Armenological Issues
2025, VOL. 2, NO. 2, 63-74
https://doi.org/10.46991/ai.2025.2.30.005

The genocide of the indigenous Christians of the Ottoman Empire (Armenians, Greeks, Syro-Aramaeans/Assyrians/Chaldeans) A detailed documentation with three modules of nine teaching units each Verlag v. Hase & Koehler 2024

Review from Jürgen Gispert*
Leipzig June 2025

Foreword

According to Max Weber, “power” represents the condition of being able to assert one's will (also) against the will of others. For its own permanence, power generates knowledge and education. Information always also means the path to information, which brings us to the political character of all education. If we want to exemplify this complex in the context of Armenian culture, the genocide of 1915 comes to mind historically, as well as the current expulsion of the Armenians in Karabakh by Azerbaijan, which is to be regarded as genocide. What does the path to information about the 1915 genocide and Karabakh look like and how is it organized afterwards? Are we in a mosque environment, at a German regulars' table or somewhere else where the topic might be discussed - it seems important to know this. But more important, because it is more comprehensive, is to know who or what paved the educational path and how. The conditions for the respective recipients of information, of education per se, are then derived from this.

The state-organized institution of the school is responsible for education, with decisions on the path to education being made on a case-by-case basis. The state character of education must be emphasized here, as can be seen in the example of Germany, where the historical connection to two genocides (namely 1915 and World War II) has had a significant impact and may lead to interference and confusion in its practical perception. If we introduce the issue of information about the Armenian genocide into the construction of a history textbook, we enter federal territory in Germany: In the so-called textbook affair in the state of Brandenburg in 2005, the then MP Platzeck, under pressure from Turkey, had the word “genocide” in connection with the Armenians removed from school textbooks, so that the issue could not be addressed and took a back seat to the Shoah. A second example: On April 24, 2024, the anniversary of the genocide, German President Steinmeyer visited Atatürk's mausoleum and grave in Turkey. Both actions reflect the Germans' relationship to their own history: Hierarchies that exist in principle

* Jürgen Gispert is Dr. and an ethnographer, Armenologist and journalist. His research mainly concerns theory of memory culture, Armenian history, particularly the Armenian Genocide.

Received 23.10.2025
Revised 06.12.2025
Accepted 09.12.2025

but are not explained thematically in history books, instead receding behind them as part of them and unrecognized, narrow the view of one's own history as conveyed in this way to a mere representation of state ideology and its practice. This results in the need for a teaching and learning tool that provides guidance on understanding the information conveyed and the ways to access it. In relation to the topic of genocide, this means that the background factors that lead to genocide, but also to its informal processing, can be identified. This also means that genocides can be compared and differentiated in terms of their comparability.

The memorial at Luisenkirchhof Berlin – a "place of learning"

Tessa Hofmann's book "The Genocide of the Indigenous Christians of the Ottoman Empire: Armenians, Greeks, Syro-Aramaeans/Assyrians/ Chaldeans" addresses this need.

The book is one of a series of publications by the Slavicist, Armenianist, and sociologist, in which her focus is on Armenia, but which also covers the regional and supraregional relationships and interconnections between the peoples of the Middle East and the Caucasus in order to provide an overall picture. This approach allows the genocides of the Christian peoples discussed in the book to be integrated into the associated complex and discussed.

The didactic value inherent in the book is complemented and further expressed by the author's activities in the fields of memory and architectural policy. Hofmann initiated "a memorial for genocide victims in the Ottoman Empire at the Luisenkirchhof cemetery in Berlin, [the only] place in the world where Christians who died in the Ottoman Empire between 1912 and 1922 are commemorated together."[1] Three times a year, on the respective days of remembrance, Arameans, Armenians, and Greeks meet to commemorate the victims together. Preparations for this memorial site began in 2012.

The choice of this particular memorial site is not without significance, as the memorial courtyard is located in the immediate vicinity of the Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Cemetery and is connected to it by two paths. The Luisenkirchhof itself is named after Queen Luise, who died in 1810 and found her final resting place here in a temple erected in her honor. Her lineage leads through Kaiser Wilhelm (KW) I and II, so that the local connection between Luisenkirchhof in its entirety and the KW Memorial Cemetery also conveys its inherent history of rule. This continuity of

[1] Tigran Petrosyan: *Tag des offenen Denkmals: Ein Riss, noch nicht verheilt. In: Die Tageszeitung*: taz. 11. September 2020

Prussian and German history of rule is symbolically interrupted by the newer memorial, which draws attention to the violence emanating from this line of rule along the vertical axis and leads us, among other things, to World War I.

The fact that the memorial found its place in three open family graves may be due to chance in the search for suitable locations, but every location found for this purpose in such a milieu de mémoire leads to corresponding connotations.

The family burial sites are located on the west wall of the cemetery and have been renamed "altars of remembrance." Luisenfriedhof III (first expanded in 1895) was originally known as the "cemetery of the New West and the new rich."[2] Their family graves are grouped around the chapel and on the west side—as "monumental" and prestigious as possible.

The reference to the economic background of those buried here may raise questions about the origin of their wealth – what about German colonialism during World War II? Thus, the proverbial "incorporation" of memorial monuments into the otherwise surrounding cemetery architecture raises important questions about the underlying system. In addition to colonialism at the time, the aforementioned economic background also connotes the importance of the associated arms industry for World War I: Rheinmetall and the state credit system come to mind – both were already well connected at the time: On its website, the Rheinmetall Group appears almost euphoric when writing about its connections to the Ottoman Empire at the time. For example, it refers to an order hoped for by the German side in 1899 from the Ottoman Empire, which is referred to as "Turkey" on the Rheinmetall website.[3]

When Hofmann describes the now modified memorial in its entirety as a "place of learning," we can also describe it as part of a visualization/objectification of what awaits us in the book. Hofmann calls this "Berlin ambivalence": "On the one hand, we have a veneration of the perpetrators on extraterritorial grounds over which the Berlin Senate has no control. On the other hand, we have the memory of three million victims in the semi-public space in Charlottenburg."[4]

---

[2] BezirksamtCharlottenburg-Wilmersdorf Ev. Luisenfriedhof III (Luisenkirchhof). https://www.berlin.de/ba-charlottenburg-wilmersdorf/ueber-den-bezirk/freiflaechen/friedhoefe/artikel.175689.php

[3] 125 Jahre Rheinmetall – die Jahre 1889 bis 1918 https://www.rheinmetall.com/de/unternehmen/historie/geschichten-rheinmetall/jahre-1889-1918

[4] Tigran Petrosyan: Tag des offenen Denkmals. Ein Riss, noch nicht verheilt In Charlottenburg gibt es einen einzigartigen Gedenkort für die Opfer des Genozids in der Türkei. taz. 11.9.2020

Berlin's so-called ambivalence further expands the space of memory and remembrance, which has already been extended by the addition of the Luisenkirchhöfe and KW memorial cemeteries: If, thanks to the ambivalence indicated, Berlin is also referred to as the city of the perpetrators, we leave the cemetery boundaries and arrive in Charlottenburg, then also Neukölln, at places of execution by relatives of the victims of the Armenian genocide.

After 1915, several of those primarily responsible for the genocide lived in Berlin: Cemal Azmi, governor of the province of Trabzon (Trapesunta) on the Black Sea; behaddin Şakir, who was responsible for organizing and carrying out the massacres; and Talaat Pasha, a member of the triumvirate among the Young Turks. All three fled to Berlin, where they were shot by Armenians. All three were buried in the courtyard of the Şehitlik Mosque in Neukölln, which is located on extraterritorial land. Talaat's body was transferred to Istanbul in 1941 with a Nazi escort. The other two graves are located in the "Martyrs' Cemetery," as the Şehitlik Mosque is called. It is interesting to note in Petrosyan's article that the mosque belongs to the state-run Turkish-Islamic organization Ditib, and the land belongs to the Turkish state.[5]

Ditib, actually the "Turkish-Islamic Union for Religious Affairs," is subordinate to the Turkish religious authority Diyanet and is entirely dependent on it. This also had an impact on the selection of the memorial site: The political and cultural relations between Germany and Turkey in the present and in history led to problems in finding a location for the planned memorial. In the course of this, the original intention to select a potential location in public space was viewed critically by the city authorities and the project was moved to a semi-public sphere, namely the churchyard, which is owned by the Protestant Church. The reason for this was the possibility of vandalism and damage.

---

[5] See 4 Petrosyan https://rheinmetallentwaffnen.noblogs.org/files/2019/07/1987_rheinmetall_vor_gericht_druck.pdf; cf. also. Annette Hauschild - Helmut Lorscheid Annette Hauschild • Helmut Lorscheid. Kampagne »Produzieren für das Leben: Rüstungsexporte stoppen« (Hrsg.) Ermittlungen gegen Rheinmetall Forum Europa Verlag Barten & Co. Berliner Platz 2, 5300 Bonn 1 Bonn, Juli 1987. rheinmetall und der erste weltkrieg, in: https://www.bing.com/videos/riverview/relatedvideo?q=rheinmetall+und+der+erste+weltkrieg&mid=916079030A784C77B4BC916079030A784C77B4BC&FORM=VAMTRV. Artillery ammunition: Rheinmetall receives largest order in its history. I found this information via Google: I typed in "rheinmetall and World War 1" to get information about the war credits in 1914, as a test, so to speak. Result: Instead of providing information about this at the top of the list, the algorithm implicitly linked "Rheinmetall" to the current special funds of 500 billion from German Chancellor Merz's federal government rather than to 1914.

Now, in contrast, the two perpetrators, or rather their mortal remains, have not only found their final resting place in the Şehitlik Mosque, but are also politically protected in this resting place, as it is extraterritorial. Figuratively speaking, they stand out in their symbolism from the political space that protects them. Furthermore, they exert influence on the political space and the cultural sphere—also with interventionist intent—by pushing the planning of a memorial from the public to a semi-public sphere: the dead grab the living (Pierre Bourdieu).

The course and process of finding and erecting memorials provide insight into local memory politics and its practice. The political institutions and the (respective) milieu they create result in a constellation that gives the genocide of ethnic groups and minorities in the Ottoman Empire a position that could ultimately be described as the counterpart of memorial and counter-memorial. Reading the entire interior as counter-history begins as soon as one changes perspective, as described above. It is therefore a matter of the concepts used in the perspectives and expressed through them. The possibility of a change of perspective thus made visible is thanks to the initiative of Tessa Hofmann and her colleagues, which is continued verbally in the book.

The book

The title of the book indicates the main structure of its content. It is divided into two main sections. The first section, entitled "Documentation" (15-229), is followed by the second section, "Learning and Teaching Modules" (233-381).

Since "genocide" is the umbrella term and the groups of Armenians, Greeks, Syro-Aramaeans/Assyrians/Chaldeans are the subject of investigation, the first chapter of Part I logically deals with the definition of what genocide means.

Hofmann presents the components of the definitions of genocide. In doing so, she emphasizes that it is important to consider the purely legal content of the definition. This means that it is "not up to the observer" to decide "whether genocide has been committed or not" (15). The wording of the 1948 Convention definition can be found in a subchapter of the second part of the book (2/I/Medium 2). This is where the advantage of the book's structure becomes apparent. The main text of the first part repeatedly refers to Part 2 with its learning and teaching modules, both as support and as a possibility for separate reading. The aforementioned Medium 2 is one of a group of 10 media distributed across 3 modules. The first six modules can

be found in 2/I, which deals with the genocide of the Armenians. In addition to the aforementioned passage from the Convention on International Law, interested readers are provided with reports from contemporary witnesses and survivors; Medium 3 deals with the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court on the crime of "crimes against humanity." Furthermore, important information on recognizing genocide is provided, and thematic maps (in 2/III/Medium 9) are suggested as aids.

The fact that most of the media are in the chapter on the Armenian genocide is not intended to emphasize an Armenian aspect of the book. The contents of the media chapters in this part are also relevant for the study of the two other genocides in the following two chapters of the second part. At the same time, in addition to the eyewitness accounts and "thematic maps" mentioned above, all chapters describe the specific characteristics of the respective groups, so that they can also be read side by side for comparison.

The questions in the chapters on individual cases (Part 2, I-III) are structured in the same way. At the beginning, the learning and knowledge objectives are presented, followed by the course plan and information on the characteristics of the respective groups. Questions are asked about those responsible, the conviction of the perpetrators, how the extermination took place, the motives of the Young Turks for their actions, whether there was resistance, the fate of the survivors, and their situation today.

The questions about resistance and fate lead back to the introductory chapter of the first part, which deals with "from assassination to the Genocide Convention." The murder of Talaat Pasha on March 15, 1922, by Soghomon Tehlirian in Berlin must be read in conjunction with the previous developments regarding retaliation/punishment of the Young Turks for what had happened. Internationally, "for the first time in legal history, a state crime was classified as a crime against humanity" – "crime against humanity." The German translation "Menschheit" (18) used here is more accurate than the term "Menschlichkeit" (humanity), which is commonly used today and which, in this context, obscures the significance of the event and even euphemizes it. After the World War, however, those responsible were unable to translate this approach into a legal text and implement it. From a domestic Turkish perspective, there was also an attempt to draw conclusions in order to hold those primarily responsible to account. However, the aim was to exchange a conviction for the preservation of their own territory. The Allies, however, wanted the territory to be divided up. This was followed by an uprising on the Turkish side under the later Ata Türk. These developments are reflected in the two treaties of Sèvres (1920) and Lausanne (1923). The Treaty of Sèvres supported border demarcations

that would have given Armenia access to the Black Sea and provided for an autonomous Kurdistan, in which Assyrians, Syro-Aramaeans, and Chaldeans would also have enjoyed autonomy. Sèvres was not implemented due to a lack of international interest and Turkish-Kemalist resistance, and culminated in Lausanne in 1923, which favored the newly emerging Turkey. Talaat was sentenced to death in absentia in Constantinople in 1919, but he was not there; he was in Berlin. This is where the story of the Wresch (Armenian for “revenge”) or Nemesis (Greek for the goddess of revenge) group, of which Tehlerian was a member, begins. Although they took it upon themselves to carry out the sentence previously handed down by a Turkish court, the nature of the act determines its assessment: as mentioned above, it was about the execution of a sentence and was therefore directed against specific individuals, not against the Turkish/Ottoman people as a whole. This is a significant difference from the Young Turks' desire for extermination, which was directed against an entire people.

Since “genocide” is a legal term, the second subchapter is devoted to Raphael Lemkin, the “initiator and principal author of the UN Convention” (pp. 20-23). Lemkin knew about the Berlin criminal trial against Tehlerian, in which the latter was famously acquitted. As a Polish Jew, Lemkin himself had been affected by persecution. The trial and its circumstances led Lemkin to question an existing legal loophole regarding the punishment of crimes committed by a state WITHIN its territory against ethnic groups and religious minorities living there: "If Tehlirian kills a person, it is a crime. But it is not a crime for his oppressor to kill over a million people? That is highly inconsistent." (21)

In addition to the Berlin assassination, another assassination a few years later in Paris brought Lemkin to the aforementioned question. What both cases have in common is that the assassins were acquitted on the grounds of insanity. From the same conditions for acquittal—insanity—Lemkin concludes: "'The perpetrator is insane and must therefore go free. [...] Gradually, I came to the conclusion that I had to act." (p. 21) The quote is also interesting from a sociological perspective, because here the lawyer Lemkin senses behind the double insanity a malaise in the system, which judges people exclusively in psychological terms as not conforming to the norm. When psychological defects are found in assassins, the crime is individualized and immunized against the collective, which plays a part in such crimes. Incidentally, this can be seen particularly clearly in the case of recent attacks in this country, where the assassin always runs the risk of being declared insane.

Lemkin's research on the subject culminated in his groundbreaking work Axis Rule in Occupied Europe, published in 1944, in which he first introduced his neologism "genocide" (on p. 22). Here, the existing dissent between the original version and the final convention should be emphasized: Lemkin brought "his draft to the United Nations for adoption [...], but at the price of compromises. The Soviet Union would not have agreed to the convention if it had not been limited to religious, ethnic, and national victim groups. For there were millions of politically or socially defined victims under Stalin's tyranny." (22)

The role of the state as the perpetrator of such acts was missing from the final version of the convention, as was any explicit reference to the genocide of the Armenians out of consideration for Turkish sensitivities. The shortcomings that were already present at the beginning of the term's career and described here led to genocide research, the findings of which are presented in chapters three and four.

When I think back to my own history lessons—significantly, the title of the textbook series was "Fundamentals of History"—what strikes me most is their didactic tone. The students had pages in front of them with black frames around the margins containing important dates (mostly battles and birth dates of rulers, dynasties, etc.) that had to be learned. The emperor, whose representative seemed to stand in front of the class, was in the foreground; less was learned about the positions of his subordinates. The actual hierarchy was reproduced by the students in their educational work, rather than being given instructions to critically reflect on what they were learning.

The arrangement of the points in the content of the book I have before me alone reveals the potential change in approach that must have passed former Prime Minister Platzeck (SPD) by (see above): In Chapter II, Hofmann introduces the Christian groups concerned, and only in Chapter III does he introduce the Ottoman Empire. This seems to be in line with the book's claim, as the groups described were already there before the Ottoman Empire came into being. This is a non-trivial aspect, which is why I prefaced my personal anecdote. The title of the subchapter, "Geography is destiny," characterizes the circumstances and conditions of the conflicts with the Ottoman Empire. This places the original inhabitants of the areas in question on a chronological timeline, on which contact with Ottoman rule begins at a certain point in time.

If we translate the Armenian word for "fate" back into English, we get "forehead writing," and we can also understand the title of this chapter as a prerequisite for appropriate channels of communication between the groups

concerned and their neighbors/invaders, which include the Ottoman Empire. In this way, readers learn about the history and culture of Armenia, Eastern Thrace, and Mesopotamia and their inhabitants as geopolitical prerequisites for the conflicts with the Ottoman Empire.

In the introduction to the book (10), reference is also made to the current demographic structure of Germany, which is home to a sizeable community of Turkish origin. It is precisely here that the author indirectly addresses a problem – are they Turks, Kurds, Armenians, Greeks...? The term "community of Turkish origin" can, under certain circumstances, be narrowed down to ethnic Turks and obscure the ethnic proportion of Armenians, Pontic Greeks, and Syro-Armenians. As a result, the relationship between ethnic Turks and the other ethnic groups mentioned remains underexposed. This would, for example, both romanticize and reproduce the political agenda of the neo-Ottoman Erdogan. This is an important aspect when it comes to historical representations.

The Balkan Wars, which were so costly for the Ottoman Empire, led to anti-Christian methods such as trade and economic boycotts, which amounted to a Turkification of the Ottoman economy. Entire professions, such as doctors, were excluded. (64) These methods were later repeated by the Nazis.

In the following chapter (IV), we learn a wealth of facts about the "course and components of the Ottoman genocide." Thus, "the Greek Orthodox inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire [...] were the first and last victims of the Young Turk and Kemalist genocide policy. Political persecution of Greek Eastern Thracians began as early as 1911." (65) Military historians and genocide researchers regard the two Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913 as "the birth of a broad-based ethnic war with massive flight and expulsion processes unknown in Europe until the First World War (1914-1918)." (65) Between 1912 and 1913, 15,690 Greeks were massacred in Eastern Thrace. Protests against this were unsuccessful. (67)

These massacres were not haphazard, but were carried out at the instigation or with the acquiescence of the state. The interaction between a special organization (Teskilat-i Mahsusa) and the Central Committee of the Ittihat ve Terakki Party was decisive in this regard. In connection with the description of the special organizations, we also read the name of Dr. B. Sakir, whose remains lie in the above-mentioned "Martyrs' Cemetery." The second "special organization" under his command recruited serious criminals into irregular units from August 1914 onwards, which indicates the genocidal intentions of the Central Committee of the Young Turks Party

even at that time. (72) Furthermore, the characteristics that characterize genocide, such as forced labor and the destruction of intellectual and spiritual leadership, are discussed, with reference to the individual groups, i.e., Armenians, Syro-Aramaeans in Iran, and Greeks.

Of compositional interest is that this chapter on the course of the Ottoman genocide includes a subchapter that highlights the influence and impact of the French and British sides on the fate of the local population. The Sykes-Picot Agreement negotiated between France and Great Britain in 1916 can be considered a textbook example of the imperial division of territories over the heads of their inhabitants. Armenians who fled during the war and genocide were brought back to Cilicia and placed under French mandate, with English and Russian counterparts (the latter ceased to exist after the October Revolution). Humanitarian interests were put forward as a pretext, but France was primarily concerned with economic interests at the time: it had its eye on the seemingly profitable cotton industry and counted on the character traits of the Armenians, which seemed conducive to trade. However, by 1921, the pretext of helpfulness was over: Cilicia became a burden for the French, who now considered French-Turkish trade relations to be of higher priority, a view reinforced by Kemalist resistance to the mandate.(163)

Smyrna, today's Izmir, is an ancient city on the Aegean coast. At the beginning of the 20th century, it had a population of around 500,000, 150,000 of whom were Greek Orthodox. The inhabitants also included Armenians and Sephardic Jews, French and Americans. The Greek side intended to unite all Greek settlement areas. This was opposed by the Kemalist ‘anti-imperialist’ struggle. The Kemalist side won the decisive battle of Dumlupinar at the end of August 1922. During the ‘disorganised retreat’ of the survivors, villages were burned to the ground. (166) Smyrna had a multi-ethnic character, consisting of ‘ethnic-religious islands’ which, side by side but not together, formed the unity of Smyrna.

The tragedy occurred on 8 September. The Greek occupying troops disembarked after three years - along with the administration - and the next day Kemalist troops under Nureddin Pasha occupied the city, whose subsequent activities earned him the name ‘Butcher of Smyrna’. The diary entries inserted here emphasise what happened. (167f). The similarity between Nureddin's methods and those of 1915 becomes clear here. (167ff)

As far as European responsibility for the catastrophe(s) is concerned, eyewitness accounts are given, whereby the quote from a French writer René Puaux stands out - the ‘tragedy of Smyrna’ was based on a ‘double illusion’: ‘the confidence of the great powers in the European powers’.

Lemkin characterises the extermination of the Armenians as ‘religious genocide’, which in turn refers to the question of the conceptual comprehensibility of ‘genocide’. In the book, elements of the Geneva Convention constituting the concept of genocide are shown on the basis of the forced Islamisation that took place, gender-differentiating genocide and the removal of children. (179-193)

The total number of Christian victims between 1900 and 1923 is between 3.5 and 4.3 million, which is also Mustafa Kemal's estimate. (196) In addition to human losses, there were also losses of cultural assets: ‘[I]n the Ottoman-ruled part of the Armenian settlement area [there were] 2,200 monasteries and churches, of which at least 2,150 were looted and burnt down during the genocide.’ Early Christian architecture from the 7th century, 20,000 Armenian manuscripts etc. were destroyed. (197) We are currently experiencing a kind of déja vu, especially in the case of Azerbaijan in connection with the expulsion of Armenians from Karabakh, which is accompanied by the destruction of Armenian cultural assets there.

The last, sixth chapter of the first large part is devoted to the relationship between Germany, Armenia and Turkey (198-229). It is important to note that those responsible in the German Reich left behind the necessary written evidence to come to the conclusion that they were aware of all phases of the extermination. The best-known example of this is the correspondence of Ambassador von Wangenheim, who testified to Berlin of the regime's will to annihilate. However, the regime's own system placed the military alliance with Constantinople above all ethical concerns. Heinrich Vierbücher, publicist and translator, worked in the latter capacity in 1915 as an interpreter for Arabic, Turkish, English and French for the Prussian Marshal Otto Liman von Sanders. He was thus able to observe the war and the expulsion and extermination of the Armenians for three years. His resulting journalistic work allows the conclusion that he took the potential of a translator to be able to translate from one culture to another through the translation process seriously: "What is certain is that the German government never even considered abandoning the alliance with the Stambul murderers, despite all the insolence of Talaat and Enver. They had put themselves in the company of criminals who held all the trump cards and succumbed to their stubborn will. Everything, including every moral consideration, was subordinated to the hunt for the phantom of victory." (205) This would support the Frenchman's illusion thesis above. However, if one does not want to treat all political action as illusionary, which would then also explain the events in Smyrna and Cilicia, then ‘illusionary’

becomes a rather superficial understatement of the events being described. Vierbücher, however, already describes a ‘victory of the emperor’ as a ‘phantom’. However, this would mean that the illusion lies in the political action as such. This leads us back to the beginning, to Weber's concept of power, which in this context provides the conditions for creating illusions or contributing to disillusionment. But then that would still be political action and not illusion.

An article by the director of the Lepsius House in Potsdam introduces the life and work of the theologian and activist Johannes Lepsius, to whom the world owes important information on the course of the extermination and the Armenian atrocities of 1894-96 and 1915, as he was at times on the scene of the events (209-217).

A work such as this is a valuable addition to the usual school products. A handout on the topic is only optionally available in two federal states, ‘but is either incomplete as far as the three victim groups mentioned are concerned or out of print’ (11). One of the book's basic concerns, the inclusion of all three victim groups, which is necessary for a thematic understanding, has been successful and helps to sensitise secondary school learners to the dangers of genocide.

Another advantage of the book is that the school lessons practised in this way introduce an interdisciplinary approach. Not only history, but also ethics and civics are taught, not forgetting the above-mentioned accounts of survivors and other fates. In addition to the extensive bibliography, there is also the option of accessing the web using the relevant URL sources and incorporating them fruitfully into educational work.

Conflict of Interests
The author declares no ethical issues or conflicts of interest in this research.

Ethical Standards
The author affirms this research did not involve human subjects.