

**A REPLY TO *JGR* PREJUDICES THAT WANNSEE WASN'T ABOUT THE JEWS, ZIONISM IS
INTRINSICALLY GENOCIDAL, AND MORE**

***This is a rejoinder to the article, "Israel Charny's Attack on the Journal of Genocide Research and its Authors, A Response" by Amos Goldberg, Thomas J. Kehoe, A. Dirk Moses, Raz Segal, Martin Shaw, Gerhard Wolf*¹**

Israel W. Charny

Note: A request to publish this rejoinder was submitted to *Genocide Studies and Prevention* – along with a complaint that there had been no prior advice to me of the forthcoming publication of the critique of my study nor an invitation to me to respond to the critique. The editor has now advised that the Editorial Board “considered the matter to be concluded and will have no further articles or comments on the matter published in *GSP*.” Two other requests to the editor of the *Journal of Genocide Research* to consider publication of a rejoinder also have gone unanswered.

I wish to express my appreciation to the above authors and to the editors of the IAGS journal, *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, for publishing the extensive critique of my study, “Holocaust Minimization, Anti-Israel Themes, and Antisemitism: Bias at the *Journal of Genocide Research*” that was published originally in the *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism*.² I welcome extensive discussion of the findings of my study, although I certainly do not relish the definition of my work as “unworthy of scholarly consideration.”³ Whatever one’s opinion about the scientific adequacy of the study, I hope it has raised much greater sensitivity to the issues involved in our day and age of rampant anti-Israel anti-Semitism (as differentiated from legitimate and necessary criticism of Israel) in academia.

I also hope the study of *JGR* articles directs our attention to the journalistic issue that even when one is reporting an otherwise legitimate and valuable study of a subject, introducing what I shall call critical prejudicial spoiler sentences leads readers to identify the article as a whole and the publication as a whole as prejudiced or biased.

My overall response to the critique of my study is that although the journal’s authors labor to point out the values of the larger contexts of their studies and the valuable information that we learn from them, it was seriously erroneous for them to include statements such as that the Holocaust in no way played a role in the formulation in the United Nations Convention on Genocide or the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; that the Wannsee Conference

was not about the “Final Solution” to the Jews; and that the conduct of the State of Israel in the War of Independence in 1948 was in direct fulfillment of “an incipiently genocidal mentality” which served as the guiding ideal of Zionism from its outset. (See the section responding for each specific article for these statements.)

The Study of *JGR* Reports the Voices of Genocide Scholars or Students – and Not Simply this Author’s Voice

First and foremost, I want to emphasize what is not at all clear in the critique which is busy attributing to me wide ranging misguided if not evil intent, unscientific design, and ad hominem attacks on authors, that the survey results that are the basis of my study express the opinions of 76 genocide scholars (including a few students) and not simply *my* voice. Of course I am responsible for raising the questions, design of the study, and my message to subjects that it is my belief that there are biases in the *JGR* articles (selected for evaluation), but however the subjects in the study were much influenced by the context I created, it is the respondents to the study themselves who give the ratings that we report. Stated otherwise, there are at least this many people in the field of genocide studies who feel that the *Journal of Genocide Research* has published articles that are significantly prejudicial in their intent to minimize the significance of the Holocaust (we report 59%), and/or anti-Israel (here too we report 59%), and/or anti-Semitic (36%), findings that should upset and concern every ethical genocide scholar.

About the Design of the Study

By a sleight of hand, the authors of the critique believe they can wipe out the validity of the research sample which they describe as “based on a personally selected mailing list that is unavailable to any other scholar to verify.” As I wrote, the list of subjects who were invited to complete this study reads to a great extent like a ‘Who’s Who in Genocide Studies.’ It is based substantially on the Directory of the International Association of Genocide Scholars (IAGS.) Note that I have no idea as to the authorship of any given response because the subjects were promised anonymity and their responses were sent directly to an online survey company (<https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-26BHWS3W/>). If we look at the list of scholars I invited we also have no way of knowing who agreed to participate in the study and who did not. Nonetheless, publicizing the list of invitees would have an element of violating the anonymity that was promised, However, I would not object to designating three distinguished genocide scholars to confidentially look at the full list of invitees so that they can certify that the invitees indeed include many well-known and well-published genocide scholars.

My critics further point out that the study included 30 respondents whose questionnaires came in following publication of the study on the IAGS Listserv in response to a letter intended as an

invitation to the moderator of the Listserv to participate himself. Among these 30 there are 16 respondents “who raced through the questionnaire” (Survey Monkey reported the time spent by each respondent) omitting *any* criticism whatsoever of *any* of the articles, so that it seems highly likely that these were ‘JGR people’ who were out to defend the journal. Even so, it is not true that all 30 of these ‘uninvited’ additional subjects championed the JGR. When we look at the results for the initial group of 46 subjects who responded to the personal invitations and then at the 76 responses that include the additional 30 subjects, there are still over half who saw JGR as minimizing the Holocaust and as anti-Israel, and another third attributed to JGR an anti-Semitic bias. Compare the groups and see if the differences really matter:

N=46 71% Holocaust minimization; 69% anti-Israel; 36% antisemitic.

N=76 59% Holocaust minimization; 59% anti-Israel; 33% antisemitic.

When we look at the results of the overall group with the 30 additional subjects included (so that N=76), there are still no less than 59% who identify the journal as a whole as minimizing the Holocaust, 59% identify it as anti-Israel, and 33% identify it as antisemitic.

So much for the current critique that describes the study as “a scientifically meaningless survey of people he regards as genocide scholars.” Again I emphasize that the results of the study are the voices of 76 recognized scholars and students who study genocide and not my voice alone.

Now a New Sample of another 30 Students in a U.S. University

Since the original study, to check my findings, an additional study of 30 beginning students in courses on religion and genocide in a U.S. university⁴ used the same questionnaire – the same summaries of the articles with direct quotations from the authors -- and the same choices. These questionnaires were returned by them to a second survey company so as not to confuse the earlier results for 76 subjects. In the new group of 30 students, the percentages characterizing each of the seven articles as minimizing the Holocaust were respectively 40, 48, 63, 30, 67, 27, 30, and the overall view by the students of the journal as a whole was that 70% characterized the journal as minimizing the Holocaust and 53% characterized the journal as a whole as anti-Israel and 23% as anti-Semitic. Such figures for a journal in the field of genocide studies should be alarming to any responsible scholar.

About Subsequent Responses to the Study

A good number of colleagues have taken strong objection to my original study, including to a letter to the editor of the *Jerusalem Post Magazine* in which I published a summary of the

study.⁵ A critical letter was written by no fewer than 29 scholars, many of them noteworthy professionals.⁶ I cannot help but add that just as the Turks delight in identifying me as not even an historian and “a sham genocide expert” with a “veneer of academic façade” because of my commitment to recognizing the Armenian Genocide,⁷ in the *Jerusalem Post* letter the above colleagues also took a pot shot at me as “not a Holocaust scholar,” and accused me of a “partisan orthodoxy that seeks to morally discredit those he accuses of biases... [and] chills the room with character assassination.” Rough business indeed, but said critics take no note whatsoever of the fact that there were other articles in the *Jerusalem Post*, such as by former IAGS President Gregory Stanton,⁸ who is a Research Professor in Genocide Studies and Prevention, applauding the study.

Prof. Charny never claimed to have conducted an exhaustive study of every article published in JGR, but the survey he conducted demonstrates that a majority of the genocide scholars he surveyed viewed the chosen excerpts as anti-Israel and anti-Zionist.

There was nothing wrong with Prof. Charny’s methodology... He never claimed that he used a random sample or some other research method. He used a neutral third party to tally the results. He got a respectable rate of return, enough to permit statistically significant conclusions.

Prof. Charny has done a service to the profession by highlighting the creeping anti-Israel bias that has overtaken global academia, and even invaded the field of genocide scholarship.

I have also received personally many letters of appreciation for the study, and I will add that at the INOGS conference in Jerusalem in July of this year (in which as noted I did present the study), I was thanked for the study by a very large number of participants. What matters is that all of us in our field take account and responsibility for the issues raised by this study.

Table 1 presents the results of all judgments of the 7 separate JGR articles and of the journal as a whole. The first line refers to the newly reported results of the study of the 30 beginning students at a U.S. university. The second line recaps the results for the 76 original subjects – 46 of whom were invited by me and 30 who came in following posting of the survey on the IAGS Listserv. The third line gives percentages for the total of 106 subjects.

About the Responses of the Authors of Various JGR Articles

Clearly every one of the subjects of the seven *JGR* articles invites a thorough discussion, but I must confine myself here to an attempt to respond to major issues in several cases.

Raz Segal and Rethinking the Holocaust in Hungary⁹

Segal's study of Hungarian anti-Semitism and mass murders of Jews as part of a larger policy of "mass violence against non-violent Magyar groups" is valuable, but what is lost is the 'simple' horrible truth that the Nazis shipped 400,000 Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz and to their deaths in the final weeks of the war.

In Segal's rejoinder I am accused of "an attempt to maintain at all costs a hierarchy of mass violence, and that my view is that "attention to the fate of non-Jews somehow detracts from the specificity of Jewish experiences." Absolutely not so. Everything in my long career as a genocide scholar says that I am a very strong proponent of study and caring about the genocides of *all* peoples. Our Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide in Jerusalem is believed to be the first in the world to link the concepts of "Holocaust and genocide" and was the first to host an international conference in 1982 on *all* genocides; we were the first to publish an encyclopedia of genocide; and more. In the State of Israel there has been and still is much pressure towards regarding the Holocaust as unique and incomparable, so that in response to this work I have had to live with withering criticism and including attempts to end my university teaching career.

Table 1. Results of Judgments of Seven Separate *JGR* Articles and Journal as a Whole (N=76)

Line 1 N=30 Line 2 N=76 Line 3 N=106

Question No. and Topics	Legitimate Critique	Minimizes Holocaust	Anti-Israel	Anti-Semitic	None of the Above
3. 1948 War of Independence	13%	40%	30%	7%	23%
	<u>3%</u>	<u>36%</u>	<u>76%</u>	<u>32%</u>	<u>19%</u>
	8%	38%	53%	20%	21%
4. Nazi Propaganda for Arabs	21%	48%	41%	21%	10%
	<u>9%</u>	<u>49%</u>	<u>22%</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>36%</u>
	15%	49%	32%	27%	23%
5. International Human Rights Law	20%	63%	10%	30%	10%

	<u>10%</u> 15%	<u>61%</u> 62%	<u>14%</u> 12%	<u>28%</u> 29%	<u>27%</u> 19%
6. Yad Vashem Narrative	37% <u>9%</u> 23%	30% <u>46%</u> 18%	23% <u>44%</u> 39%	10% <u>25%</u> 18%	10% <u>35%</u> 23%
7. Holocaust and UN Law and as Archetype	37% <u>14%</u> 26%	67% <u>67%</u> 67%	0% <u>11%</u> 6%	10% <u>34%</u> 22%	7% <u>17%</u> 12%
8. Transport for Hungarian Jews	37% <u>15%</u> 26%	27% <u>62%</u> 45%	7% <u>7%</u> 7%	20% <u>41%</u> 31%	20% <u>21%</u> 21%
9. Holocaust and Nakba	30% <u>10%</u> 20%	30% <u>52%</u> 41%	60% <u>75%</u> 68%	37% <u>35%</u> 36%	7% <u>15%</u> 11%
10. Journal as a whole	30% <u>22%</u> 26%	70% <u>59%</u> 65%	53% <u>59%</u> 56%	23% <u>33%</u> 28%	7% <u>18%</u> 13%

Note 1: The percentages are based on how many of a group of subjects chose the given option. Since respondents were encouraged to choose more than one response, the total percentage for each row is greater than 100 percent.

Line 1 N=30 Beginning students Southern U.S. University

Line 2 N=76 Original study, 46 invited responses, plus 30 responses resulting from inadvertent notice on IAGS Listserv

Line 3 N=106 All subjects to date

Note 2: The article reporting the research in the *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism* discusses eight articles, but the study questionnaire addressed only seven of these articles. The article by Gerhard Wolf that denies that the Wannsee Conference addressed the Final Solution of the Jews was not included in the study because it was published after we had already completed the questionnaire. However this article is such a powerful exemplification of the *JGR* biases that I added it to the discussion, and now Gerhard Wolf has also participated in the response of the authors.

Thomas Kehoe on the Intentions behind Nazi Propaganda for the Arabs during World War Two¹⁰

Here too there is a valuable study of Nazi propaganda for the Arab world during World War Two. But again the basic truth is missing, namely that the Nazis were conspiring with the Arabs to execute the Final Solution of the Jews in all countries affiliated with the Nazis and especially against the Jewish community in Palestine which they were seeking to conquer and almost did.

Gerhard Wolf on the Wannsee Conference and Nazi Living Space¹¹

If only this frightening distortion of history about the Wannsee Conference were published by *JGR*, it is in itself a sufficient basis for castigating the journal.

Wolf: The Wannsee conference is still largely understood as the echo of an earlier decision to annihilate European Jewry. This article questions this assumption.

Here is what the German-directed Wannsee House in Germany, which maintains an excellent high level memorial and research center, says:

On January 20, 1942, high-ranking members of the SS, the police force, the government administration, and the National Socialist German Worker's Party (the NSDAP or Nazi party) met to discuss the 'Final Solution of the Jewish Question.'

How dare Wolf and how dare *JGR*? This is no longer legitimate academic difference of opinion, where even radical original ideas must be given expression if we are to advance knowledge and science. Wolf's revisionism smacks of the denialist contentions that seek to wipe out a major reality of the Holocaust.¹²

Amos Goldberg about Yad Vashem,¹³ and Bashir and Goldberg the Holocaust and the Nakba¹⁴

I very much agree with the basic point made by the author of the first article, Amos Goldberg about Yad Vashem's refusal/denial to recognize the genocides of other peoples. Yet, even as Goldberg characterizes Yad Vashem correctly as "insufficiently sensitive to other peoples," our subjects felt that Goldberg's wording was also insufficiently sensitive: 45 % of the subjects characterized it as diminishing the Holocaust and 43% characterized it as anti-Israel, while 23% saw it as having an anti-Semitic tenor. Once again, the critics accuse me personally of defining Goldberg as all of the above, but I only report the opinions of the subjects of this study.

The second article on the Holocaust and Nakba was co-written by Bashir Bashir and Goldberg. I agree with them emphatically that the Nakba ["disaster," "catastrophe"] experience of the

Palestinian community must be respected and addressed. I myself have long been a researcher and critic of the genocidal massacres that were committed by Israelis in the War of Independence,¹⁵ but I cannot agree with Goldberg and Bashir that “the State of Israel... generated and was fully involved in the events of the Nakba.” It is much more complicated. It began with the war the Arabs waged against the Jews of Palestine, one which the Jews also viewed with good reason in the wake of the very recent Holocaust and in response to Arab genocidal rhetoric as intended at exterminating all Jews and not only conquering the new State of Israel. In Bashir and Goldberg’s article there is no conceptualization of the Nakba following the armed revolt of the Palestinians and threats of annihilation of the then small Jewish community in Palestine along with the invasion of Palestine by several Arab countries. There is also little attention paid to the many instances in which Jewish commanders declined to execute any policies of ethnic cleansing and any number of Arab communities which lived through the war without being attacked.¹⁶

Martin Shaw and the Palestine-Israel Debate¹⁷

The defense of Martin Shaw begins with the charge that I had not read the original article by him in *Holyland Studies* (which in fact I did) and that my material on Shaw was taken from “a short debate” in *JGR* with Omer Bartov (this “short debate” takes up no less than 16 pages in *JGR*’s article). But this is only the prologue to the major point that the critique makes that had I read Shaw’s earlier article, I would know that he is indeed “acknowledging the bloody history of the Jews in Europe”; that he had cited Benny Morris¹⁸ to the effect that the 1948 war indeed was initiated by the Arabs; and most important “that he acknowledged that Zionist rejection of co-existence of Jews and Arabs in Palestine was conditioned by Arab attacks on Jewish communities”; also “that he argued (citing Mark Levene) *against* the idea that the Zionist movement had a single, long-term ‘intention’ to remove the Arab population.”

To all of the above I could say, ironically, ‘Bravo, my fellow Zionist, Martin Shaw’ (although I obviously know Shaw and Zionism do not mix well at all, and there have been other publications which discuss openly whether Shaw is anti-Semitic). Moreover, the word “Zionist” is a red flag for many of my critics! I have not exactly been complimented for my very much being a Zionist, nor for “the hegemonic status of Israel Charny’s favored memory regime, namely the compensatory redemptive narrative that he and others have invested in the Holocaust’s incalculable suffering.”

In fact, in our study questionnaire we clearly included in our quotations from Martin Shaw his acknowledgment that the Israelis were *not* out to murder all the Arabs in Palestine or to expel them all:

No serious scholar contends that Israel had a single policy of destroying the whole of Arab society (still less of murdering all Palestinian Arabs)... they took advantage of the

war to extend the boundaries of the Israeli state beyond those allocated by the U.N., and to expel large parts of the Arab population... Their aim was clearly... not to expel all Arabs from Palestine or indeed from Israeli territory... Israel's destruction of the larger part of Arab Palestinian society in 1948 was not exceptionally murderous - 'only' a few thousand Arabs were massacred...

Bravo again, my 'fellow Zionist,' but take note that having included the above quote from you in the summary of your article, respondents to the study did have an opportunity to learn of your sensitivity to the Israeli people and the extent of your objectivity. The problem for you is that we also included in the question about your article still another quotation by you:

Pre-war Zionism included the development of an incipiently genocidal mentality towards Arab society...

We also noted in the question about your article that "within a paragraph the author refers openly no less than to *'the genocide of 1948'* (bold and italics by researcher)"; and that you then conclude with words that have some truth for the many of us who are critical of the continued occupation and want to see a successful peace process, but again you inject a poisonous innuendo when you say-

The consequence of a society founded on genocide... is a situation of more or less permanent war. So long as Israel does not come to terms with the genocide of 1948... [it] cannot hope either for integrity or for security.

The fact is that 76% of the respondents in the original study of recognized genocide scholars rated your article as anti-Israel. Granted, this percentage drops in the new sample we are reporting here of 30 additional American college students who are beginners in Holocaust and historical studies. Yet even with this number, do we want to have a professional journal of genocide studies that is viewed as anti-Israel by one-third of American college students?

Two Papers in *JGR* which Claim that the Holocaust Played No Significant Role in the Creation of the United Nations Convention on Genocide or in the Formulation of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights

The subject of the influence of the Holocaust on the development of the United Nations Convention on Genocide and on the formulation of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights was first brought up by Marco Durante¹⁹:

The present study has determined that progenitors of the Universal Declaration did not speak at the UN of the Holocaust as a unique evil...[and] questions the centrality of the Holocaust.”

A second article, no less than by the editor of *JGR*, then states categorically²⁰:

Having abandoned... justifications for the Holocaust centrality – namely that its horror led to the United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights and The Genocide Convention in 1948... the ways in which the Holocaust is ... distinct make it a poor archetype for understanding other genocides.

In stark contrast, an online U.N. document states:

Adopted at the first UN General Assembly in 1948, the Genocide Convention was largely a response to the Holocaust, which resulted in the murder of six million Jews and many other members of minority groups.²¹

Another U.N. document by the 2010 Education Working Group on the Holocaust and other Genocides says:²²

The Holocaust is often called the paradigmatic genocide. In a number of ways, the Holocaust functions as a benchmark for other genocides. Some reasons for this are:

- the term “genocide” did not exist before the Holocaust, but was coined in 1943-4 by the Polish Jewish lawyer Raphael Lemkin in response to the Nazi crimes²³
- the Holocaust was an extreme form of genocide in which the perpetrators sought to destroy a human group through the attempted murder of every member of that group
- the Holocaust is well documented, researched and published
- the Holocaust is considered a watershed event in world history
- the impact of the Holocaust to our present Western society is immense as it took place in the heart of Europe
- its strong place in our collective memory means that other genocides are often seen and interpreted through the lens of our understanding about the Holocaust

We also find a report by Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty:²⁴

British Prime Minister Winston Churchill called genocide a "crime that has no name" -- the Nazis' deliberate and systematic extermination of as many as 6 million European Jews. But a name was soon found -- genocide, literally the killing of a people or nation. The Genocide Convention adopted by the United Nations in 1948 was meant as a pledge to ensure the horrors of the Holocaust would never be repeated.

Conclusion: The Study of JGR Articles is Scientifically Valid

To conclude, the study that I published in the *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism* about JGR articles and the journal as a whole qualifies as a valid scientific study (and I do not have to go back shamefaced to the PhD program in psychology where I was trained to do such studies, any number of which I have published over the years).

Of course, rarely is there a study which covers *every* aspect of a subject or presents a representative sample that meets every single criterion for proving objectivity. Science is a process in which many researchers participate and it is the accumulation of knowledge from different studies that leads us to our firmest conclusions.

Yes, the present study was designed by me, and the invitations that were received by the first group of 46 subjects were in response to a personal invitation from me, and the very selection of questions in the study clearly conveyed or implied my views. Yet that in itself does not disqualify the study of the opinions of the readers after they read summaries including quotations from the articles. In addition, we had 30 more uninvited responses from members of the IAGS listserv, including quite likely a group whose avowed purpose was to absolve *JGR*, and the combined results still yielded high ratings of bias. Further, we now report the results of administration of the same survey to a new, third group of subjects, undergraduates taking courses on topics of religion and genocide and the results reinforce the earlier conclusions.

Personal Conclusion

I was thrilled by a sense of moral purpose in my association with the early greats of genocide studies and for a good number of years as IAGS took form. I believe that our professional specialization must be anchored firmly in deep respect, caring, and empathy for *all* victims of genocide in as objective studies of genocides as possible, and that genocide studies must be devoted to inspiring concerted efforts to reduce genocide. Over-intellectualization or politicizing of viewpoints do not make for an inspiration to fight for life. I pray for the return of a respectful atmosphere for research and exploration in a well-defined moral context of caring about the survival and quality of life of *all* peoples.

Israel W. Charny is a co-founder and past president of the International Association of Genocide Scholars. He is the Director of the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide in Jerusalem. His last two works are Fascism and Democracy in the Human Mind (University of Nebraska Press), and most recently The Genocide Contagion: How We Commit and Confront Holocaust and Genocide (Rowman & Littlefield).

NOTE: The complete questionnaires of the 76 subjects in the basic study can be examined fully at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-26BHWS3W/> The questionnaires of the 30 students in the additional study that is reported here were received and compiled by the Kwiksurveys company that does not provide a public link for results. However, any researcher who requires a pdf copy of these questionnaires is invited to write the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide in Jerusalem at encygeno@gmail.com.

Word count 5787

References

¹ Goldberg, Amos; Kehoe, Thomas J.; Moses, A. Dirk; Segal, Raz; and Shaw, Martin (2016). Israel Charny's Attack on the *Journal of Genocide Research* and its Authors: A Response. *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, Issue 2, Vol 10, Article 4.

<http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/gsp/vol10/iss2/4>

² Charny, Israel W. (2016). Holocaust Minimization, Anti-Israel Themes, and Antisemitism: Bias at the *Journal of Genocide Research*. *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism*, see upcoming Vol. 7, No. 1. <http://jsantisemitism.org/images/journals/articles/Holocaust-Minimization-Anti-Israel-&-Antisemitism-at-JGR.pdf>

This article can also be seen on the website of the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide in Jerusalem at http://www.ihgilm.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Holocaust_Minimization_at_the_Journal_Genocide_Research.pdf;

or on the website of Genocide Watch <http://genocidewatch.net/2016/06/08/letter-from-steven-baum/>; or on the website of Alliance Against Genocide

<http://againstgenocide.org/2016/06/08/letter-to-genocide-scholars-from-steven-k-baum/>

Both Genocide Watch and the Alliance Against Genocide include a letter by Steven Baum, Editor of the *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism* that was published in the listserv of the International Association of Genocide Scholars.

³ Note: I am not citing specific page numbers of the quotations taken from *JGR* articles. These appear in the references to each article as it is discussed in this paper, and of course were given in the references to each article in the original study (endnote 2). Similarly, no page numbers are given for quotations from authors in the critical Response to the study which is an electronic publication (endnote 1) since they are immediately available in the critical article.

⁴ The students were enrolled at the University of Alabama in one of two courses taught by veteran genocide scholar Professor Steven L. Jacobs. The students were voluntarily invited to participate in the study in exchange for extra credit. The students completed the questionnaires privately and submitted them to an independent survey company, kwiksurveys.com. They then informed their professor that they had done so.

⁵ Charny, Israel W. (May 27, 2016). Genocide Scholars Who Minimize the Holocaust and Some Who are Coming to Town. *Jerusalem Post Magazine*. <http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Genocide-scholars-who-minimize-the-Holocaust-and-some-who-are-coming-to-town-455021>. The article can also be seen on the website of the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide, Jerusalem at <http://www.ihgilm.com/2016/06/26/genocide-scholars-who-minimize-the-holocaust-and-some-who-are-coming-to-town/>

⁶ Letter by 29 scholars (June 17, 2016). Holocaust 'Minimized.' *Jerusalem Post Magazine*, Letters to the Editor. See the website of the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide at <http://www.ihgilm.com/2016/06/26/genocide-scholars-who-minimize-the-holocaust-and-some-who-are-coming-to-town/>

⁷ Tall Armenian Tale. The Other Side of the Falsified Genocide: Israel Charny: A Man Obsessed? <http://www.tallarmentale.com/israel-charny.htm>

⁸ Stanton, Gregory (June 24, 2016). 'Minimization Revisited.' *Jerusalem Post Magazine*, Letters to the Editor. See the website of the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide at <http://www.ihgilm.com/letter-from-gregory-stanton/>

⁹ Segal, Raz (2014). Beyond Holocaust studies: Rethinking the Holocaust in Hungary. *Journal of Genocide Research*. 16(1), 1-23. Quotations from p. 1

¹⁰ Kehoe, Thomas J.(2012). Fighting for our mutual benefit: Understanding and contextualizing the intentions behind Nazi propaganda for the Arabs during World War II. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 14(2), 137-158. Quotations from pp. 151-152

¹¹ Wolf, Gerhard (2015). The Wannsee Conference in 1942 and the National Socialist living space dystopia. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 17(2), 153-175. Quotations from pp. 153, 170.

¹² See Browning, Christopher (1978). *The Final Solution and the German Foreign Office*. New Jersey: Holmes and Meier; see also Charny, Israel W. (2003). 'A Classification of Denials of the Holocaust and Other Genocides. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 5 (1), 11-34.

¹³ Goldberg, Amos (2012). The 'Jewish narrative' in the Yad Vashem global Holocaust museum. *Journal of Genocide Research* 14(2), 187-214. Quotations from pp. 187, 208.

¹⁴ Bashir, Bashir, and Goldberg, Amos (2014). Deliberating the Holocaust and the Nakba: disruptive empathy and binationalism in Israel/Palestine. *Journal of Genocide Research* 16(1), 77-99. Quotations from pp. 80, 92.

¹⁵ See for example Charny, Israel W. and Fromer, Daphna. A study of attitudes of viewers of the film "Shoah" towards an incident of mass murder by Israeli soldiers (Kfar Kassem, 1956), *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 1992, 5 (2), 303-318. See also the "Appendix: Studies on Israeli Willingness to Commit Evil" in Charny, Israel W. (2016). *The Genocide Contagion: How We Commit and Confront Holocaust and Genocide*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 185-197. This chapter reports on a series of studies by Israel Charny and Daphna Fromer of simulations of situations in which Israeli students in the health professions are called on to do evil acts, and on the work of Yoel Elizur and Nufar Yishai-Karin on brutalities of Israeli soldiers.

¹⁶ There is no question whatsoever about the devastation of the Arab community in Palestine in 1948. However, from a point of view of historical justice, one must consider that along with several instances of shameful genocidal massacres by the Israelis such as at Deir Yassin and Lod and Ramle, as well as a variety of crimes against humanity by Israeli fighters, the bulk of Arabs left Israel at the urging of seven converging Arab armies so that they would not be in the way of their attack. There is overwhelming evidence including from Arab sources. Thus, according to Syria's Prime Minister after the war, Khaled al Azm, "As early as the first months of 1948 the Arab League issued orders exhorting the people to seek a temporary refuge in neighboring countries, later to return to their abodes in the wake of the victorious Arab armies and obtain their share of abandoned Jewish property." The above information is attributed to the Research Group for European Migration Problems (January/March 1957). *Research Group Bulletin*, 5 (1).

¹⁷ Shaw, Martin, and Bartov, Omer (2010). The question of genocide in Palestine, 1948: An exchange between Martin Shaw and Omer Bartov, *Journal of Genocide Research*, 12(3-4), 243-259. Quotations from pp. 244, 245-246.

¹⁸ Morris, Benny (2009). *1948: A History of the First Arab-Israeli War*, New Haven: Yale University Press; Morris, Benny (2004). *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; and Morris, Benny (1989). *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem, 1947-1949*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

¹⁹ Duranti, Marco (2012). The Holocaust, the legacy of 1789 and the birth of international human rights law: Revisiting the foundation myth. *Journal of Genocide Research*. 14(2), 159-186. Quotations from pp. 180, 159, 180.

²⁰ Moses, Dirk A (2012). The Canadian Museum for Human Rights: the 'uniqueness of the Holocaust' and the question of genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 14(2), 215-238. Quotations from pp. 216, 232.

²¹ The United Nations and Holocaust Outreach Programme. Where the UN Genocide Convention stands after 65 years, and what more can be done.

<http://www.un.org/en/holocaustremembrance/2013/genconventionstory.shtml>

²² United Nations. Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust , Education, Remembrance and Research. 2010 Education Working Group Paper on the Holocaust and Other Genocides.

http://www.un.org/en/holocaustremembrance/EM/partners%20materials/EWG_Holocaust_and_Other_Genocides.pdf

²³ The fact that Lemkin coined the word “genocide” in his 1944 book, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, should not obscure the fact that Lemkin began his wonderful pursuit of an international law against mass killing already in a proposal to the League of Nations in the 1930’s.

²⁴ Sindelar, Daisy (January 26, 2005). World: Post-Holocaust World Promised 'Never Again' -- But Genocide Persists. Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. <http://www.rferl.org/a/1057096.html>

I express my appreciation to Dr. Steven Baum, and Professors Steven L. Jacobs and Samuel Totten for their critical reading and editing of this paper.