

# DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

## Chapter 1 : Stages of Genocide

*The Rwandan genocide, also known as the genocide against the Tutsi, was a genocidal mass slaughter of Tutsi in Rwanda by members of the Hutu majority government. An estimated 1,000,000 Rwandans were killed during the day period from April 7 to mid-July, constituting as many as 70% of the Tutsi population.*

Although most well-known genocides are in the past, they still occur today. Less-developed countries with high poverty rates are particularly prone to genocidal attacks launched by corrupt governments or terrorist groups. Stanton, the stages of genocide are nonlinear, unpredictable and preventable. There are ten stages of genocide, and each stage can be stopped if preventive measures are taken. Ten Stages of Genocide Classification: People can be categorized by their ethnicity, nationality, race or religion. Societies with mixed categories, such as Burundi and Rwanda, are at greater risk of genocide. This early stage can be prevented by establishing institutions that integrate identities and promote tolerance. Names and symbols are assigned to classified people. They are defined by specific terms, color or dress. Without dehumanization, symbolization does not necessarily result in genocide. Political institutions can ban group marking and hate symbols, but these bans must be supported by popular culture enforcement. Denying symbolization can also be powerful. A dominant group of people denies the rights of other groups. The powerless group may be deprived of citizenship, civil rights or voting rights. Combatting discrimination requires full political empowerment and citizenship rights for all groups of people. Discrimination on any basis can be outlawed, and individuals can retain the right to appeal if their rights are violated. A group of people denies the humanity of another group. One group is regarded as less than human or even alien to the society. Genocide requires organization and is typically orchestrated by the state. States often use militias, but organization may be informal or decentralized. This stage can be averted by outlawing membership in genocidal militias, banning genocidal leaders from international travel and imposing arms embargos on countries involved in genocide. Extremists may further divide groups by forbidding intermarriage and social interaction. Hate groups may also broadcast polarizing propaganda. This can be curbed by protecting moderate leaders, assisting human rights groups and seizing extremist assets. Plans are made for genocidal killing where leaders propose the a solution to the problem of the targeted group. Targeted groups are identified and separated from the population. Victims may be segregated into ghettos or deported to concentration camps. A Genocide Emergency may be declared at this stage, whereby armed international intervention and humanitarian assistance should be provided. Refugee escape corridors and safe areas can be established. Denial lasts throughout and follows genocide as perpetrators attempt to destroy any evidence that indicates a genocide occurred. Denial can be combatted through legal punishment of perpetrators and education in schools and the media. Genocide Watch has three levels of Genocide Alerts: Genocide Watch is declared when early warning signs indicate potential persecution, Genocide Warning is called when massacres occur and genocide is imminent, and Genocide Emergency is declared when genocide is underway. There are currently eight Genocide Emergencies declared to be occurring around the world. Understanding the stages of genocide can prevent further genocidal massacres.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

## Chapter 2 : The Stages of Genocide and How to Prevent Them | The Borgen Project

*Genocide of Yazidis by ISIL Genocidal massacre, ethnic cleansing, that the systematic destruction of the Yazidi people by the Islamic State was genocide.*

Stanton, the president of Genocide Watch, presented the "8 Stages of Genocide" to the United States Department of State, citing that genocide develops in eight stages that are "predictable, but not inexorable. Stanton expanded the stages to 10 Stages of Genocide to include Discrimination and Persecution. The Genocide Report recognizes Dr. Stanton's 10 Stages of Genocide as the model by which to evaluate the process of genocide. Classification All cultures have categories to distinguish people into us and them; by ethnicity, race, religion, or nationality: German and Jew, Hutu and Tutsi. Bipolar societies that lack mixed categories, such as Rwanda and Burundi, are the most likely to have genocide. The main preventive measure at this early stage is to develop universalistic institutions that transcend ethnic or racial divisions, that actively promote tolerance and understanding, and that promote classifications that transcend the divisions. The Catholic Church could have played this role in Rwanda, had it not been torn apart by the same ethnic cleavages as Rwandan society. Promotion of a common language in countries like Tanzania has also promoted transcendent national identity. This search for common ground is vital to early prevention of genocide. Symbolization We give names or other symbols to the classifications. We name people; Jews or Gypsies; or distinguish them by colors or dress; and apply the symbols to members of groups. Classification and symbolization are universally human and do not necessarily result in genocide unless they lead to dehumanization. When combined with hatred, symbols may be forced upon unwilling members of pariah groups: To combat symbolization, hate symbols can be legally forbidden swastikas as can hate speech. Group marking like gang clothing or tribal scarring can be outlawed, as well. The problem is that legal limitations will fail if unsupported by popular cultural enforcement. Though Hutu and Tutsi were forbidden words in Burundi until the s, code-words replaced them. If widely supported, however, denial of symbolization can be powerful, as it was in Bulgaria, where the government refused to supply enough yellow badges and at least eighty percent of Jews did not wear them, depriving the yellow star of its significance as a Nazi symbol for Jews. Discrimination A dominant group uses law, custom, and political power to deny the rights of other groups. The powerless group may not be accorded full civil rights, voting rights, or even citizenship. The dominant group is driven by an exclusionary ideology that would deprive less powerful groups of their rights. The ideology advocates monopolization or expansion of power by the dominant group. It legitimizes the victimization of weaker groups. Advocates of exclusionary ideologies are often charismatic, expressing resentments of their followers, attracting support from the masses. Examples include the Nuremberg Laws of in Nazi Germany, which stripped Jews of their German citizenship, and prohibited their employment by the government and by universities. Denial of citizenship to the Rohingya Muslim minority in Burma is a current example. Prevention against discrimination means full political empowerment and citizenship rights for all groups in a society. Discrimination on the basis of nationality, ethnicity, race or religion should be outlawed. Individuals should have the right to sue the state, corporations, and other individuals if their rights are violated. Dehumanization One group denies the humanity of the other group. Members of it are equated with animals, vermin, insects or diseases. Dehumanization overcomes the normal human revulsion against murder. At this stage, hate propaganda in print and on hate radios is used to vilify the victim group. The majority group is taught to regard the other group as less than human, and even alien to their society. They are indoctrinated to believe that. We are better off without them. The powerless group can become so depersonalized that they are actually given numbers rather than names, as Jews were in the death camps. They are equated with filth, impurity, and immorality. Hate speech fills the propaganda of official radio, newspapers, and speeches. To combat dehumanization, incitement to genocide should not be confused with protected speech. Genocidal societies lack constitutional protection for countervailing speech, and should be treated differently than

## DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

democracies. Local and international leaders should condemn the use of hate speech and make it culturally unacceptable. Leaders who incite genocide should be banned from international travel and have their foreign finances frozen. Hate radio stations should be shut down, and hate propaganda banned. Hate crimes and atrocities should be promptly punished. Organization Genocide is always organized, usually by the state, often using militias to provide deniability of state responsibility the Janjaweed in Darfur. Sometimes organization is informal Hindu mobs led by local RSS militants or decentralized terrorist groups. Special army units or militias are often trained and armed. Plans are made for genocidal killings. Acts of genocide are disguised as counter-insurgency if there is an ongoing-armed conflict or civil war. The era of total war began in World War II. Firebombing did not differentiate civilians from non-combatants. The civil wars that broke out after the end of the Cold War have also not differentiated civilians and combatants. They cause widespread war crimes. Mass rapes of women have become a characteristic of all modern genocides. Arms flows to states and militias often in violation of UN Arms Embargoes facilitate acts of genocide. States organize secret police to spy on, arrest, torture, and murder people suspected of opposition to political leaders. Motivations for targeting a group are indoctrinated through mass media and special training murderous militias and special army killing units. To combat this stage, membership in these militias should be outlawed. Their leaders should be denied visas for foreign travel and their foreign assets frozen. Polarization Extremists drive the groups apart. Hate groups broadcast polarizing propaganda. Laws may forbid intermarriage or social interaction. Extremist terrorism targets moderates, intimidating and silencing the center. Leaders in targeted groups are the next to be arrested and murdered. The dominant group passes emergency laws or decrees that grants them total power over the targeted group. The laws erode fundamental civil rights and liberties. Targeted groups are disarmed to make them incapable of self-defense, and to ensure that the dominant group has total control. Prevention may mean security protection for moderate leaders or assistance to human rights groups. Assets of extremists may be seized, and visas for international travel denied to them. Vigorous objections should be raised to disarmament of opposition groups. If necessary they should be armed to defend themselves. Preparation National or perpetrator group leaders plan the Final Solution to the Jewish, Armenian, Tutsi or other targeted group question. They often use euphemisms to cloak their intentions, such as referring to their goals as ethnic cleansing, purification, or counter-terrorism. They build armies, buy weapons and train their troops and militias. They indoctrinate the populace with fear of the victim group. There is a sudden increase in inflammatory rhetoric and hate propaganda with the objective of creating fear of the other group. Political processes such as peace accords that threaten the total dominance of the genocidal group or upcoming elections that may cost them their grip on total power may actually trigger genocide. Prevention of preparation may include arms embargoes and commissions to enforce them. It should include prosecution of incitement and conspiracy to commit genocide, both crimes under Article 3 of the Genocide Convention. Persecution Victims are identified and separated out because of their ethnic or religious identity. Death lists are drawn up. In state sponsored genocide, members of victim groups may be forced to wear identifying symbols. Their property is expropriated. Sometimes they are even segregated into ghettos deported into concentration camps, or confined to a famine-struck region and starved. They are deliberately deprived of resources such as water or food in order to slowly destroy them. Programs are implemented to prevent procreation through forced sterilization or abortions. Children are forcibly taken from their parents. The victim groups basic human rights become systematically abused through extrajudicial killings, torture and forced displacement. They are acts of genocide because they intentionally destroy part of a group. The perpetrators watch for whether such massacres meet any international reaction. If not, they realize that the international community will again be bystanders and permit genocide. At this stage, a Genocide Emergency must be declared. If the political will of the great powers, regional alliances, or the U. Security Council or U. General Assembly can be mobilized, armed international intervention should be prepared, or heavy assistance provided to the victim group to prepare for its self-defense. Humanitarian assistance should be organized by the U.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

## Chapter 3 : The Rohingya Crisis: Ethnic Cleansing or Genocide? | The Claremont Journal of Law and Public

*Genocide, as defined in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, must involve provable intent to eliminate a group of people; ethnic cleansing, in opposition, does not necessitate the element of intent. Upon inspection, the qualifications of genocide parallel the situation at hand in Myanmar.*

Native American Genocide – onward years The determination of whether a historical event should be considered genocide can be a matter of scholarly debate. Some scholars argue that intent of genocide is not necessary, since genocide may be the cumulative result of minor conflicts in which settlers, or colonial or state agents, perpetrate violence against minority groups. Others argue that the dire consequences of European diseases among many New World populations were exacerbated by different forms of genocidal violence, and that intentional and unintentional deaths cannot easily be separated. Some scholars regard the colonization of the Americas as genocide, since they argue it was largely achieved through systematically exploiting, removing and destroying specific ethnic groups, even when most deaths were caused by disease and not direct violence from colonizers. While the overall death toll of man made deaths of Native Americans from both Americas is unknown, a few events in which many Native Americans from both Americas and across all centuries perished. The combined highest but roughly put death toll of natives in the Americas is put at around 1. This could be on top of the list from sheer estimation of the number of the dead but the correct number of the dead is unknown and so the numbers are taken from all accounts of known wars and forced work and labor where there was a possible estimation of the death toll. It has been estimated that, in their entirety, internal forced migrations affected some 6 million people. Some 1 to 1. An estimated 2,, Rwandans, mostly Hutus, were displaced and became refugees. The best estimation of the number of dead collectively ranges from 1. The death toll ranges from 1. The minimum death toll 1. Rough estimates of the death toll ranges from 4 up to as high as 10 million. Estimated death toll ranges from 4 to 6 million dead Jews. The number of 20 million was considered official during Soviet era. These figures have been accepted by most historians outside of Russia. However the official figure of 8. Officials at the Russian Central Defense Ministry Archive maintain that their database lists the names of roughly 14 million dead and missing service personnel. Some critics in Russia put total losses in the war, both civilians and military, at over 40 million.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

## Chapter 4 : The History Place - Genocide in the 20th Century: Bosnia-Herzegovina

*about the concept of genocide and in particular, the terms "massacre" (SÅ©melin and ) and "ethnic cleansing" (Mann ) as alternative concepts to genocide.*

Lindsay Glauner excerpted from: Because of indifference, one dies before one actually dies. Instead, the United States government, its agencies, and those involved with carrying out the measures designed to inflict genocidal acts against the Native American population must be held in violation of customary international law, as well as conventional international law, as proscribed in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide Genocide Convention. The term "genocide" was coined by Raphael Lemkin in and was derived from the Greek word *genos*, which means tribe or race, and the Latin word *cide*, which is commonly found in words such as homicide, infanticide, and fratricide. In his first enunciation of "genocide," Lemkin defined the term in two different ways: A practice is proscribed as a crime under customary international law through the existence of the following: Customary international law also recognizes any crime that is universally condemned by the international community as a *jus cogens* international crime, which gives rise to obligations *erga omnes*. In accordance with customary international law, an obligation *erga omnes* requires a state party to extradite or prosecute perpetrators of these crimes found within its territory. Because the international community has universally condemned genocide, as evidenced in part by the ratification of the Genocide Convention, it has risen to the level of a *jus cogens* international crime. As a result, any individuals, agencies, or states that commit genocide must be held accountable. According to the Vienna Convention on the Laws of Treaties, conventions are binding and enforceable against all states that have signed and ratified the specific convention. Therefore, in accordance to Article IV of the Genocide Convention, which requires all parties to prosecute those charged with genocide, conspiracy to commit genocide, direct and public incitement to commit genocide, attempt to commit genocide, and complicity in genocide, regardless of their capacity as a ruler or public official, in a competent tribunal within the State where the crime took place or in a competent international tribunal that has proper jurisdiction over the case, any persons or agencies that commit acts of genocide within the territory of the United States must be held accountable for their crimes. Even though the crime of genocide remains universally condemned by the international community, the United States government, its agencies, and its personnel have been effectively granted *de facto* immunity. The time has come to hold the perpetrators of these acts of genocide accountable and to formulate a system of reparation for the victims of these heinous international crimes, in order for the world, as well as the victims, to realize that justice does prevail in the international community. Because the United States had a direct role in perpetrating genocidal acts against Native Americans, it must be held accountable for these acts. The international community must hold these agencies and persons responsible, and an apology and reparations must be awarded to Native Americans for their grave losses. While the need for reparations is clear, the method used to provide these reparations remains at issue. Part II of this Comment will explore the evolution of the crime of genocide as proscribed under both customary and conventional international law. Part II will also address how international law is applied in the United States, specifically the Convention on the Prevention and Prohibition of Genocide and customary international law. Part IV will analyze how the United States government, its agencies, and its personnel committed acts of genocide against Native Americans. Part V will explore the implications of these acts of genocide on Native Americans today and the appropriate method of reparation.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

## Chapter 5 : Project MUSE - "Ethnic Cleansing" and Genocidal Intent: A Failure of Judicial Interpretation?

*In the aftermath of World War II, the Balkan states of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Croatia, Slovenia and Macedonia became part of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. After.*

Etymology[ edit ] An antecedent to the term is the Greek word andrapodismos Greek: Most Poles of Volhynia now in Ukraine had either been murdered or had fled the area. This process was repeated on an even larger scale in 1941, involving many other groups suspected of disloyalty towards the Soviet Union. After the beginning of the invasion of the USSR,[ clarification needed ] he concluded: It was widely popularized by the Western media during the Bosnian War 1992–95. The first recorded mention of its use in the Western media can be traced back to an article in The New York Times dated 15 April 1992, in a quote by an anonymous Western diplomat. Those practices constitute crimes against humanity and can be assimilated to specific war crimes. Furthermore, such acts could also fall within the meaning of the Genocide Convention. In the words of Andrew Bell-Fialkoff: At one end it is virtually indistinguishable from forced emigration and population exchange while at the other it merges with deportation and genocide. At the most general level, however, ethnic cleansing can be understood as the expulsion of a population from a given territory. Neither the intent, as a matter of policy, to render an area "ethnically homogeneous", nor the operations that may be carried out to implement such policy, can as such be designated as genocide: The expulsion of a group or part of a group does not in itself suffice for genocide. Waters argues that if similar circumstances arise in the future, this precedent would allow the ethnic cleansing of other populations under international law. Ethnic cleansing is similar to forced deportation or population transfer whereas genocide is the intentional murder of part or all of a particular ethnic, racial, religious, or national group. While ethnic cleansing and genocide may share the same goal and the acts used to perpetrate both crimes may often resemble each other, ethnic cleansing is intended to displace a persecuted population from a given territory, while genocide is intended to destroy a population. Genocide is the last resort of the frustrated ethnic cleanser. Please help improve it or discuss these issues on the talk page. This section possibly contains original research. Please improve it by verifying the claims made and adding inline citations. Statements consisting only of original research should be removed. July Learn how and when to remove this template message The 12th anniversary exhibition of ethnic cleansing in Abkhazia , which was held in Tbilisi in 2005. The survivors of the German population were forcibly expelled and the city was repopulated with Soviet citizens. In the s Bosnian war , ethnic cleansing was a common phenomenon. These included places of worship, cemeteries, works of art and historic buildings. According to numerous ICTY verdicts, both Serb [25] and Croat [26] forces performed ethnic cleansing of their intended territories in order to create ethnically pure states Republika Srpska and Herzeg-Bosnia. Serb forces were also judged to have committed genocide in Srebrenica and Zepa at the end of the war. During the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict , the armed Abkhaz separatist insurgency implemented a campaign of ethnic cleansing against the large population of ethnic Georgians. When enforced as part of a political settlement, as happened with the forced resettlement of ethnic Germans to the new Germany after 1945, it can contribute to long-term stability. Silent ethnic cleansing[ edit ] A ceremony marking the 16th anniversary of Operation Storm , which resulted in the expulsion of more than 100,000 ethnic Serbs from Croatia. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. August Learn how and when to remove this template message Silent ethnic cleansing is a term coined in the mids by some observers of the Yugoslav Wars. Apparently concerned with Western media representations of atrocities committed in the conflict—which generally focused on those perpetrated by the Serbs—“atrocities committed against Serbs were dubbed "silent" on the grounds that they did not receive adequate coverage.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

## Chapter 6 : Bosnian Genocide - HISTORY

*Introduction. Cultural homogenization, ethnic cleansing, and genocide can be seen as part of a continuum. Throughout the modern era, states have forced their citizens to conform to common standards and cultural patterns.*

I want to begin not just by thanking the US Holocaust Memorial Museum for bringing the question of genocide to public attention but also to thank you for coming. The persistence of genocide is a question most people would rather not think or talk about, a question which haunts a number of thoughtful people. What I will do tonight is to explore the extent of political death in this century, distinguish genocide from other killing, and tell you something in what I have learned of the causes of genocide. I will consider why the Holocaust may be a deceptive model, consider the case of Bosnia, and conclude on a note of sceptical optimism, giving you a notion of what could be done to deter genocide. So there is something to which you can look forward. We begin this series with the consciousness of the scope and range of horrors in the twentieth century. This has been a century of murders by states and non-state actors—death squads, party paramilitaries, guerrillas—but mainly by states. Rummel, has estimated that purposeful state killings of civilians, which he calls democide, have taken the lives of million people in this century. Almost one-fourth of them Others were victims of politicide, mass killing of political groups, indiscriminate state massacres, forced labor and concentration camps, of bombing of civilians, and of starvation imposed and reinforced by the state. The number of victims in this century surpasses the population of all but the five largest states in the world today. However, this applied only to acts conducted during war or in preparation for war. The subsequent United Nations Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide UNGC —hereinafter called the Genocide Convention—applies to acts committed in peace and war, against the nationals of other states and against citizens of your state. Regardless of the record and our need for clear thinking on these issues, some cynics doubt the existence of genocide as other than a rhetorical weapon because the concept of genocide has been diminished, vulgarized and banalized in public rhetoric. This has been done especially in the United States and is done by persons and groups of all political persuasions vying to aggrandize their cause as victims. Opposing policies labelled as genocide include school integration and segregation; voluntary and forced abortion; tolerating drug addiction and instituting methadone drug-control programs. Threats and trends labelled as genocide or genocidal include birth control, dieting, family planning, opposition to bi-lingual education and suburbanization. Calling an issue, a person, a phenomenon as genocide appears to many the ultimate charge, leaving no room for analysis or debate. Despite all these misuses, it is apparent from the daily newspapers that we need a clear concept of genocide to employ when it is appropriate. Definitions and indicators enable us to recognize the persistence of genocide, to monitor genocidal massacres and genocidal ideology in order to devise appropriate strategies to prevent it. Since the Holocaust, genocides have been repeated on every continent; 13 to 20 cases have been documented. Because of its geographical limits, it omits cases in the Soviet Union, Paraguay, and Guatemala]. Genocides and state political killings have taken the lives of over four times the number of people killed in war between and including civilians according to one recent survey. Other surveys have led to similar findings. One team of scholars show that state killings between and have claimed more than twice as many lives as have wars. Similarly, state killings caused about two and a half times the number of lives lost in the aftermath of natural disasters between and Genocide, said my caller from Zagreb Dr. Slobodan Lang of the Helsinki Watch Committee , has become the most successful crime of this century. Unlike an occupation or colonial enterprise, its results can not be undone. Since , the practice of genocide has reoccurred in Europe, where it was stopped, we had wishfully believed, forever. We first need to understand how this has happened in order to figure out how we can change the habits of existing institutions and create new institutions to prevent and stop genocide. Although we often repeat the warning of Santayana that those who forget history are doomed to repeat it, we often overlook the fact that not forgetting does not lead in itself to not repeating. I do not mean to imply that history reiterates the

## DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

same pattern mechanically regardless of what we do. For genocides, like other great and terrible events, are never the same entirely and yet reveal some common elements, rationales, and preconditions. In order to devise a strategy to stop genocide, we have to understand what it is. This has been muddled both by those people who see the Holocaust as the paradigm for other genocides and by those who see the Holocaust as radically unique. Let us start by clarifying the terms. Some use it only to refer to the annihilation of the Jews. I use it to refer to the train of genocides in World War 2, beginning with the Final Solution and going on to the collection and annihilation of the Gypsies. The concept of genocide and the UNGC [Convention] are largely attributable to the writing and single-minded work of Raphael Lemkin, a Polish Jewish jurist, who gave up a career as a law professor in the Ivy League to lobby for the Convention in the halls of the United Nations. Lemkin first introduced the concept of genocide to explain German population and occupation policies in a book published in 1944. Genocide was the aim Lemkin perceived behind German plans to destroy whole nations and races both directly and indirectly. The Jews were to be destroyed immediately and completely. Racial discrimination in feeding Today, the authoritative definition of genocide is that of Article 2 of the Genocide Convention: Genocide means any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical [sic], racial, or religious group as such: Although the Convention has been international law since 1948, due to domestic opposition the United States only signed it and the Senate approved it as a treaty in 1988. There has been much controversy over the UNGC definition. Many scholars and some lawyers are dissatisfied with the definition of the Convention for several reasons: I believe that the Convention definition is a good one, a great advance in international law in the 20th century. Genocide had to be defined generically to protect groups whose enduring nature and right to exist was agreed upon. It was not agreed and probably would not be agreed on today that political groups—“including the Nazi SA, Black September, the Party of God, and the Khmer Rouge”—deserve special protection. It is not even agreed in even human rights convocations that homosexuals merit specific protection. The Convention definition is a workable one, I believe. We do not know to what extent it can stretch because we have no case law. The UN could not set a numeric threshold e. The principal problem with the UNGC is that it can not be invoked by the victim directly but depends on states, usually the perpetrators or bystanders of genocide, to invoke it. This is akin to asking the wolves to guard the sheep. Even in cases in which the government which perpetrates genocide loses power or falls, as in the case of Bangla Desh and Cambodia, other states have not prosecuted the perpetrators. Many scholars use briefer definitions for research. I have listed several definitions on the accompanying handout, including my own, which seeks to parallel the terms of the convention but to apply it to all collectivities—“nonviolent groups with shared identification and values. My definition is that: Genocide is sustained purposeful action by a perpetrator to physically destroy a collectivity directly or indirectly, through interdiction of the biological and social reproduction of group members, sustained regardless of the surrender or lack of threat offered by the victim. Scholars have different definitions which often reflect their research and other agendas. Rather than read these definitions and comment on them, what I try to show in the next diagram projected on the screen is the actual import of the differences between my colleagues and myself in terms of extensiveness. The narrowest and radically unique definition is that of Steven Katz, who defines only the attempted total annihilation of a people as genocide and considers the annihilation of the Jews during the Holocaust as the only case of genocide in history. Katz does not consider the Gypsies as victims of genocide and says that they were gassed at Auschwitz because they had typhus. It is not clear whether this was a public health measure to protect the remaining Gypsies or the Jews. Katz has replied to my criticism that his definition would not apprehend the Holocaust in process, as a genocide-in-the-making, by asserting that the Holocaust could be classified as a genocide, by his definition, by This appears to me late in the day for an estimated 1, Jews or Further, an additional , About one in every five Jews in the Warsaw ghetto died from hunger and disease before the deportations of July In the middle are a number of definitions which overlap in large part: This is a free-form diagram, and the space between them is not meant to be based on an exact metric. The most expanded definition is that of Israel Charny, founder and President on the International

## DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide. This does not mean that the issues Charny and Kuper address—“including nuclear and fire-bombing”—are not serious issues with moral and human-rights dimensions, but that they I believe that they are neither better understood nor stopped by labelling them as genocide. But Rummell differentiates genocide from democide; over three-fourths of the victims of democide are not victims of genocide. There is a need, it seems to me, to put genocide and the Convention in the context of both human rights law and sociological theories of intergroup relations, collective violence, political violence, and state terror. Genocides and other state murders are most apt to be committed by totalitarian and authoritarian governments. Among the latter, there is often a history of intergroup violence—“pogroms, communal massacres, race riots—and rebellion which precede genocide. But most intergroup and political violence, such as that between supporters of the African National Congress and Inkatha to which Charny alluded prior to the transfer of power, does not escalate to genocide. To detect and trace genocide, I devised a paradigm or set of conditions to look for: There was a sustained attack or continuity of attacks by the perpetrator to physically destroy group members; The perpetrator was a collective or organized actor or commander of organized actors; Victims were selected because they were members of a collectivity; The victims were defenseless or were killed regardless of whether they surrendered or resisted; and The destruction of group members was undertaken with intent to kill and murder was sanctioned by the perpetrator. To detect genocides, we can not use the Holocaust as a mechanical model or template for the Holocaust was in many ways singular. Further, no one appreciated the magnitude of the Holocaust until it was over—“perhaps because it was over. The Holocaust is singular, I believe, because of at least two characteristics. Firstly, it was a transnational genocide, affording us the opportunity to observe the same process in country after country. This is unlikely to happen again, for a continental-wide victory, such as that of Nazi Germany, would not be tolerated in any continent. Second is its duration. It was the product of a ruler who had announced his fantasy or intent a decade before coming to power, almost two decades before the Final Solution began. Thus, the extent and length of warning time of intent is singular; it is only fair to say that not all scholars agree with this. Even if we restrict the length of warning-time to the date of inception of the Final Solution, June , it went on for almost four whole years. Few dictators who precipitate genocide these days are so articulate or public about their intentions as was Adolf Hitler. Large numbers of Americans before the war were hostile to Jews and viewed them as somehow responsible for their persecution. So, the imputed innocence of the target group is not an indicator of whether they are or are not victims of genocide. Genocides before and after the Second World War have had many instigators: More common is retributive genocide, in which an elite of a dominant ethnic group destroys a significant part of another group which it fears will take its place as the dominant group. There are also developmental genocides, the destruction of indigenous people seen to be in the way of development, competing with the dominant group for land and resources. Lastly, there are despotic genocides to eliminate potential opponents, such as undertaken by Idi Amin in Uganda between and

# DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

## Chapter 7 : Genocide of Yazidis by ISIL - Wikipedia

*cultural homogenization, ethnic cleansing universalistic viewpoint, considering not only the Jews, the Roma and other victims of the Holocaust, but the broader Nazi agenda for the demographic.*

Personal use only; commercial use is strictly prohibited for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice. Many writers see the massive depopulation of the indigenous population of the Americas after as a clear-cut case of the genocide. Other writers, however, contend that European and U. To a significant extent, disagreements about the pervasiveness of genocide in the history of the post-Columbian Western Hemisphere, in general, and U. Conservative definitions emphasize intentional actions and policies of governments that result in very large population losses, usually from direct killing. More liberal definitions call for less stringent criteria for intent, focusing more on outcomes. They do not necessarily require direct sanction by state authorities; rather, they identify societal forces and actors. They also allow for several intersecting forces of destruction, including dispossession and disease. Because debates about genocide easily devolve into quarrels about definitions, an open-ended approach to the question of genocide that explores several phases and events provides the possibility of moving beyond the present stalemate. However one resolves the question of genocide in American Indian history, it is important to recognize that European and U. These include violence resulting directly from settler expansion, intertribal violence frequently aggravated by colonial intrusions, enslavement, disease, alcohol, loss of land and resources, forced removals, and assaults on tribal religion, culture, and language. The configuration and impact of these forces varied considerably in different times and places according to the goals of particular colonial projects and the capacities of colonial societies and institutions to pursue them. The capacity of Native people and communities to directly resist, blunt, or evade colonial invasions proved equally important. Did the actions and policies of Europeans and U. Americans toward Indians qualify as genocide or not? Academics, students, citizens, in short, almost everyone has an opinion on the subject. Some are certain that the answer to the question is yes, that the massive depopulation of indigenous America after was a clear-cut case of genocide. Others, however, are equally certain that the answer is no, namely that European and U. American actions and policies toward Indians were at least sometimes deplorable but cannot be labeled as genocidal. This essay begins with the premise that the issue of genocide in American Indian history is far too complex to yield a simple yes-or-no answer. The relevant history, after all, is a long one more than five hundred years involving hundreds of indigenous nations and several European and neo-European empires and imperial nation-states. While it would be absurd to reduce this history to any single category, genocide included, it would be reasonable to predict that genocide was a part of this history. With this in mind, the essay invites readers to resist a tendency toward a quick or easy resolution of the question of genocide in American Indian history and to engage in an open-ended exploration. The object is not a definitive answer but a clarification of the issues. More than many debates, those about genocide often center on definitions. Because of this fact, readers might expect an essay on genocide to begin by discussing various definitions of the term and related terms such as ethnic cleansing and cultural genocide and proceed either to argue for one definition as authoritative or to propose a new one. This approach, however, would work against my objective of facilitating an open-ended exploration of the issue, and so a formal discussion of definitions will be deferred to the historiographical section at the end of this essay, though, as the essay develops, it will pause periodically to consider how specific events or phases might or might not be regarded as genocidal depending on definitions that have been or could be applied to them. As will become apparent, debates about whether or not specific cases and phases qualify as genocide typically center on these issues: Virgin Soil Epidemics and Native Depopulation Discussions about genocide in the Americas often begin with the moment of initial contact between Europeans and Native people and emphasize the catastrophic impact of European diseases especially smallpox and measles for which Indians had no acquired immunity. A standard estimate was 8 million for the entire hemisphere and 1 million north of the Rio

## DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

Grande. In the s, however, the anthropologist Henry Dobyns took account of disease to provide much higher estimates of 75 million for the hemisphere and 10â€”12 million north of Mexico. If 75 million people lived in the Western Hemisphere in and the death toll from epidemic disease was 70, 80, or even 90 percent as was sometimes the case , the sheer numbers 50â€”60 million are overwhelming and compel recognition as genocide when measured against the numbers for commonly accepted cases of genocide in the twentieth century. Good reason exists, however, to challenge the premise that the extent and intentionality of initial depopulation from disease is crucial to the question of genocide and American Indian history. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that European and European American actions toward the Indians of eastern North America during the eighteenth century long after the first epidemics were consistently genocidal according to the most conservative definition of the successful execution of a societal or governmental intention to physically kill all Indians. An arithmetic approach assigning the majority of total deaths to disease would argue against regarding the last phase in depopulation as genocide, yet why should the number of Indians in that region who had died earlier from disease have any bearing on an assessment of whether the annihilation of the survivors would qualify as genocide or not? Whether the annihilated survivors were 10, 30, or 50 percent of a pre-Columbian population would be irrelevant. For a discussion of genocide, then, the issue is not so much the impact of initial epidemics but the effects of direct actions Europeans and European Americans took toward Indians through wars of conquest, enslavement, forced dispossession and removal, and destruction of material resources. War, for example, can result in displacement, impoverishment, and social stress, thus increasing vulnerability to pathogens. Often, in fact, epidemic disease did not appear at the moment of initial contact but instead emerged at a later stage when processes of colonization were well underway. Disease and Other Forces of Destruction To make these observations more concrete, let us look at what happened in the place where Columbus first landed, the Caribbean. Soon after landing, some of the crew became ill, probably from influenza, and infected the Native populations of Hispaniola, Cuba, and Jamaica. The severity of the epidemic was probably related to the prior lack of exposure of Indians to the pathogens in question, though the epidemic cannot be separated from other forces of destruction. To create and maintain slavery and to suppress real and imagined insurrections, the Spanish regularly maimed, murdered, and waged war against Native people. The purpose was not to kill every single Indian some were needed to work but to terrorize them into submission. Rape, evidently common, did not simply reveal individual or group pathologies, it functioned as a tool of terror. Violence, then, was central to Spanish colonization in the Caribbean, although far more Indians died from disease, malnutrition, and starvation. It is clear, however, that as the Spanish colonizing project expanded in the early sixteenth century, its destructive impacts escalated. Another major epidemicâ€”smallpoxâ€”swept through the islands in â€” By this time, however, the indigenous population of the major islands had been greatly reduced. On Hispaniola only twenty to thirty thousand adult Tainos remained alive, far fewer than the pre-Columbian population of at least several hundred thousand and by some estimates as high as 8 million. In this instance, then, smallpox, so often appearing as an initial destroyer, arrived with a horrific catastrophe well underway. By , the Native population of Hispaniola was only two thousand. Enslaved Africans were now the main source of labor. Some analysts might apply a strict interpretation of intent and conclude that the Spanish did not commit genocide, since they did not establish a formal plan to exterminate all Indians. Other analysts, however, might observe that the large majority of Indians who died during these fifty years did so under conditions that the Spanish created as they pursued their objectives and contend that this should be considered genocide under a looser interpretation of intent. The timing of disease and its intersection with other forces of destruction varied from region to region within the Americas. It was not until the late seventeenth century that the classic killer smallpox appeared. When it did its spread was closely connected to the British colonial project of exploiting existing indigenous practices of captive taking to create markets both for slaves outside Indian country and for European goods manufacturers, alcohol, clothing within it. The slave trade directly contributed to the depopulation of many Indian communities, but its most damaging consequence was the creation of conditions for the transmission of

## DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

epidemic disease. When smallpox broke out in Virginia it spread rapidly along networks of human contact that had been shaped by violence, deracination, and deprivation, destroying Indian communities from the Carolinas to the Gulf Coast and up the Mississippi River to Illinois. It was only now, two hundred years after the first European set foot in the Southeast, that Native populations experienced the catastrophic population declines usually associated with initial contact epidemics. As in the Caribbean, when smallpox struck, it was a consequence of European economic pursuits. It was not until almost three hundred years after Columbus that Europeans began exploring the coast of what is now Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia. Smallpox first appeared in the region in the mids, probably transmitted by Spanish expeditions landing along the coast. Over the next fifty years, smallpox epidemics continued to devastate Native communities, though in contrast to expectations of a linear population decline, northwestern Indians were able to recover a good part of their post-contact losses. Indians had time to recover between epidemics, and these epidemics became less severe over time as surviving populations acquired immunities to a greater range of disease. The main European colonial project in the Northwest was the fur trade. The exchange of furs for European goods occasionally led to disputes that sometimes became violent. Over time, the trade encouraged consumption of alcohol, prostitution, and destruction of game, all forces that damaged Indian health and community well-being. Compared to many other colonial enterprises, however, the fur trade was relatively benign and had positive short-term consequences for individuals and communities who were positioned to improve their material well-being and advance strategic objectives. However, in the s malaria—a new disease—repeatedly struck Chinooks and Kalapuyas along the lower Columbia and Willamette Rivers. According to anthropologist Robert Boyd, between and , the Native population in this area declined by as much as 90 percent. Unlike the smallpox epidemic in the Southeast, the s malaria epidemics in the Northwest were only indirectly related to colonialism. Europeans, of course, introduced malaria probably by way of Pacific trade networks , but the disease spread in an environment that European colonial projects had not yet disrupted. The crucial question is what happened next. One thing that happened is that Native populations did not recover or, to put it another way, were never allowed to recover. Although missionaries offered Christian conversion, as historian Gray Whaley has argued, they saw colonization as a progressive development that might allow for the salvation of a few individual Indians but would otherwise result in their general dispossession and extermination. Once settlers arrived, they forced Indians off their land, often squatting on Native land in advance of treaties, which eventually legalized dispossession. Instead, the on-the-ground facts of squatter occupation combined with severe material deprivation and the threat and actual use of violence constituted powerful means of coercion. Violence was especially pronounced in southwestern Oregon in the early s when gold rush settlers waged a war of extermination against Indians, a clear-cut case of genocidal intent. For some, though, even this case might not qualify as genocide, since the federal government did not directly sanction settler actions even though it did underwrite expansion into the region. In the same decade, settlers in the Puget Sound area went to war to subdue a Native resistance movement led by the Nisqually chief Leschi. In this situation, however, war did not escalate into one of total elimination, as a relatively small settler population lacked the inclination, impetus, and power to eliminate Indians. The actions of the Pilgrims and Puritans toward Indians, especially, are seen as constitutive and emblematic of a subsequent colonial and U. In , just prior to the arrival of the Pilgrims, an epidemic variously identified as typhus, yellow fever, and leptospirosis struck New England coastal Indian communities and raged for three years. Current estimates are that the epidemic killed up to 90 percent of the Native population in the Massachusetts Bay area. Supported by Naragansett and Mohegan allies, a colonial force set fire to a village of several hundred Pequots on the Mystic River and killed most of those who tried to escape. The colonists hunted down surviving Pequots, killing some and selling others into slavery, and then imposed a treaty that abolished the Pequot nation. Under a narrow definition of genocide as requiring an intention to physically eliminate every single individual of an ethnic or racial group even if the relevant group is limited to the Pequots and is not construed as all Indians , the Pequot War does not qualify. If, however, the definition is loosened to include cases of an intention to destroy a group by physically

## DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

eliminating a substantial portion of its numbers, it probably does, since evidence is abundant of an exterminatory disposition prior to the Mystic River massacre. On the spectrum of available definitions of genocide, some of which assess impact, not intention, and some of which require only cultural destruction, this one is still fairly conservative since it retains the necessity for intent and massive killing. For those critical of the Puritans, the Pequot War has the status of a national original sin, and so it is understandable that it would become the focus of intense debate about genocide. What decision is reached about this particular case, however, may not be of more than limited utility in resolving the broader question of genocide in American history. Ultimately, this involves taking into account complex histories spanning at least three centuries. But these events are generally treated as precursors to a more extended consideration of genocide in the history of the United States. Writers who indict the United States and its citizens for genocide cite depopulation from disease, sometimes alleging its intentional infliction. The most frequent charge is that the army or fur traders distributed smallpox blankets to Indians on the upper Missouri River in 1792. Overall, though, arguments for genocide tend to place more emphasis on massacres and forced removals than disease. Unlike the debate on the Pequot War, in which antagonists have staked out clear positions, there has been no point-by-point response to arguments that the United States systematically committed genocide.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

## Chapter 8 : "Ethnic cleansing"™ and "genocide"™ | European Journal of Public Health | Oxford A

*Genocide is the deliberate and systematic destruction, in whole or in part, of an ethnic, racial, religious or national group. The term was coined in by Raphael Lemkin.*

Messenger It has been 20 years since Bosnian Serb forces killed and secretly buried more than 7, Muslim men and boys over three tragic days in Srebrenica. The awful event is the only legally recognised genocide to have taken place in Europe since World War II. But as the world prepares to mark the incident, Russia has vetoed a UN resolution to acknowledge that genocide took place at Srebrenica. Its ambassador dismissed the resolution as a politically motivated attempt to blame one side for the terrible events that took place in the Balkans in the s. This is just the latest twist in a dispute about whether the killings were genocide and, if they were, why other terrible war crimes committed during the collapse of the former Yugoslavia were not. It is fairly clear that people do not like genocide " not enough to stop committing it, but just enough to protest vehemently if they or their ancestors are accused of it. There has been a similar reluctance to accept the magnitude of what happened in Srebrenica. The day after being sworn in as president of Serbia in , Tomislav Nikolic went on Montenegrin TV to say that the Srebrenica killings were a war crime, by people who should be brought to justice " but that the events were not genocide. A year later, he made an historic apology for the killings but maintained that it had not been proven to be genocide. Aleksandar Vucic, the current prime minister of Serbia, is reportedly preparing to attend the official 20th anniversary commemorations of the massacre, but this has angered some people because there is still no official acceptance by Serbia that genocide took place. Narrow definition Perhaps the most staggering thing about this debate, though, is that Srebrenica is the only incident legally classified as genocide in the Yugoslav conflict, despite all the other atrocious war crimes and crimes against humanity that are known to have taken place. An exhibition in Geneva marks the Srebrenica anniversary. The Bosnian Serbs targeted the Bosnian Muslims as a specific ethnic or religious group. In legal terms, there was, at Srebrenica only, the special intent to destroy an ethnic or religious group. This sets it apart, according to the Genocide Convention , which is where genocide and its special intent are defined. Or, more specifically, according to how the convention has been interpreted by high-profile courts and tribunals. The same conclusion was reached by the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur. Instead the people who planned and organised attacks on villages pursued the intent to drive the victims from their homes. When ethnic cleansing becomes a defence The effect of this is that if a case goes to the ICJ via the Genocide Convention, reparations or other remedies can only be given if genocide is proven. If the abhorrent actions do not carry that special intent, they might still be war crimes and crimes against humanity but the ICJ is powerless to act against states that commit the actions. The individual perpetrators might face trial, but there can be no sanctions against the state they served. The unfortunate consequences of this were brought into stark relief earlier in this 20th anniversary year in the case of Croatia v. The ICJ accepted this, and repeated the findings of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, which had found that various war crimes and crimes against humanity were aimed at forcing the Croats out of certain regions rather than destroying the group. The Serbian defence was that it was not committing genocide because, instead, it was carrying out ethnic cleansing. It cannot be right that ethnic cleansing has become a defence to genocide. At least then, we might stand an outside chance of being able to give support to victims and their family, and to rehabilitate those who deny, or even celebrate, their role in or support for genocide.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

## Chapter 9 : Genocide and Other State Murders in the Twentieth Century – United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

*Definitions and indicators enable us to recognize the persistence of genocide, to monitor genocidal massacres and genocidal ideology in order to devise appropriate strategies to prevent it. Since the Holocaust, genocides have been repeated on every continent; 13 to 20 cases have been documented.*

In the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina, conflict between the three main ethnic groups, the Serbs, Croats, and Muslims, resulted in genocide committed by the Serbs against the Muslims in Bosnia. Bosnia is one of several small countries that emerged from the break-up of Yugoslavia, a multicultural country created after World War I by the victorious Western Allies. Yugoslavia was composed of ethnic and religious groups that had been historical rivals, even bitter enemies, including the Serbs Orthodox Christians, Croats Catholics and ethnic Albanians Muslims. A fierce resistance movement sprang up led by Josip Tito. Tito, a Communist, was a strong leader who maintained ties with the Soviet Union and the United States during the Cold War, playing one superpower against the other while obtaining financial assistance and other aid from both. After his death in and without his strong leadership, Yugoslavia quickly plunged into political and economic chaos. A new leader arose by the late s, a Serbian named Slobodan Milosevic, a former Communist who had turned to nationalism and religious hatred to gain power. He began by inflaming long-standing tensions between Serbs and Muslims in the independent province of Kosovo. Orthodox Christian Serbs in Kosovo were in the minority and claimed they were being mistreated by the Albanian Muslim majority. Serbian-backed political unrest in Kosovo eventually led to its loss of independence and domination by Milosevic. In June, Slovenia and Croatia both declared their independence from Yugoslavia soon resulting in civil war. The national army of Yugoslavia, now made up of Serbs controlled by Milosevic, stormed into Slovenia but failed to subdue the separatists there and withdrew after only ten days of fighting. Milosevic quickly lost interest in Slovenia, a country with almost no Serbs. Instead, he turned his attention to Croatia, a Catholic country where Orthodox Serbs made up 12 percent of the population. Serbs living in Croatia as well as Jews had been the targets of widespread Ustasha massacres. In the concentration camp at Jasenovac, they had been slaughtered by the tens of thousands. In, the new Croat government, led by Franjo Tudjman, seemed to be reviving fascism, even using the old Ustasha flag, and also enacted discriminatory laws targeting Orthodox Serbs. In the city of Vukovar, they bombarded the outgunned Croats for 86 consecutive days and reduced it to rubble. After Vukovar fell, the Serbs began the first mass executions of the conflict, killing hundreds of Croat men and burying them in mass graves. The response of the international community was limited. An arms embargo was imposed for all of the former Yugoslavia by the United Nations. However, the Serbs under Milosevic were already the best armed force and thus maintained a big military advantage. By the end of, a U. In April, the U. Sarajevo soon became known as the city where Serb snipers continually shot down helpless civilians in the streets, including eventually over 3, children. Bosnian Muslims were hopelessly outgunned. As the Serbs gained ground, they began to systematically roundup local Muslims in scenes eerily similar to those that had occurred under the Nazis during World War II, including mass shootings, forced repopulation of entire towns, and confinement in make-shift concentration camps for men and boys. The Serbs also terrorized Muslim families into fleeing their villages by using rape as a weapon against women and girls. Despite media reports of the secret camps, the mass killings, as well as the destruction of Muslim mosques and historic architecture in Bosnia, the world community remained mostly indifferent. Thus they remained steadfastly neutral no matter how bad the situation became. Throughout, confident that the U. Bosnian Serbs operated under the local leadership of Radovan Karadzic, president of the illegitimate Bosnian Serb Republic. Karadzic had once told a group of journalists, "Serbs and Muslims are like cats and dogs. They cannot live together in peace. Sights and sounds of the bloody carnage were broadcast globally by the international news media and soon resulted in calls for military intervention against the Serbs. A total of six Muslim towns had been established as Safe Havens in May under the supervision of U. Bosnian Serbs not only attacked the Safe Havens but also attacked

## DOWNLOAD PDF STATES OF GENOCIDE, GENOCIDAL MASSACRES, AND ETHNIC CLEANSING

the U. NATO forces responded by launching limited air strikes against Serb ground positions. The Serbs retaliated by taking hundreds of U. At this point, some of the worst genocidal activities of the four-year-old conflict occurred. In Srebrenica, a Safe Haven, U. In addition, the Serbs continued to engage in mass rapes of Muslim females. On August 30, , effective military intervention finally began as the U. The bombardment continued into October. Serb forces also lost ground to Bosnian Muslims who had received arms shipments from the Islamic world. As a result, half of Bosnia was eventually retaken by Muslim-Croat troops. On November 1, , leaders of the warring factions including Milosevic and Tudjman traveled to the U. After three weeks of negotiations, a peace accord was declared. Terms of the agreement included partitioning Bosnia into two main portions known as the Bosnian Serb Republic and the Muslim-Croat Federation. The agreement also called for democratic elections and stipulated that war criminals would be handed over for prosecution. By now, over , Muslim civilians had been systematically murdered. More than 20, were missing and feared dead, while 2,, had become refugees. It was, according to U.