularly challenged human rights organizations — including Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch — over their reports concerning Guatemala's, El Salvador's and Nicaragua's brutal and inhumane treatment of their perceived enemies, among other citizens in their respective countries.

A list of Abrams' questionable positions/actions vis-à-vis the aforementioned issues is much too long to provide herein. That said, the following excerpt from an April 2013 article ("The Rehabilitation of Elliott Abrams") in *The Nation* by Eric Alterman provides one with a sense as to why the appointment of Mr. Abrams to the advisory board of the CoC is not a little questionable:

Abrams...repeatedly and purposely misled Congress about the government's involvement with the death-squad-riddled Salvadoran military, the Nicaraguan Contra counter-revolutionaries and other Central American mass murderers. He white-washed their massacres... and the genocidal Guatemalan regime of

## GENOCIDE SCHOLARS TO USHMM ABOUT ABRAMS

Gen. Efrían Ríos Montt...Abrams did all this while casting aspersions on the motives of journalists and human rights workers who sought to tell the truth about these crimes (n.d.).

To include Mr. Abrams on the CoC's advisory board is both shocking and unconscionable. Indeed, we find it hard to understand how an individual with a record such as Mr. Abrams vis-à-vis human rights could ever be considered a good fit to uphold the mandate of the COC: "to alert the national conscience, influence policy makers, and stimulate worldwide action to confront and work to halt acts of genocide or related crimes against humanity." One would assume that the advisory board of the CoC would be composed of individuals who are absolutely committed to the universal protection of human rights — meaning, anyone and everyone's rights no matter his or her race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, class, or political stance.

It is clear to us that Mr. Abrams' past positions/words/actions directly contradict the following description of the make-up of the CoC committee (noted in bold) that appeared on the USHMM website on October 12, 2000: "The 42-member Committee, comprised of distinguished moral leaders, was established five years ago to confront and work to halt acts of contemporary genocide or related crimes against humanity."

While some of the signatories to this letter can "understand" Mr. Abrams' "defense" of an administration whose human rights record in Guatemala was untoward, one would think that after his service in said administration Mr. Abrams would duly reflect on what he helped create, and, in turn, attempt to atone for *his moral failures* by at least apologizing for his role. To our knowledge, he has not done so; and even if he did, we feel his past record of active complicity in some of the worst mass atrocities in the recent history of the Americas should rule him out completely for consideration as a Committee of Conscience board member.

We understand that CoC advisory board members are presidential appointees. It seems that USHMM officials should have alerted the White House to Abram's background, and insisted that his appointment to the COC advisory board would not only be problematic but hypocritical. To have done anything less, we believe, calls into question the seriousness of the CoC's very mandate.

That said, we request the following:

First, we wish to be provided with an explanation as to how top USHMM officials reacted to the appointment of Mr. Abrams to the advisory board of the CoC. We are fairly positive that USHMM officials were involved in the vetting of each individual, and thus this is an important matter.

Second, we wish to request that USHMM officials make an immediate and formal request to President Barack Obama to remove Mr. Abrams from the advisory board of the CoC.

We thank you in advance for your attention to this matter, and look forward to receiving your reply.

## GENOCIDE SCHOLARS TO USHMM ABOUT ABRAMS

Sincerely,

Dr. Samuel Totten  
Professor Emeritus  
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Dr. Helen Fein  
Institute for the Study of Genocide  
Cambridge, MA

Dr. Roger Smith  
Professor Emeritus  
College of William and Mary  
Williamsburg, VA

Dr. Frank Chalk  
Professor of History and Director  
The Montreal Institute for Genocide and Human Rights Studies  
Concordia University  
Montreal, Quebec

Dr. Eric D. Weitz  
Dean of Humanities and Arts  
Distinguished Professor of History  
The City College of New York

Dr. Payam Akhavan  
Professor of International Law  
McGill University  
Montreal, Quebec

Dr. Israel W. Charny  
Founder/Director, Institute on the Holocaust & Genocide, Jerusalem  
Retired Professor of Psychology & Family Therapy,  
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

PLUS 23 other scholars

## GENOCIDE SCHOLARS TO USHMM ABOUT ABRAMS

Dear Dr. Totten,

Thank you for contacting us. We have noted your views. You should know that Mr. Abrams has been a very dedicated and constructive member of the US Holocaust Memorial Council and its Committee on Conscience.

Sincerely,

Sara J. Bloomfield Director  
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum  
[www.ushmm.org](http://www.ushmm.org)

Oct 17

Dear Ms. Bloomfield,

Thank you for your reply.

Unfortunately, your response is what many of us feared — a total disregard vis-a-vis Abrams' past. There is some behavior, we believe, that is so untoward that individuals who engage in it must be held accountable.

Furthermore, are we to assume that the following description, which is found on the USHMM website, of CoC members no longer germane: "The 42-member Committee [is] comprised of distinguished moral leaders..."? If Elliot Abrams is considered to be a moral leader by the USHMM and CoC then something is sorely wrong. Prior to being deemed a moral leader is it not imperative that one's past positions/actions be scrutinized for upright behavior — or its opposite — and then be judged accordingly?

At this time, I wish to inform you and Mr. Abramowitz that both your stance regarding Abrams and his relationship with the USHMM and CoC (and, of course, his appointment to two terms on the CoC) shall be made public.

Finally, while we do not want to draw any facile analogies between Abrams' aberrant behavior during the Reagan Administration and other individuals' aberrant behavior at different points in time, please allow us to say this: both Abrams' attitude and actions vis-a-vis the atrocities perpetrated against innocent people in Guatemala, Nicaragua, El Salvador, etc. and the USHMM and the CoC's cavalier disregard of the latter hardly comports with the USHMM's current fundraising slogan: NEVER AGAIN: WHAT YOU DO MATTERS.

Disappointedly,

Dr. Samuel Totten

## DEALING WITH GENOCIDAIRES: NEGOTIATION IS OFTEN CALLED FOR BUT SO IS ACTION BY SAMUEL TOTTEN AND HERB HIRSCH

*Samuel Totten*  
*Professor Emeritus,*  
*University of Arkansas, Fayetteville*

*and*

*Herb Hirsch*  
*Professor of Political Science,*  
*Virginia Commonwealth University*

### **Introduction**

Is there any reason at all to attempt to negotiate with genocidaires either during or in the aftermath of genocide, particularly if they are wont to carrying out further atrocities? Or, should the international community automatically resort to military force in an attempt to bring their murderous actions to a quick and decisive end? As with most complex--and controversial--issues, there are likely to be a whole host of opinions across the spectrum.

In a recent (June 28, 2014) article on Hutu militias in the DRC (“Offering to Disarm in Congo, After 20 Years of War: A Reversal by a Militia of Rwandan Hutus in Democratic Republic of Congo” by Somini Sengupta), Russ Feingold, the United States special envoy for the Great Lakes region of Africa, was quoted as passionately arguing against any negotiations whatsoever: “People involved in genocide, who are included in this group, are not entitled to dialogue.” Really? And how did Feingold come to that conclusion? Based on what reality? And on what justification?

In one way, we suppose, Feingold’s position is understandable. After all, members of the Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (composed of ethnic Hutus from Rwanda and known by its French initials, FDLR) not only perpetrated the genocide in Rwanda in 1994 during which some 500,000 to one million people

(mainly Tutsi but also moderate Hutu) were killed in 100 days, but have wreaked havoc, terrorized and killed an untold number of innocents in the Democratic Republic of the Congo over the past twenty years. Put another way, there are few, if any, redeeming features inherent in the FDLR. It is also significant that the International Criminal Court has issued a warrant for Sylvestre Mudacumura, one of the F.D.L.R.’s main leaders, for his part in the 1994 genocide in Rwanda.

The FDLR’s record of atrocities is clear. However, it is also clear that the FDLR finally seem willing to give up their weapons, leave the conflict in the eastern DRC, and return to Rwanda if they were given the opportunity to negotiate with the current government of Rwanda. The major point of contention, though, particularly from the perspective of the Rwandan government, is that the FDLR insists on negotiating some sort of power sharing with the Kagame regime. Furious at the thought of negotiating anything with the FDLR, the Rwandan government, according to Sengupta, “has since accused the United Nations of trying “to sanitize F.D.L.R. genocidaires.” [Does he use FDLR or F.D.L.R. in the article?]

That said, in another way, Feingold is apparently totally oblivious to the fact that time and again, in both the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the international community and individual nations, including the United States, have attempted to engage in dialogue (i.e., negotiations and peace treaties) with perpetrators of genocide. For example, in the aftermath of the Iraqi genocidal massacre against the Kurdish people in northern Iraq in March 1988, the international community continued to negotiate with Saddam Hussein. Tellingly, a briefing paper by the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office stated: “We believe it

## DEALING WITH GENOCIDAIRE: NEGOTIATION IS OFTEN CALLED FOR BUT SO IS ACTION

better to maintain a dialogue with others if we want to influence their actions. Punitive measures such as unilateral sanctions would not be effective in changing Iraq's behaviour over chemical weapons, and would damage British interests to no avail." As for the United States, in the aftermath of the genocidal massacre, Geoffrey Kemp, then head of the Near & Middle East desk at the U.S. State Department, put it more bluntly: "Saddam was a son of a bitch but he was our son of a bitch."

As for another example, well after the July 1995 genocide of some 8,000 Muslim boys and men by Serbs at Srebrenica, western negotiators, including the United States, engaged in prolonged discussions with Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic. In fact, during 1996 peace negotiations in Bosnia, U.S. envoy Richard Holbrooke even offered Karadzic immunity from prosecution. In his highly informative book discussing the negotiations to end the atrocities in the Former Yugoslavia (*To End a War*. New York: The Modern Library, 1999), Holbrooke notes: "Hindsight tends to give historical narrative a sense of inevitability. But there was nothing predetermined about the outcome of the Bosnia negotiations. In August 1995, when they began, it was almost universally believed that they would fail, as all previous efforts had. And we knew that if we failed, the war would continue" (p. xvii).

### **If Negotiation Is Off the Table, Then What?**

Depending on what is meant by negotiation and under what conditions negotiations are conducted, we believe that it is a grotesque oversimplification to argue that there should be no negotiations of any kind whatsoever with perpetrators of genocide. If negotiation involves stopping violence, and offers space for reconstructing society and punishing perpetrators in the post genocide period, we think

it is not only needed but would be a positive development.

One needs to both recognize and appreciate that part and parcel of this issue is that more often than not there is a total lack of commitment on the part of national and international institutions to engage in the action to stop crimes against humanity and genocide or to fully protect human rights in the aftermath of either, which could be carried out without negotiations. Unless there is a willingness to commit all the resources necessary to defeat perpetrators, as in World War II, negotiations are the only tool left. While they are in many ways unsatisfactory, we do not see the probability of any ground invasions, total surrender, military occupation and expensive rebuilding of any place where genocide is taking, or has taken, place. All one has to do is examine how the international community, and individual nations, have responded to the many crises facing the world today, including but not limited to the following: the crisis in Syria, the ongoing brutality and killing of Muslims by radical Buddhists in Myanmar, the butchery in the Central African Republic perpetrated at different points in time by both Christians and Muslims against one another, the mass rape and killing in the Democratic Republic of the Congo by various factions, the ongoing destruction and killing in Darfur, and the daily aerial attacks against the civilians of the Nuba Mountains by the Government of Sudan. [Do you want to add Iraq/ISIS?]

### **Conclusion**

We are not naïve. We are not arguing that negotiation is the panacea in dealing with crimes against humanity and genocide. In many cases, negotiations go on for far too long and result in talk, talk, and more talk while nothing concrete gets done. That, of course, is counterproductive.

## DEALING WITH GENOCIDAIRES: NEGOTIATION IS OFTEN CALLED FOR BUT SO IS ACTION

To engage in negotiations month after month and year after year while a perpetrator engages in low-intensity atrocities and gets away with it, no matter how relentless the international community is in demanding an end to them or how vociferous it is in deploring them, is to allow perpetrators to play the international community for a fool. And, we must note, such negotiations allow the number of dead to pile up--more slowly, but still inexorably.

The same is true in regard to bringing the perpetrators to justice. More specifically, as Geis and Mundt (2009) point out, “The indictment against Bashir illustrates an unfortunate truism confronting the court: in the absence of concerted political will and the threat of coercive action, international criminal justice has little deterrent power. The oft-cited comparison of the Bashir indictment with that of the Milosevic indictment by the ICTY illustrates the point: the indictments against Milosevic and others only had an impact after NATO had taken coercive action that ended attacks on civilians and the ICTY was therefore able to prosecute those who bore greatest responsibility for crimes committed” (p. 17).

When it becomes obvious that negotiations are getting nowhere, that peace treaties are broken almost as soon as they are agreed to, that the perpetrator is ratcheting up its attacks on the victim population and killing an ever-increasing number of people, it is time to resort to action. Action that is supported with a Chapter VII mandate, a full complement of troops and weapons and resources for the job, and the determination to be as efficient and effective as possible in order to save as many lives as possible as quickly as possible. Here, Hobbes’ observation that “covenants without the sword are empty pieces of paper” (that is, negotiations without the full realization that a

military option is a very real reality should the former break down or go now where) is certainly germane here.

Are we the only ones who sense that it is beginning to appear, at least in certain instances, that we are moving backwards from 1945?



## *Genocide Studies International* — Volume 8, Number 2, Fall 2014

by T Hawkins

Now available online...

<http://bit.ly/gsi82>

### Editors' Introduction

Maureen S. Hiebert, Henry Theriault

In our first general issue of *Genocide Studies International*, we have included a mix of academic articles; a "Research Note" on an important book containing primary documentation of a case of genocide that has not been given the attention it should have; and, in our first "Notes from the Field" installment, an extended interview with a humanitarian aid worker in the midst of ongoing mass violence in the Nuba Mountains area of Sudan. These contents are intended to put into practice GSI's mission of publishing a journal that not only makes new research and analysis on genocide studies and genocide prevention available to readers but also puts on the record and disseminates important primary documents and other forms of policy-relevant information and analysis that can inform the work of scholars, policy makers, and anti-genocide NGO workers and activists. Our vision for this issue and the journal generally is to bridge the gaps separating ivory-tower academics, policy makers, and communities around the world; researchers and practitioners; and theory and practice. The editors of this issue believe that the articles and other material contained herein go some distance toward accomplishing this task. (excerpt from Editors' Introduction) DOI: 10.3138/gsi.8.2.01 [http://bit.ly/gsi\\_82e](http://bit.ly/gsi_82e)

### *The United Nations and Genocide Prevention: The Problem of Racial and Religious Bias*

Hannibal Travis

Could racial or religious bias within the United Nations be hindering efforts to prevent and punish the crime of genocide? I answer this question by surveying the UN response to a variety of alleged genocides, ranging from Biafra starting in the late 1960s to Syria starting in 2012. In terms of quantitative analysis, this article explores whether the UN response to claims of genocide is proportionate to the scale of actual harm, using absolute death tolls and percentage reductions in the populations of specific minority groups to assess harm. It finds that voting blocs based on racial or religious identity may be warping the UN response to potential genocides, resulting in disproportionate attention across cases. In this regard, the Arab League, the Non-Aligned Movement, and the Republic of Turkey appear to play important roles in shaping UN responses. In terms of qualitative analysis, the article surveys evidence that key actors at the United Nations may have been motivated by bias in framing collective responses to claims of genocide and other mass violence. DOI: 10.3138/gsi.8.2.02 [http://bit.ly/GSI82\\_Travis](http://bit.ly/GSI82_Travis)

### *Polluting the Waters*

Adam Hughes Henry

In response to an alleged Communist coup in Indonesia on 1 October 1965, ambassadors Sir Keith Shann (Australia), Sir Andrew Gilchrist (United Kingdom), and Marshall Green (United States) initiated anti-Communist propaganda campaigns. In conjunction with the Indonesian army, these campaigns helped to underpin the rationale for widespread, army-coordinated anti-Communist repression throughout Indonesia. Through a careful re-examination of Australian archival materials regarding Indonesia between October 1965 and February 1966, this article provides a detailed, transnational chronology of propaganda efforts

during the period of the massacres, highlighting the direct and indirect connections between them and the killings. DOI: 10.3138/gsi.8.2.03 [http://bit.ly/GSI82\\_Henry](http://bit.ly/GSI82_Henry)

## **The Role of the Netherlands in the European Framework for an International Response on Darfur during its Presidency in 2004–2005**

Fred Grünfeld, Wessel N. Vermeulen

In this article, we discuss the role of the Netherlands with respect to the Darfur crisis during 2003–2005. From the moment the crisis broke out, the Netherlands was active as a major donor and tried to facilitate political solutions. During the period January 2004–July 2005, it functioned as the (acting) presidency of the Council of the European Union and was therefore involved in creating a common EU position. We discuss how policy was made while observing internal (domestic) and external (international) influences. We conclude that the Netherlands was partially successful in establishing a more active EU position regarding Darfur. However, we also find evidence that, eventually, the EU has lagged behind the response of the UN Security Council, despite being a major donor to emergency relief and the African Union mission in Sudan. DOI: 10.3138/gsi.8.2.04 [http://bit.ly/gsi\\_82d](http://bit.ly/gsi_82d)

## ***Genocide and Identity (Geo)Politics: Bridging State Reasoning and Diaspora Activism***

Khatchik DerGhougassian

Since the independence of Armenia in 1991, the question of whether and how to include the Armenian Genocide on the state's foreign policy agenda has become the most important issue of controversy between the republic and the global Armenian diaspora. International recognition of

the genocide and demands for reparations have been central to diaspora activism and have defined what experts conceptualize as “identity politics.” The Armenian state, however, has been reluctant to include the issue on its political agenda. Eager to establish diplomatic relations with Turkey and open their shared border—closed since 1993—for trade and economic development, Yerevan has insisted on “relations without preconditions” with Ankara. There is, therefore, a clear gap between the state reasoning and diaspora activism. This paper looks at identity politics and state reasoning through the lenses of international relations theory to examine the divide between the two parties and how it might be bridged. It employs Yossi Shain's framework of diaspora politics to study the relationship between the Armenian diaspora and state concerning the question of the genocide. It argues that an area of convergence followed the failure of the Armenian-Turkish agreement of 2009, which is evidence of an ongoing social construction of identity geopolitics toward a bridging of the gap. DOI: 10.3138/gsi.8.2.05 [http://bit.ly/GSI82\\_DerGhougassian](http://bit.ly/GSI82_DerGhougassian)

## ***Anatomy of Denial: Manipulating Sources and Manufacturing a Rebellion***

Dikran Kaligian

Turkey's and Sudan's governments use similar genocide denial tactics. This article, by closely examining Turkey's tactic of claiming an Armenian rebellion, can help scholars combat similar claims by Sudan. Deniers claim the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF) fomented a rebellion, but they elide the fact that Turkey's ruling party tried to recruit the ARF to form a fifth column behind Russian lines. They also dismiss as a subterfuge the ARF World Congress decision that Ottoman and Russian Armenians must join their respective armies. These authors ignore multiple sources describing the

interparty negotiations but base their positions on a book by Esat Uras, a perpetrator of the genocide, which created the template for denial. Deniers also distort the formation of volunteer regiments in the Russian army, made up predominantly of Russian Armenians, into a mass movement of Armenians deserting the Ottoman army to conduct guerilla warfare. The evidence for these false claims consists of a single Ottoman intelligence report and distortions of Armenian sources. But the internal deliberations of the ARF show no evidence of a conspiracy with Russia. DOI:10.3138/gsi.8.2.06 [http://bit.ly/GSI82\\_Kaligian](http://bit.ly/GSI82_Kaligian)

### RESEARCH NOTE

#### *The Black Deeds of the Kremlin: Sixty Years Later* *Bohdan Klid*

In 1953, on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Famine of 1932–1933 in Ukraine, émigrés from eastern and central Ukraine published in Toronto an English-language collection titled *The Black Deeds of the Kremlin: A White Book*. The volume contained largely memoirs and testimonies on policies and actions taken by Soviet authorities that Raphael Lemkin had identified that same year as constituting the Ukrainian Genocide. A second volume, published in 1955, was dedicated to the collectivization and famine. The two, however, went virtually unnoticed by the scholarly community until the appearance of Robert Conquest's *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine* (1986). At that time, Conquest was attacked for using émigré sources, characterized by some critics as Cold War products, biased and unreliable. Despite shortcomings, the publication of the two volumes marked an admirable effort by the émigrés to tell their stories of repression and persecution under Stalinist rule in Ukraine. DOI: 10.3138/gsi.8.2.07 [http://bit.ly/GSI82\\_Klid](http://bit.ly/GSI82_Klid)

### NOTE FROM THE FIELD

#### *Interview with Dr. Tom Catena, Physician-Surgeon, Mother of Mercy Hospital in Gidel, South Kordofan (Nuba Mountains), Sudan* Samuel Totten

The following interview of Dr. Tom Catena by Samuel Totten was largely conducted in the Nuba Mountains, Sudan. Catena, a US citizen with a medical degree from Duke University in Durham, North Carolina, has what one can aptly describe as legendary status in the Nuba Mountains. He is the only physician-surgeon at the only hospital in the Nuba Mountains. Due to the fact that he cares for anyone who shows up at Mother Mercy Hospital in Gidel, he has seen up-close the human impact of the bombs the government of Sudan has dropped almost daily on the civilians of the Nuba Mountains since June 2011, as well as the impact of civilians being forced off their farms due to the aerial bombings—that run the entire gamut from malnutrition to starvation. His thoughts on the current crisis in the Nuba Mountains are fascinating and insightful. DOI: 10.3138/gsi.8.2.08 [http://bit.ly/gsi\\_82i](http://bit.ly/gsi_82i)

### REVIEWS

Katharina von Kellenbach, *The Mark of Cain: Guilt and Denial in the Post-War Lives of Nazi Perpetrators*, reviewed by Valerie Hébert

Ervin Staub, *Overcoming Evil: Genocide, Violent Conflict, and Terrorism*, reviewed by George R. Mastroianni

DOI: 10.3138/gsi.8.2.09 [http://bit.ly/gsi\\_82r](http://bit.ly/gsi_82r)

## CALL FOR PAPERS: THE TWELFTH MEETING OF IAGS JULY 8-12 2015, YEREVAN, ARMENIA

### **Comparative Analysis of 20th Century Genocides**

### **The Twelfth Meeting of the International Association of Genocide Scholars**

**July 8-12 2015, Yerevan, Armenia  
Call for Papers**

The International Association of Genocide Scholars (IAGS) will hold its twelfth meeting in Yerevan on 8-12 July 2015, hosted by the Armenian Genocide Museum & Institute (<http://www.genocide-museum.am/>). Director of the AGMI Hayk Demoyan will serve as Local Conference Chair.

The conference theme is “Comparative Analysis of 20th Century Genocides”.

2015 is an important year for all Armenians worldwide in terms of commemoration of the centennial of the beginning of the Armenian genocide. The Armenian genocide is sometimes considered as the first genocide of the 20th century and in many ways served as a template for subsequent genocidal crimes. 2015 is also the year of 70th anniversary of the end of WWII and the Holocaust. Therefore, it is a significant time to analyze both crimes and all genocides of the 20th century in global and comparative perspectives.

On April 24th 2015 the Armenian Genocide Museum and Institute will be opened after two years of renovation and new exhibition development. This is the first major re-opening since its inauguration in 1995. The renovated museum's mission and exhibits will feature all genocides that occurred after the Armenian genocide. New exhibits will enable all visitors to understand the deep roots, causes, dynamics of development and consequences of the genocide, while also offering a platform for dialogue.

The urgent need for early warning systems to prevent genocide, and efforts to revisit the basic concepts of the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, are matters of pressing concern. Related questions also arise: How were ideologies and religion instrumentalized for mass destruction during the 20th century? What kind of interaction exists between genocidal intent and genocidal processes? Who are the victims, perpetrators, bystanders and witnesses and how do we classify the relevant actors in different cases? How might the comparative study of 20th century genocide help to prevent 21st century genocides and mass atrocities? How might the legal consequences of the pre-1948 UN Convention “crimes against humanity” be settled?

IAGS and Armenian Genocide Museum and Institute welcome the submission of papers and presentations for the 12th IAGS conference to be held in Yerevan from July 8 to 12 with a theme of “Comparative analysis of 20th century genocides.”

Papers on all aspects of genocide and genocidal violence in the 20th century are welcomed, particularly following :

- “Genocide” - new definition of old crime.
- Conceptual dimensions of UN Convention: new approaches
- Armenian genocide: A template for further genocides
- Genocide of Greeks, Assyrians and Yezids in the Ottoman Empire
- Comparative Genocide Research: the Holocaust, genocide in Bosnia, Cambodia, Indonesia, Rwanda, Darfur and Latin American genocides.

## CALL FOR PAPERS: : THE TWELFTH MEETING OF IAGS JULY 8-12 2015, YEREVAN, ARMENIA

- The genocidal process: early warning signs, prediction, and prevention
- The dynamics, causes, and consequences of genocide
- Punishing genocidal crimes: the issue of reparations and limited capacity of international justice
- Genocide, collective memory, narrative and public commemorations
- Genocide education as a step towards prevention
- Genocide denial
- New directions in comparative genocide research: advances, problems, and possibilities for future research

Besides panels and papers, the organizers encourage other modes of presentation, including workshops, roundtable discussion, film screenings, book presentations, cultural media, and artistic works/readings.

The conference will begin with a visit to the newly developed exhibition of Armenian Genocide Museum & Institute. During the conference participants will be able to devote one day to an optional excursion to Gyumri, the city where the world largest orphanages were established by American Near East relief after the Armenian genocide and to visit Memorial to Musa Dagh Resistance in nearby Yerevan.

Attendance at the conference is open to all interested professionals and students, but presentation at the conference requires one to be a member of IAGS. For information on membership, please see <http://www.genocidescholars.org/membership>.

The applications for the participation in the meeting will be accepted by the due date, January 23, 2015. The applications should include: email address, title and abstract (250 words maximum in English) and a short 3-4 sentence biographical statement (please no CVs) should be sent to the organizational committee at: [iags2015yerevan@gmail.com](mailto:iags2015yerevan@gmail.com)

The quality and relevance of the applications will be assessed by the Conference Evaluation Committee. The Organizational Committee will cover the accommodation of selected participants from developing countries, whose institutions cannot pay their travel and other expenses and students and others with special circumstances. Further announcements will give information on how to apply for each of these benefits.

See more at: <http://www.genocidescholars.org/news/twelfth-meeting-iags-july-8-12-2015-yerevan-armenia#sthash.iPo8NRoG.dpuf>

## ISG PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE

All orders must be PREPAID with a check drawn on a U.S. bank made out to the Institute for the Study of Genocide. Please e-mail first to confirm availability of publication (e-mail feinhelen@comcast.net) and other information unless there is other ordering information for particular publications.

### *Darfur: Genocide Before Our Eyes*

ed. Joyce Apsel. Institute for the Study of Genocide, 3rd ed., 2007. \$20 in the U.S., \$25 in other countries by Global Priority Mail. Essays by Joyce Apsel on “Teaching About Darfur through the perspective of genocide and human rights”; Jerry Fowler, “The Evolution of Conflict and Genocide in Sudan,”; Eric Markusen and Samuel Totten, “Investigating allegations of genocide in Darfur”; Eric Reeves, “Darfur: Genocide before Our Eyes,”; Gregory Stanton, “Twelve Ways to Deny a Genocide”; and Jennifer Leaning, “The Human Impact of War in Darfur.” Also contains four maps, glossary, webography of sources on Sudan and the test of the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide. To order, first contact Joyce Apsel, jaa5@nyu.edu

### *The Prevention of Genocide: Rwanda and Yugoslavia Reconsidered*

(Institute for the Study of Genocide, 1994)

\$25 US / \$30 International (Prepaid, international money orders, U.S. Dollars only)

*Ever Again?: Evaluating the United Nations Genocide Convention On its 50th Anniversary.* (1998) Essays by noted scholars, journalist and lawyers. \$15 US / \$20 International

### *Teaching About Genocide: An Interdisciplinary Guidebook with Syllabi for College and University Teachers*

New Edition 2002, eds. Joyce Apsel and Helen Fein. Published for the Institute for the Study of Genocide in cooperation with the American Sociological Association. Syllabi by 22 noted teachers (in anthropology, history, international affairs, law, philosophy, political science, psychology, law, religion, sociology) on the Armenian genocide; the Holocaust; genocide and Holocaust; genocide; genocide, human rights and international affairs; essays by the editors; and selected internet websites on genocide. Cost for mailing in the US is \$18 for members of ISG, IAGS and ASA and \$22 for all others; add \$3 for Canada and Mexico and \$6 for other countries. To order, send check in US dollars drawn on a US bank or by credit card (American Express, MasterCard or Visa) to American Sociological Association: by mail (1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20005-4701); telephone (202 383 9005, ext. 318), by fax (202 638 0882) or web (www.asanet.org).

## SAVE OUR SPECIES: PAY YOUR ISG DUES

The Institute for the Study of Genocide exists to promote and disseminate scholarship and policy analyzes on the causes, consequences, and prevention of genocide. It is maintained by members' contributions and grants. The Newsletter is sent to all members of the ISG semiannually. Members will also receive working papers, annual meetings and conference notices, and voting rights at the annual meeting. Memberships are due annually. If you last paid dues in 2013, please rejoin for 2014 today. If you have received a complimentary copy of the Newsletter, please join us to be sure that you continue receiving copies. All contributions are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law.

Make out checks drawn on U.S. banks or international money orders in U.S. dollars to the Institute for the Study of Genocide and return with the form below or a photocopy of this form to:

Joyce Apsel, President ISG  
 925 Andover Terrace  
 Ridgewood, NJ 07450

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_

Postal Code: \_\_\_\_\_ Country: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>(Per Year)</b>	<b>Domestic (First Class)</b>	<b>International Air Mail (Air Printed Matter)</b>
Member	\$30	\$35
Supporter	\$50	\$60
Sponsor	\$100	\$110
Patron	\$500	\$510
Library ( <i>Newsletter*</i> only)	\$20	\$25

\*The *ISG Newsletter* is published twice a year.