**Part I: Defining Genocide**

 According to the United Nations Genocide Convention, genocide is a coordinated plan to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group by killing, causing serious bodily or mental harm, inflicting conditions designed to bring about its destruction, preventing births within the group, or removing children from the group. Many genocides have occurred throughout history, from the murder of Christians by the Romans in the first century to the deaths of nearly one million people in Rwanda in 1994. Yet the word genocide did not exist until the 1940s.

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

***Who devised the term "genocide"?***

 Raphael Lemkin, a legal scholar, recognized that these questions needed to be answered. He began thinking about the questions after the Armenian Genocide (1915-1918) and contemplated the answers from the early 1920s until his death. Lemkin followed the case of a young Armenian, Soghomon Tehlirian, who had murdered the Turkish minister of the interior in Berlin in 1920 because Tehlirian held the minister responsible for the organized killing of Armenians. Lemkin found it hard to understand a system in which Tehlirian could be charged and tried for the death of a single man, but which did not hold Turkish leaders accountable for killing more than a million Armenians.

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

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

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

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

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

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

***How did World War II change the international community?***

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

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

***What were the Nuremberg trials?***

 Following their victory, the Allies kept the promise they had made and put twenty-four accused Nazi war criminals on trial in Nuremberg, Germany. (Many others would be tried later on; some were never tried.) They were charged with crimes against peace, crimes against humanity, and violating the rules of war. Numerous defendants argued that only a state and not individuals could be held responsible for these actions. They also argued that their actions were not illegal because under the long-held international principle of state sovereignty a country is protected from outside interference. The court rejected these arguments and sentenced twelve defendants to death and six to prison terms; three were acquitted. (Two of the defendants were not sentenced: one had committed suicide and the other was physically and mentally unable to stand trial.)

***What important legal principles emerged from the Nuremberg Trials?***

 The defendants at Nuremberg had been found guilty of crimes against humanity—not genocide, although Lemkin had encouraged the prosecutors to include the term genocide in the indictment. Even so, the international community agreed that some important legal principles came out of the Nuremberg Trials. These Principles of the Nuremberg Tribunal were adopted into international law in 1950, eroding the absoluteness of state sovereignty.

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

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

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

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

***Why did Lemkin propose a UN resolution banning genocide?***

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

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

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

***The Genocide Convention***

 Traveling between New York and Geneva, Lemkin continued to lobby hard for the treaty. On December 9, 1948, the UN unanimously passed the Genocide Convention. The treaty made genocide a crime and obligated its signers to prevent, suppress, and punish genocide. The treaty held violators responsible whether they attacked another state or acted inside their own borders. The Genocide Convention further eroded the principle of sovereignty that had been weakened at Nuremberg: states could no longer expect to be free from outside interference if they were committing genocide.

|  |
| --- |
| **Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide Adopted by Resolution 260 (III) A of the UN General Assembly 9 December 1948** **Article 2** In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.  |

While most Americans agree with the sentiment "never again," what this means for policy is unclear. The role of the international community and the United States in preventing genocide remains to be defined. In the next section you will have the opportunity to examine five historical case studies of genocide that give a brief overview of the responses of the United States and the international community.

**Five Case Studies**

 It is hard to imagine that throughout the twentieth century the extermination or attempted extermination of an entire group occurred time after time. Despite widespread acknowledgment that genocide should not and will not be tolerated, both the United States and the world have struggled to respond to this recurring problem for a variety of reasons. The complexity of balancing a country's role in the international community requires many hard decisions and difficult trade-offs.

 In Part I of the reading you learned how genocide is defined and about the evolution of the international community's response to it. In this section, you will examine five sketches of genocides that occurred during the twentieth century. Each case study touches upon the events leading up to the genocide, the actual events of the genocide, and the various responses of the United States and the international community. In addition, there are controversies that surround each case study. A box in each case study touches on some of the disputes and disagreements.

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

**The Armenian Genocide**

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

***What were the origins of the Turkish-Armenian conflict?***

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

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

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

***How was the genocide committed?***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Furthermore, no law yet existed prescribing how to respond to such an event.

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

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

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

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

 In 1923 the Ottoman Empire, renamed Turkey, was declared a republic and received international recognition. With this new beginning, the Turkish-Armenian issues of resettlement and restitution were swept aside and forgotten by most of the world. The few Armenian survivors of the genocide migrated around the world, seeking refuge in over two dozen countries.

**The Holocaust**

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

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

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

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

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

***How did Hitler implement his "Final Solution"?***

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

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

***How could it have happened?***

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Holocaust Victim Count**The number of victims of the Holocaust is widely disputed. Due to the incineration of bodies, mass grave burials, and lack of complete records it is impossible to know with certainty how many people were killed in the genocide. Politics, denial, and differing historical interpretations also play into the uncertainty. Moreover, because the Holocaust was orchestrated under the veil of World War II, it is sometimes difficult to establish which deaths were part of a targeted extermination campaign (the Holocaust) and which deaths were wartime casualties. The most widely, though certainly not universally accepted estimate is twelve million Holocaust victims—six million Jews and six million others.  |

***How did the world respond?***

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

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

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

***What happened after the war?***

 The Allied forces set up refugee and displaced person camps. Between 1948 and 1951 nearly seven hundred thousand Jews immigrated to the newly established state of Israel. Thousands of others relocated to countries around the world. International commitment to humanitarian assistance and intervention proved to be stronger than ever after the genocide ended. The world vowed that such atrocities would "never again" take place. Dozens of countries drafted and signed the Genocide Convention.

**The Cambodian Genocide**

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

***What led to the Cambodian Genocide?***

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

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

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

 As part of the "transition," all banks and forms of currency were destroyed. Telephone and postal services were abolished. Media was censored. Religion was forbidden. Clothing was collected and destroyed; the entire country was forced to dress in the same government-issued black pants and shirts. Every hospital was closed and medicines were banned. The educational system was dismantled and all books were confiscated and burned.

|  |
| --- |
| **Auto-genocide**Auto-genocide (self-genocide) is the term given by the UN Human Rights Commission to genocide of a people against itself rather than another ethnic group. A large percentage of the deaths in the Cambodian Genocide were of ethnic Khmer people—people from the same cultural group as the Khmer Rouge. It is for this reason that the Cambodian Genocide is often referred to as an "auto-genocide." There were, however, many other groups targeted by the Khmer Rouge as well.  |

***How was the genocide carried out?***

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

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

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

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

***How did the world respond?***

 There was little international effort to stop the killing in Cambodia. The Khmer Rouge expelled all foreigners from the country immediately after taking power. It was nearly impossible for the outside world to gain firsthand knowledge of what was taking place in Cambodia, so news coverage was sparse. At the same time, the Vietnam War was coming to an end as the United States withdrew from South Vietnam. Communism and capitalism were both vying for political dominance around the world. Most governments were focused on their own affairs. There were networks of people who helped smuggle Cambodians out of the country and to safety, as well as many small international efforts to raise funds, but overall, very little attention, time, or money was devoted to the Cambodian Genocide. Yet again, genocide was underway as the world watched.

***How did the United States respond?***

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

 During the Ford administration (1973-1976) the United States maintained economic embargoes against the Communist countries of Vietnam and Cambodia. No significant measures were taken to curb the human rights abuses in Cambodia; the United States was more concerned about containing communism and winning the Cold War. In addition, other significant issues focused U.S. attention elsewhere. Finally, the United States had not yet signed the Genocide Convention and most did not feel obliged to contribute time, energy, or money to solving the problem in Cambodia. Jimmy Carter became president in 1976 and inherited the "Cambodian Problem" just as it began to erupt into a massive blood bath. As the killing increased and it became more and more obvious that genocide was underway, President Carter's administration struggled to balance its commitment to human rights with broader imperatives such as winning the Cold War. Disturbed by the number of tyrannical regimes the U.S. had supported in the name of anti-communism, Carter made an effort to give priority to human rights.

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

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

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

 Civil unrest, hunger, and devastation persisted. The infrastructure of the country had been almost completely destroyed during Pol Pot's reign. Nearly all intellectuals had been killed, countless women were widowed and children orphaned, and land mines still covered the countryside. These factors made Cambodia's recovery from the genocide difficult. In addition, there was very little international commitment to helping Cambodia with this process.

 In recent years the international community, with the United States taking much of the lead, has begun to assist Cambodia with its quest for justice and reconstruction. In 1991 a peace agreement was signed among opposing groups including the Khmer Rouge. Democratic elections, under the observation of a UN peacekeeping force, were arranged in 1993.

 The former monarch was restored in what ended as disputed elections. The process of establishing international criminal trials to hold Khmer Rouge leaders accountable for genocide and crimes against humanity began in 1998. Leader Pol Pot died in 1998, before he could be tried. An agreement between the UN and Cambodia to establish an international genocide court was reached in March 2003, amidst much debate and disagreement. Some social and economic reconstruction programs have also begun, despite occasional political instability. Progress is being made in the country, though many large obstacles remain.

**The Bosnian Genocide**

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

***What were the origins of Yugoslavia's unrest?***

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

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

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

***Who was targeted during the Bosnian Genocide?***

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

***How did the world respond?***

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

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

 The peacekeeping effort proved to be largely ineffective in stopping the genocide. The so-called UN safe areas all fell to the Serbs and were "ethnically cleansed," most infamously perhaps in Srebrenica where UN troops, who had promised to protect Bosnian Muslims, withdrew. Some eight thousand Bosnians were massacred.

|  |
| --- |
| **Ethnic Cleansing** The term "ethnic cleansing" is often used either in addition to or instead of "genocide" when describing the Bosnian case. Some scholars contend that the deaths that occurred in Bosnia were part of an ethnic cleansing campaign that was full of genocidal acts but was not an actual genocide. Those who characterize the Bosnian case solely as ethnic cleansing believe that the Serbs' intention was not the complete extermination (i.e. genocide) of all Bosnian Muslims, but rather the forced and complete exportation of them (i.e. ethnic cleansing). This position holds that genocidal acts were used to attempt to instill the fear and devastation necessary to get the Muslims to leave their land and take refuge elsewhere, but that complete extermination was never a goal. On the other hand, many scholars claim that the number of genocidal massacres used to carry out the ethnic cleansing campaign leaves little question that the events should be considered a genocide. In April 2004, the United Nations War Crimes Tribunal announced that the persecution and killing of Bosnian Muslims by Serbs was indeed a genocidal campaign |

***How did the tide turn in Bosnia?***

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

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

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

 In October 1995, a cease-fire was reached. A formal peace agreement was signed in Dayton, Ohio in December, 1995. The agreement was meant not only to end the war, but also to build a democratic, multi-ethnic state. To a large degree, it is the United States that has stood behind the international commitment to maintain Bosnia's borders and to compel the young state's three main ethnic groups to share the responsibilities of government. When U.S. peacekeepers first entered Bosnia, President Bill Clinton pledged that they would stay no longer than a year. By 1999, he conceded that accomplishing his goals in Bosnia would require many years, even decades, of international involvement.

 Today, thousands of refugees who were victims of "ethnic cleansing" have returned to their homes. The former leader of Yugoslavia, Slobodan Milosevic, was charged with "crimes against humanity," "violations of the laws or customs of war," and genocide by the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia (ICTY) at the Hague. He died in March 2006, having been held since 2001. Many other officials are being tried in the International Criminal Court as well, though motivation to track down the top Serbian officials who remain at large is wanting. In 2007, the UN's International Court of Justice ruled that the Serbian government was not directly responsible for the genocide in Bosnia but also ruled that the government could have prevented the slaughter in Srebrenica. This was the first time the UN tried a state for genocide.

 Hundreds of millions of dollars in economic aid have been spent to restore the economy. The United States and its allies remain hopeful that their investment will pay off. More than one million refugees have returned to their homes. Politically, voters from all three ethnic groups have consistently supported candidates with nationalistic views. The multi-ethnic central government envisioned by the Dayton Treaty exists largely on paper.

**The Rwandan Genocide**

 In the spring of 1994, the world watched as violence engulfed the tiny central African country of Rwanda. Over the course of one hundred days, nearly one million people were killed at the hands of army militias, friends, family members, and neighbors. In a country that had a total population of fewer than eight million, these numbers are mind-boggling. In a world that had pledged "never again," the reality seemed instead to be "again and again."

***What are the origins of the Tutsi-Hutu conflict?***

 The hostility between Hutus and Tutsis, however intense, reaches back only a few decades. Although a minority, making up approximately 15 percent of the population, the Tutsis have long held most of the land in Rwanda (and neighboring Burundi). For centuries, they were primarily cattle herders while the Hutus, making up 84 percent of the population, were farmers. (The Twa people comprise the remaining 1 percent of the population.) Under German and then Belgian colonial rule, the economic differences between the two groups deepened. The Belgians openly favored the Tutsis. Educational privileges and government jobs were reserved solely for the Tutsis. Identity cards were issued to document ethnicity. (These types of cards were later used to identify the Tutsi during the 1994 genocide.) This colonial favoritism contributed to tensions between the Hutus and Tutsis. Despite the growing tensions, widespread violence did not break out between the two groups until the country gained independence in 1962 as Rwanda-Urundi. (The country later split into the nations of Rwanda and Burundi.) In the late 1950s, the Belgians hastily organized elections in Rwanda and Burundi as their colonial empire in central Africa began to crumble. Hutu parties gained control of the Rwandan government in 1959, reversing the power structure and triggering armed opposition by the Tutsis. In three years of civil war, fifty thousand Rwandans were killed and another one hundred thousand (almost all Tutsi) fled the country. In neighboring Burundi, the Tutsis took advantage of their control of the army to override election results and seize political power. During the next three decades, Burundi's Tutsi-led government crushed repeated Hutu uprisings. In 1972 as many as one hundred thousand Hutus were killed in Burundi.

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

***What events led to the Rwandan Genocide?***

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

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

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

***How was the genocide carried out?***

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

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

***How did the international community respond?***

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

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

 Eventually, the Tutsi-led Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) stepped up its assault against the government and the massacres came to a halt. By July 1994, the RPF had seized the capital and forced the Hutu army to flee in panic. Fearful of reprisals, as many as two million Hutus abandoned their homes, many taking refuge in the Congo. International forces, including two thousand American troops, arrived after the massacres had ended to protect international relief operations for the nearly two million Hutu refugees, including many of the killers. The last UN peacekeepers left Rwanda in early 1996.

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

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

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

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

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

 Rwanda's government has taken steps to heal the wounds of Tutsi-Hutu conflict within Rwanda. Almost all of the Hutu refugees have returned home. Local and national elections have been held and both Hutus and Tutsis fill top government positions. The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (in Arusha, Tanzania) has tried more than fifty of the top organizers of the genocide, though there are currently thousands of suspects still awaiting justice, and many others at large. By 2007, the government had released about sixty thousand prisoners, many of whom had already served the maximum sentence for their alleged crimes.

 Many of these former prisoners will still be tried and could return to jail if found guilty. Most will be tried by *gacaca* (pronounced ga-cha-cha), courts in a local, traditional justice system. These courts are trying lower level participants in the genocide to help bring justice and healing to the remaining victims and perpetrators. According to Rwandan officials, about 85 percent of the population has been involved in the *gacaca*, and by December 2008 as many as 761,446 accused will have been brought before the courts. At the same time, some Rwandans say they have been threatened from testifying in these courts.

 Memories of the 1994 genocide remain fresh, though the government says its promotion of national unity is working. Countless Hutus and Tutsi live as displaced persons or refugees. Intermarriage and close friendships between Tutsis and Hutus are no longer as common as they once were. Moreover, Rwanda's poverty, which has worsened since 1994, threatens to touch off further ethnic conflict. Regional instability and the massive refugee problem in the African Great Lakes Region are additional factors that threaten stability in Rwanda.

**Universal Declaration of Human Rights**

**Proclaimed and adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations**

**December 10, 1948**

**Preamble**

 Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

 Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

 Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

 Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,

 Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

 Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

 Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

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

**Article 1.**

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

**Article 2.**

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

**Article 3.**

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

**Article 4.**

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

**Article 5.**

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

**Article 6.**

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

**Article 7.**

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

**Article 8**.

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

**Article 9.**

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

**Article 10**.

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

**Article 11**.

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

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

**Article 12.**

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

**Article 13.**

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

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

**Article 14.**

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

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

**Article 15.**

(1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.

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

**Article 16.**

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

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

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

**Article 17.**

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

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

**Article 18.**

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

**Article 19.**

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

**Article 20**.

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

(2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

**Article 21.**

(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

(2) Everyone has the right to equal access to public service in his country.

(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

**Article 22.**

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

**Article 23.**

(1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

**Article 24.**

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

**Article 25.**

(1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

**Article 26.**

(1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

**Article 27.**

(1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

(2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

**Article 28.**

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

**Article 29.**

(1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

(3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

**Article 30.**

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