# The Armenian Issue
## Why the "genocide" label doesn't fit

*" ... in the absence of unequivocal evidence ... British Governments have not recognized those events as indications of genocide. Nor do we believe it is the business of Governments of today to review events of over 80 years ago ..."*

*Baroness Ramsay of Cartvale, British Foreign Office spokesperson, April 14, 1999.*

An overview and analysis of the controversy surrounding the events of 1915

Produced by a multi-national panel of independent researchers
of European, American and Turkish Ancestry

2nd Edition April 2010

This is a document in two parts as follows:
**Part I** - The General Overview
**Part II** – An appendix entitled "The Index of Misrepresentations of Fact" … a litany of the misrepresentations of the Armenian Propagandists in the West

## Part I General Overview
Contents


**1. INTRODUCTION....1**

**2. MOVEMENT ALIGNED WITH TERRORISM....2**

**3. "GENOCIDE SCHOLAR" MOVEMENT....3**

**4. THE GREAT MONEY MACHINE....4**

**5. WHO ARE THE ARMENIANS?....5**

**6. PROBLEMS AND ISSUES....6**

6.1. THE REBELLION....6
*Comparison to WWII....6*
*Documentary evidence....6*
*Civilian casualties....7*
6.2. THE WORD "GENOCIDE"....7
6.3. INTOLERANCE AND HATRED....8
6.4. POLITICIZATION OF HISTORY....8

**7. CONCLUSION: CALL FOR ACTION....8**

**8. EPILOGUE....9**

**9. PART II - APPENDIX: INDEX OF MISREPRESENTATIONS OF FACT....11**

# 1. Introduction

Statesmen and politicians in Western countries are often besieged by representatives of Armenian groups that have huge voting blocs demanding resolutions in connection with events that occurred in Eastern Anatolia in late 19th and early 20th centuries. Legislators usually feel obliged to hear these people out and feel somewhat obliged to address their concerns. Electoral campaign contributions play significant role in these transactions.

The historical events in question, however, are extremely complex. Not only did they occur in a Moslem culture - which is seldom studied in sufficient detail in Western universities - but the particular events in question occurred at the center of an extremely complex web of relationships between nations of widely diverse cultural and religious backgrounds.

Legislators that are approached with these demands:

- Are not elected to legislate on events that occurred a century ago.
- Are not equipped to evaluate the veracity of allegations in question.

The legislators, for their part, have been increasingly acquiescing to the views presented to them by their Armenian constituents, without asking probing questions, and many legislators have been appealing to the authority of a group of so-called "genocide scholars" that suddenly appeared in roughly the same timeframe (in the 60's) that the Armenians started voicing their demands loudly.

American citizens of Turkish ancestry report many incidents of ethnic prejudice in their daily lives as a result of these campaigns. But they are almost everywhere vastly outnumbered by constituents of Armenian origin, and refrain from reporting prejudices they suffer. The same situation is true for persons of Turkish ancestry in other Western countries.

The Armenian groups have been widely successful in representing their ideological opponents as "Genocide Deniers," comparing them to David Irving ("Holocaust Denier") and others, who go so far as to claim that there are "unanswered questions about the Nazi Gas Chambers." This slander campaign has been so successful that representatives from the Turkish side are rarely allowed to make their case, and when allowed, the opportunity is very brief, and only in a poisoned, prejudicial atmosphere.

Due process, the freedom of speech, and presumption of innocence until proven guilty, are the foremost values of democracy and civilized jurisprudence. Yet, time and again, while Armenian genocide proponents are given a free rein to convince an unknowing public - and legislators - that Turkey and Turks are guilty of a horrible crime of humanity, the accused Turkish side has been typically denied its right to self-defense. The legislative bodies have tended to act as both the prosecutor and the judge. . The legislators' pro-Armenian stance is attributable to a large extent to electoral campaign contributions from the well-funded Armenian lobby groups (in the U.S., chiefly the Armenian National Committee of America and the Armenian Assembly of America).

Turks and Turkey have repeatedly argued that the proper forum to discuss and resolve disagreements of historical nature is an international commission of scholars representing Armenia, Turkey and other nations. Turkey has proposed that conclusions reached by such a commission be binding on both sides. The Armenian side, however, has consistently refused to participate in such a

commission, stigmatizing the Turks as "Genocide Deniers" and insisting that the very formation of such an historical Commission of Inquiry would amount to "Genocide Denial".

It is also noteworthy that, "genocide" being a special crime subject to strict judicial criteria, the Armenian side has refrained from taking its case to an international court of jurisprudence, such as the International Court of Justice in The Hague, the only competent body to rule on genocide allegations. The reason for such avoidance in clear: The Armenian side would rather rely on propaganda and ethnic politics than take a chance in a court of law, where due process is the rule, and where both sides are given an equal opportunity to make their cases.

In point of fact, after World War I the victorious British tried to prosecute Ottoman officials thought to be responsible for atrocities against Armenians. Working closely with their Armenian cohorts, and relying principally on information obtained from the Armenian Patriarchate in Istanbul, the British arrested and deported without serious investigation 144 high-ranking Ottoman officials to the island of Malta. Included among the deportees were the Grand Vizier (Prime Minister), members of the cabinet, the Speaker of the House, members of the Parliament, Chief of the General Staff, Army commanders, and governors. The deportees were accused of massacre of Armenians. The British had access to all the Ottoman archives in Istanbul, and tried hard to find reliable incriminating evidence against the accused. They even searched the American archives in Washington and sought the help of the State Department. Despite all these efforts, no legal evidence was found that could be used in a court of law.

In reference to the American archives, reported the British Embassy in Washington to London: "*I regret to inform Your Lordship that there was nothing therein which could be used as evidence against the Turks who are being detained for trial at Malta.*" This, despite a ton of propaganda material from Ambassador Morgenthau and his consuls filed in the State Department archives in Washington.

Disappointed, the British decided not to hold a trial, and on October 31, 1921 returned all the Malta detainees to Turkish soil.

Also, British governments have not recognized the 1915 events as genocide (see quote above).

Further, the European Court of Justice in Brussels, in its December 2003 ruling on a lawsuit launched by Armenians in Europe ("Euro-Armenia" and the Krikorians), concluded that the Armenian "genocide" resolution passed by the European Parliament in 1987 was a "purely political" decision, with no legal foundation. On appeal by the plaintiffs, the ruling was re-confirmed in October 2004.

## 2. Movement aligned with terrorism

The Armenian movement for the recognition of a genocide label has not been peaceful. Although many of the participants in the movement are law-abiding citizens, the movement in general gave its silent assent and financial support to a series of criminal acts perpetrated by the terrorist organization ASALA[1] and JCAG[2] against Turkish civil servants in the period 1973-1991. The two ARF newspapers "Armenian Weekly" and "Azbarez" gave their full editorial support to the terrorist

1 "Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia"
2 "Justice Commandos Against Armenian Genocide"

acts of JCAG and the “Armenian Mirror-Spectator”, a publication with ties to the Armenian Assembly of America, printed articles justifying the assassination of Turkish civil-servants by the Armenian Terrorist groups. The legal defense costs of the majority of the arrested ASALA terrorists were paid by committees funded by prominent Armenian associations. Several prominent Armenian and pro-Armenian "scholars", including UCLA Professor Richard G. Hovannisian and Gerard Libaridian in the U.S., and Jean-Marie Carzou, Gérard Chaliand and Yves Ternon in France, testified for Armenian terrorists at their trials

A total of 110 acts of terror were carried out by Armenian terrorists in 38 cities of 21 countries, including the U.S. Thirty nine of these acts were armed attacks, 70 of them bomb attacks, and one was an occupation. Forty two Turkish diplomats and 4 foreign nationals were assassinated in these attacks, while 15 Turks and 66 foreign nationals were wounded.

One planned act of terrorism was by Murat Topalian, the ex-Chairman of ANCA, the prominent arm of the Armenian lobby in the USA. Topalian was sentenced to a 3-year prison term by an Ohio court in 2001.

These acts were not openly condemned by the Movement, which raised funds for the legal defense of some of the perpetrators and openly treated others as heroes. One ASALA terrorist, Varadian Garabedian, received a warm hero’s welcome in Yerevan upon his release from a French prison in 2001. The anti-Turkish Government propaganda preceding the ASALA violence afforded the terrorists some level of face-saving and bought them much needed time and cover. It also enabled them to intimidate dissenters - all in an era when the West's approach to terrorism was characterized by the naïveté of the pre-9/11 world.

In 1977 Armenian extremists bombed the off-campus home of UCLA history professor Stanford Shaw who, after having studied the Turkish Archives, had taken the position that there was no genocidal attempt on the Armenians.

## 3. “Genocide Scholar” movement

The rise of the "Genocide Scholar" movement on the Armenian issue coincided roughly with the virulent rise of Armenian Diaspora demands in the West. The movement came into being largely through the efforts of individuals rather than through a combined effort by established academic institutions. Moreover, unlike the conventional meetings in established academic institutions, the proceedings of the “Genocide Scholars" are conducted behind closed doors. Individuals who disagree with their thesis are not welcome. Their process is not transparent, and they do not uniformly enforce recognized standards of academic rigor.

The movement's habit of attacking the integrity and character of their ideological opponents as "Genocide Deniers" does not conform to academic standards which require that documentary evidence and objectivity, not personal attacks on the integrity of one’s opponents, play a central role in argumentation. Furthermore their castigation of their ideological opponents as "Genocide Deniers" amounts to a condemnation of practically all Turkish scholars, since the overwhelming majority of Turks feel very strongly that the events in question cannot rightly be labeled "genocide."

To date the "Genocide Scholar" movement has attempted to avoid the stigma of being labeled racist by pursuing a 3-pronged strategy:

- All rhetoric is directed at the Turkish Government, arguing that it is not the Turkish People but the Turkish Government that is guilty of "Genocide Denial." Care is taken to portray Turks as a people brainwashed by their government. In reality, of course, Turks as a race are being depicted as the perpetrator of the crime.
- It is claimed that the perpetrators of "genocide" were the Ottoman Turks, not the present Turkish government ...which need not take offense.
- The "Innocent Deniers" theory developed by the movement's spokesman Israel Charny is a thinly veiled attempt to escape the onus of racism. According to this theory, huge groups of people, while "denying," are yet "innocent" by virtue of their own unawareness that they are covering up "genocide." Using such an argument, Charny would have us believe that he is not condemning an entire ethnic group, (i.e. people of Turkish ancestry), and thus escape the 'racist' epithet. The last time we saw people talk about an entire race like this was during World War II, when the Nazis argued that, although some Jews appeared to be good, and tried to be good, they could not help being evil nonetheless. After all, the Nazis argued, it was in their blood to do evil.

The "Genocide Scholar" movement's response to the Statement of 69 American academicians published in several leading newspapers in 1985 is most telling of their modus operandi. Major advertisements appeared in New York Times and Washington Post on May 19, 1985, signed by 69 American scholars specializing in Turkish, Ottoman and Middle Eastern Studies, objecting to the use of "genocide" label in a House Joint Resolution then before the U.S. Congress. Instead of openly debating the issue, the "Genocide Scholar" movement immediately embarked on an effort to discredit these academics on various grounds, insinuating that some of them may have been corrupted by having received research grants from the Turkish Government, etc. Without any academic debate, the signatories were collectively denigrated as "Genocide Deniers," violating all norms of academic discourse and scholarly etiquette. Many of the signatories were subsequently intimidated, and some lost their academic positions. (The Statement by the 69 American academicians was subsequently supported in a Declaration signed by 120 Turkish academicians on April 23, 2001).

This constant pattern of relentless personal attacks by the "Genocide Scholars" on the integrity and professional qualifications of their ideological opponents cannot be tolerated any longer.

A partial list of eminent foreign scholars and intellectuals who do not subscribe to the "genocide" characterization is given in Part II (Appendix).

## 4. The Great Money Machine

A well-oiled machine keeps the Armenian "cause" alive on a day-to-day basis. For an excellent detailed statistical report on the Armenian Lobbies, see "Divided They Conquer: The Success of Armenian Ethnic Lobbies in the United States" by Heather S. Gregg[3] [1]. Two competing Armenian ethnic lobby groups in Washington, the Armenian National Committee of America (ANCA) and the Armenian Assembly of America (the Assembly), raise huge sums of money and wield an uncanny level of political influence in Washington D.C. Their political influence far exceeds their sizes in terms of membership. It is significant to note that the rhetoric coming from the adherents of these

[3] This document is available at: http://repository.forcedmigration.org/show_metadata.jsp?pid=fmo:2686

two lobbying groups is characterized by a conspicuous level of hate speech directed toward Turks in general and the Turkish Government in particular - coupled with a defamation campaign against historians who disagree with their analysis of the events of 1915. This institutionalized ethnic hatred has become a "cause" for these people. Knowing what we know about the desperate need for election reform in the present-day American political system, we should not be surprised to learn that the level of disruption caused by these Armenian lobbies in the U.S. is staggering.

## 5. Who are the Armenians?

The Armenians are a Christian people whose history goes back as far as the earliest centuries of Christianity. Of all the ancient patriarchates of Christianity, the Armenians have the distinction of being the only Patriarchate to have developed and evolved outside the ancient Roman Empire. All the other ancient patriarchates, the Alexandrian, the Roman, the Greek, the Jerusalem and the Syrian, evolved and flourished - until the rise of the Arab Empire - within the boundaries of the Roman Empire. It is worth noting that the adoption of Christianity as the state religion under Constantine in 325 AD was preceded by a similar event - devoid of any political or social connections - in Armenia, where the monarch, Triadates, had converted just two decades earlier, effectively bringing with him practically the entire population of the country.

Though the Armenians from time to time were part of the Roman Empire, there was no prolonged period in the pre-Arab era during which they were full subjects of the Roman Empire. Thus, the political forces and social climate which sometimes influenced the development of church doctrine were different in the Armenian church. Armenian bishops were present, however, at most major Church councils as far back as the Nicene, and participated with their peers in the deliberations. The Great Church Controversies of the 5th century resulted in the Armenians permanently rejecting Ecclesiastical control from both Rome and Constantinople.

Although Christians, the Armenians remained in many ways separated from the West for over a thousand years, well beyond the Middle Ages. They were a protected minority when the Ottoman Empire was at its height, and Europe was trembling at the advance of the Ottoman armies. As the Ottoman Empire began to decline in the 18th-19th centuries, however, and the "Great Powers" of Europe and "Holy Russia" foresaw the impending collapse of the "Sick man of Europe," the Armenians were re-discovered by the Christian West, not only as long-lost fellow Christians, but as potential friendly contacts in a territory which they aspired to split among themselves.

This re-discovery, with the accompanying mixed motives, was to have unfortunate consequences for the Armenians when the hour of final collapse of the Ottoman Empire came in the war we now call the "Great War."

These newly discovered Christians were viewed not only as future allies to aid territorial ambitions, but also as potential proselytes. Protestant missionaries were sent in, wherever possible, to win over new converts from the long-separated Armenian fold to the doctrines of the Protestant Reformers that had so changed the texture of Western Christianity during the interval of separation. These were soon followed by Roman Catholic Missionaries - all of whose efforts were to be backed by a conspicuously high level of support from their respective governments.

But although the Armenians were very accepting of new Western ideologies - particularly nationalism - the assiduous efforts of the missionaries did not result in nearly as many conversions as they had hoped for. Most Armenians remained attached to the "Orthodox Armenian" Church.

In the 19th century there were nearly 2,000 foreign religious missions in Anatolia, hailing from the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, etc. Although they established educational institutions, they involved themselves in the lives of the Armenians, and had the effect of separating them from the Turks. Documentary evidence shows that the missionary schools ultimately had a role in the Armenian revolutionary activity.

## 6. Problems and issues

We can now discuss the primary problems and issues with the use of the "genocide" label for the 1915 events.

### *6.1. The Rebellion*

Comparison to WWII

The Armenian insistence on the "genocide" label distinctly ignores the very serious role of the Armenian Revolt and the accompanying provocation in the hour of peril. Unlike the American Experience in WWII, in which American civilians were not the targets of violence, Armenian revolutionary activity in the years leading up to 1915 involved many instances of deliberate killings of Turkish Moslem (and some Jewish) civilians. The Armenian military leaders, emboldened by the support they were receiving from the Western powers and Russia, were so reckless and confident of victory that they openly informed the Turks that they would not side with them in the impending war, but would instead side with the enemy (Imperial Russia)[4]. Such betrayal, in fact treason, was directed at the very state (Ottoman Empire) where the Armenians had lived peacefully for centuries, rising to prominent (even cabinet-level) positions in government and commerce.

Documentary evidence

The armed struggle, or rebellion, of Armenian militants against Turks was admitted by none other than Boghos Nubar Pasha, the head of the Armenian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, and by Hovhannes Katchaznouni, the first prime minister of Armenia[5] in a manifesto[6] delivered at the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF) convention held in Bucharest, Romania, in 1923. As noted previously, during the war Armenian Revolutionaries were very bold and confident of victory because the "Great Powers" of the West (i.e., Christian Powers) were promising them their own piece of the soon-to-be-carved-up Ottoman Empire (i.e., an independent Armenian nation-state in Eastern Anatolia).

After the war was over, these same revolutionaries very loudly demanded that the Western powers make good on their promises and cede to them an Armenian nation-state of their own. In a 40-page

[4] It would be difficult tofind a parallel in the history of the world for such a bold and openly reckless act of treason. Although the Ottoman state was in an advanced state of instability at this time the Armenians were still not only Ottoman subjects but their leaders were holding high ranks in the Ottoman state.

[5] The first "Republic of Armenia" here referred-to existed for only a brief period of just over two years. It was formed after the Russian (or "Bolshevik") revolution on the territory which had formerly been the Czarist Russian province of "Eastern Armenia." In 1920 the Soviet Red Army entered Yerevan, effectively ending the Armenian self-rule.

[6] This document is entitled "Dashnagtzoutiun has nothing to do anymore – The Manifesto of Hovhannes Kachaznouni First Prime Minister of the independent Armenian Republic." An updated English translation was published in 2006 in Istanbul.

document[7] presented to the Paris Peace conference in 1919, and still extant in English, they argued that this was their due since Armenian "volunteers and soldiers ...fought side by side with the Allies ...on all fronts." They provided lengthy evidence of their complicity against their own government and demanded that the Allies pay up on these grounds. Similar evidence was presented in "Why Armenia Should be Free - Armenia's role in the present war" published in Boston in 1918. Against the backdrop of such documentation, it is most embarrassing to see modern Western legislators speaking of a "genocide" of Armenians in 1915. Clearly, such legislation ignores the deaths of non-combatant Moslem civilians while counting only the deaths of Christian (Armenian) civilians. It also ignores the treasonous acts of Armenian revolutionaries.

Civilian casualties

The allegation of "genocide" manifestly ignores the rebellion, betrayal and provocation of Armenian militants that took up arms to collude with powerful enemies that were invading the Ottoman territory. Such collusion posed a great military danger not only to the Ottoman armies in the eastern and southern fronts, but also to large populations of innocent civilians.

Archives also show unequivocally that nearly 524,000 Turks (and some Jews) were massacred by armed Armenian rebels in the eastern provinces of the Ottoman Empire during 1910-1922. The gangs also massacred local Armenian civilians that did not cooperate. Documentary evidence directly from Armenian sources[8] and from contemporary US newspapers shows that wealthy Armenians were forced by the leading Armenian party (the Dashnaks) to contribute financially to the Revolutionary effort. And many were slaughtered - often publicly- for refusing to submit to extortion.

### *6.2. The word "genocide"*

In the words of one recent author, this word "evokes implicit comparisons with the Nazi past," and this imagery in popular usage inescapably enters into the deliberations of civic and political institutions on the question of "genocide." Ironically, Armenians lived peacefully for centuries with Turks while the European Jews lived in an atmosphere of animosity in their communities. Turks also welcomed Sephardic Jews that were persecuted in Spain in the 15th century. This is precisely what makes the accusation of "genocide," when originating from the West toward Turks, so insulting and intolerable.

As pointed out above, the Armenian problem started when revolutionary elements among the Armenians - encouraged by Christian powers with territorial ambitions on the collapsing Ottoman Empire - embarked on a path that threw the entire region into turmoil. This sparked a conflict that quickly grew out of control, gravely endangering a large sector of the Armenian population, precipitating the Great Armenian Tragedy of 1915. Moslems in great numbers suffered as well. Massacres of Moslems by Armenian gangs, which started well before the 1915 events, amounted to ethnic cleansing.

Because Jews did not do what the Armenian militant elements did in their communities, it is utterly dishonest to directly or indirectly compare the Holocaust with the Armenian Tragedy of 1915.

---

[7] See "The Armenian Question before the Peace Conference," Feb. 12, 1919

[8] See K.S. Papazian, "Patriotism Perverted," p. 15-18 for a comprehensive discussion of the terrorization of the wealthy Armenians for the purpose of extorting funds. He includes the names of the victims and some of the perpetrators – complete with sources of authority.

### *6.3. Intolerance and hatred*

"Genocide" allegations by Armenians, and their reckless campaign against Turkey, have fostered in the West an atmosphere of prejudice and animosity toward present-day Turks. Turks often feel discriminated against, and some feel unwanted. They are vastly outnumbered, and are made the objects of slander and calumny. As such, Turks are loath to defend themselves against charges that they view as patently biased and unjust.

Turks, however, have recently started to speak out. All of us, whether Americans or Europeans, must refuse to allow this manifest injustice to persist in our midst. We in the West have determined to take a stand against bigotry and hatred in all forms. Yet, it is on our soil and in our legislatures that this hate campaign is being allowed to flourish. It has clear religious undertones, shows a disregard for standards of integrity, and is clearly impacting global relations in a most negative way. If we fail to act, we cannot escape the onus of complicity in such a campaign.

### *6.4. Politicization of history*

Because Turks are almost never heard in the West, pronouncements as to what happened before, during and after World War I do not in any way amount to a debate. Most people, and legislative bodies, simply assume that Armenians were victims of genocide. To Armenians, this is quite convenient, but the reality is that the historians are generally much more circumspect in their judgments. Politicians, under pressure from powerful constituencies, introduce bills that recognize "Armenian 'genocide,'" while many knowledgeable scholars do not share such conclusion.

Equally disturbing, when legislative bodies pass such resolutions, the Turkish side is not granted the right of self-defense.

History should normally be left to historians. But on the Armenian issue history is turned into a political tool, and the accompanying slander campaign has the effect of bullying opposing historians into silence. As a result, the truth suffers, and the standards of historical scholarship in the West are debased in an inexcusable -and a most embarrassing- way.

## 7. Conclusion: Call for action

Clearly, the government's decision to relocate the Armenians in the waning days of the Ottoman Empire was undertaken in the hour of extreme danger, desperation and chaos bordering on anarchy. It was a decision in response to Armenian Revolt, dictated by national security concerns in perilous times. It is disingenuous to dismiss the overwhelming historical evidence and falsely accuse Turks of malice toward the Armenian populace because of their ethnicity or religion. Except for select leaders in Istanbul, the Armenians (some 200,000) in the Western part of Anatolia were largely exempted from the relocation orders. The vast majority of relocated Armenians died as a result of depravation, hunger and disease in time of war, and the killings and suffering on the Moslem side were equally harrowing.

Armenian sources attest that during their short-lived Armenian Democratic Republic, (May 28, 1918 to Dec. 2, 1920) 195,000 of the approximately one million Armenians in Armenia died of starvation and epidemics. These dramatic deaths are blamed on Turks and not on their revolutionary leaders, who subsequently escaped to Western countries after the catastrophes they inflicted on their own people

No court has endorsed a "genocide" label for the 1915 events, and in fact, the Armenian side has not dared to take its claims to an international court. There is also no UN resolution that recognizes the 1915 events as genocide. When the historical evidence is examined, it is clear that Armenian Revolutionary activity, or the Armenian Revolt, is what prompted the 1915 relocation orders. The movement started decades before the 1915 relocation, and stemmed from a desire to "take back" lands which Armenians considered to be their own – where, however, they were always a minority.

An impartial observer of events would admit that the present-day movement for recognition of a "genocide" label for the Armenian Tragedy is not at all the humanitarian movement that its promoters would have us believe. Instead, it is a deliberate distortion of historical facts, carrying with it the malignant fruits of ethnic animosity, terrorism, defamation, intimidation, and disruption of legitimate political processes in Western societies.

We call upon the recipients of this document to take all steps in their power to ensure that no further support is given to such a harmful and deceitful movement.

## 8. **Epilogue**

The majority of Armenians, both in Armenia and the Diaspora, live today in a surreal world of distrust, animosity and even hatred directed against Turks. Indoctrinated to be anti-Turkish from childhood onward[9] in their families, schools, churches and close-knit communities, they become bigoted citizens in the society. Such bigotry is anathema to racial and ethnic harmony.

No nation in history has escaped traumatic experiences, some impinging on life and death. But most nations leave historical grievances, justified or otherwise, behind, and look forward for fruitful and peaceful existence with other nations. But not, apparently, the Armenians. Armenian revolutionist leaders still exert significant influence on the majority of Armenians living both in Armenia and the Diaspora.

World history is fraught with tragic conflicts. World War I consumed the lives of more than 15 million people, and World War II, more than 70 million people. Yet, most nations, including Turks, embroiled in such trans-national conflicts have chosen to live in peace with their former adversaries. Some have forged trusted treaties and alliances. A world at peace requires such perseverance and attitude.

The Western tendency to repeatedly count only Christian lives, and minimize or disregard Turkish civilian lives as unworthy, is especially galling to present-day Turks. During the 1912-1913 Balkan Wars, for example, non-combatant Moslem civilians faced conditions that were in many ways similar to those Armenian civilians faced in Anatolia in 1915. Untold numbers of Moslems suffered horrific cruelty and died on their "Trek to the East" during the Balkan Wars. Yet, no one in the West speaks of the "Great Turkish Tragedy" of 1912-1913.

And as recently as 1992, when Armenian troops mutilated and killed defenseless Azeri (ethnic Turkish) civilians under the most inhumane conditions at Khojaly (Nagorno-Karabakh), no Western legislature passed any "resolution" on this travesty. Nor was there any notable outcry in the Western media.

---

[9] For insight into the depth of this childhood indoctrination see the 2006 Readers Digest Article "My Journey from Hate to Hope" by Line Abrahamian available at http://www.readersdigest.ca/mag/2006/10/hate_to_hope.php

Does the West feel comfortable about applying different standards of morality according to religion and ethnicity?

The question the Armenians should ask themselves is: why can't they leave history behind and look forward to amicable relations with their historical adversaries? The events in question happened nearly a century ago, but the Armenians, in a sense, are still living in the past. They promote their smear campaign with a vengeance. Turks are prepared to face their history, as long as the Armenians face their own. Turks are prepared to let a joint commission of historians to study and judge the past, if the Armenians also wish the same.

Propaganda efforts that pander to religious and ethnic sympathies and one-sided resolutions in legislative bodies, however, will not resolve historical disputes. Openness and dialogue will.

Apart from Turkish citizens of Armenian origin, who enjoy full citizenship rights[10], there are roughly 100,000 undocumented Armenians living and working in Turkey. They are free to practice their faith. That says much about Turks' tolerance, and their outlook on history. Most of these undocumented Armenians entered on a 90-day visa with no intention of leaving. Yet, one would be hard pressed to find a single Turkish family now living in Armenia where public flag-burnings of the Turkish Flag are regularly tolerated.

[10] It is significant to note that these Turkish Armenians are extremely disturbed by the political and social pressures brought to bear on them by the Diaspora Armenians whose views they often do not share, and whose tactics they reject.

# 9. Part II - Appendix: Index of Misrepresentations of Fact

## Contents

**1. ABOUT THIS INDEX ..... 11**

**2. CONTINUED USE OF WARTIME PROPAGANDA AS HISTORICAL SOURCES ..... 12**

2.1. MORGENTHAU'S STORY ..... 12
2.2. THE BLUE BOOK ..... 13

**3. INTENTIONAL OMISSION OF KEY PARTS OF THE STORY ..... 14**

3.1. THIS HISTORICAL CONTEXT ..... 14
3.2. CIRCUMSTANCES ATTENDING THE RELOCATION ..... 14
3.3. THE DEADLY GAMBLE ..... 15

**4. CONTINUED USE OF ANCESTRAL WAR STORIES ..... 16**

**5. USE OF FALSIFIED DOCUMENTS ..... 16**

**6. THE HITLER QUOTE ..... 16**

**7. REPRESENTING THE 'GENOCIDE' LABEL AS "SETTLED HISTORY" ..... 17**

## 1. About this index

This "Index" is the second part of a two-part document outlining and analyzing the events of 1915 in Eastern Anatolia. In this Index we list some of the misrepresentations of Armenian Propagandists in the West regarding the events of 1915, including a corrective discussion.

## 2. Continued use of wartime propaganda as historical sources

Armenian Propagandists often cite two sources in particular: "Ambassador Morgenthau's Story" and the British "Blue Book" prepared by the young graduate student Arnold Toynbee. To the uninformed layman, these documents have the appearance of reliable historical sources. But from the point of view of competent historians there are serious problems with these sources.

- The most glaring problem with the continued use of these two sources is that it violates a fundamental principle of historical research: Single sources cannot be viewed out of the context of all primary documentation bearing on the subject. In other words, if overwhelming evidence from other known facts and documents throws one or two sources in doubt, the discrepancy must be reconciled. Both of these documents are known - on the testimony of the authors themselves - to have been intended as wartime propaganda to secure the entry of the U.S. into the war. This fact, by itself, does not necessarily impeach them, but when viewed in conjunction with all the remaining evidence, it becomes clear that they have little value as historical records and should instead be regarded primarily as wartime propaganda.
- Those who have seen war first hand describe its cruelty, inhumanity and injustice. Almost any war, when viewed through the eyes of one side only, can look like a genocide. Both Morgenthau's story and the British Blue Book are clear examples of one-sided documents. Reputable historians view them as having, at best, very limited value for understanding the events of 1915, but when presented to the uninitiated public they produce an extremely distorted and misleading picture of those events.

### *2.1. Morgenthau's Story*

U.S. Ambassador Henry Morgenthau had a habit of keeping a scrupulous record of his daily activities in writing. We have his diaries and extensive documentation of so many events of his daily life. His 1918 book, *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story,* which originally appeared in monthly installments in what was then one of America's best-known magazines, "The World's Work" (circ. 120,000) reads like an adventure novel, and was such a sensation that not only did it play a major role in fostering public support for America's entry into the war, but it even received a movie offer from Hollywood - which Morgenthau rejected at the urging of President Wilson. But when the "stories" in his book are checked against his diary and other personal records, the value of the work as a historical source is destroyed completely.

Furthermore, the book itself is characterized by a significant number of anti-Turkish clauses that are nothing less than racist - an element that was necessary for propaganda value. In the book Turks are portrayed as an inferior race, reflecting the evil spirit of Germany. One of the main themes of the book is a series of stories portraying the Central Government as having had a conspiracy to exterminate the Armenians. But even if we were to disregard the other obvious problems with Morgenthau's book, there are irreconcilable problems with these stories. For example:

- Why is it that there are so many communications – still extant in the original - coming from this same government, warning that anyone who molested the deported Armenians or who failed to protect them adequately would be punished severely?

- If the government had a conspiracy to exterminate the Armenians, why is there so much documentation showing that this same government punished, and even executed in many cases, persons whom it considered guilty of massacring innocent Armenians?
- If the government wanted to exterminate the Armenians, why did it offer them Autonomy in August 1914, in Erzurum- an offer which they promptly rejected?

Blatant Armenian accusations contained in Morgenthau's book are rebuffed by his successor, Admiral Mark Bristol, who served as the Commander of the U.S. Naval Detachment in Turkish waters and as the U.S. High Commissioner to Turkey during the years 1919-1927. Based on his first-hand observations in the area, Bristol called the false Armenian reports circulating in the United States an "outrage." His writings are contained in "Bristol Letters" in the Library of Congress. "Genocide" proponents conveniently ignore or avoid any reference to Bristol's writings.

In 1990 Professor Heath Lowry of Princeton University characterized *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story* as a record of "crude half-truths and outright falsehoods."

In summary, Morgenthau's diary is generally regarded as an interesting historical source by both sides, but the diary clearly exposes his book as a propaganda piece.

### *2.2. The Blue Book*

A second source that is continually used by Armenian Propagandists is the British Blue Book, published in 1916 mostly through the efforts of Arnold Toynbee, who was at the time a graduate student. Abundant evidence exists to show that the intention of the British Government in producing the Blue Book was to bring about the entry of the U.S. into the war; not to deliver a comprehensive portrayal of what was happening in Eastern Anatolia at the time. Again, by itself, this fact does not necessarily impeach the work. However, there are several problems with the use of this document as a historical source authenticating the label of "genocide":

- Contrary to the assertions of Armenian Propagandists, the Blue Book contains no evidence proving that the Turkish government was responsible for the massacres[11] described therein. The atmosphere of near-anarchy and local animosity stemming from the depravity of the Armenian Revolutionaries would in any case tend to militate against such a conclusion.
- Contrary to the assurances of co-Author Lord Bryce, that most of the stories in the Blue book came from "eye-witnesses" most of the evidence presented in the work is hearsay evidence, not first-hand.
- Five years after compiling it, Toynbee would visit Turkey, report his deep shock at the instances of cruelty and barbarity he saw perpetrated by Greeks against Moslem Turks in Western Anatolia, and then later reveal that he had - all along- been ignorant of Armenian provocation in Eastern Anatolia[7].

[11] For an excellent discussion of the problems with use of the Blue Book, see p. 137-139, Guenter Lewy, *"The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey. A Disputed Genocide,"* Salt Lake City, University of Utah Press, 2005.
[7] This confession appears on p. 276 of Toynbee's 1922 work, "The Western Question in Greece and Turkey."

# 3. Intentional omission of key parts of the story

## *3.1. This historical context*

The Relocation of the Armenians -the event that marked such great suffering and loss of life- occurred in 1915. 1908 was the year of the "Young Turks" revolution. As a result of this revolution, there was a breakdown of law and order in many parts of Anatolia. Later, in 1914, when World War I broke out, the situation became much more urgent. Then in March of 1915, a massive Anglo-French naval attack force consisting of 18 battleships attacked at the Dardannelles straits at Gallipoli hoping to push through to Constantinople. By this time most Turkish able-bodied men were being called to defend the country from overwhelming invasion[12]. The Allied battleships penetrated partially up the straits to the massive Turkish cannons defending the channel at Çhanakkale unaware that the Turkish cannons raining fire down on them were almost out of ammunition. At a critical point in the battle, the damage to Anglo-French ships from the cannon fire and from mines laid by the Turkish minelayer *Nusrat* caused the remaining battleships to abandon the naval project completely. This critical turning point occurred on March 18th 1915 – a day that occupies a special rank on the Turkish calendar to the present time.

But though they celebrated their victory, the Turkish generals knew it wasn't over yet. The French and British, who would soon be joined by forces from far away Australia and New Zealand ("ANZACS"), were abandoning the naval effort only to regroup for a massive land invasion at Gallipoli. Conditions for the Turks had now became so desperate that not only able-bodied men but even policemen were called to the western front to defend the country as Turks would soon be dying by the thousands in a conflict of apocalyptic proportions at Gallipoli. This added to the breakdown of law and order and brought Eastern Anatolia to a near-anarchic condition.

By this time Armenian Revolutionary activity - complete with internal attacks on non-combatant civilians - had been going on not for years but for decades. They had openly recruited Armenian men in the country to side with "Holy Russia," the hereditary enemy of the Ottomans. They had felt so confident of Allied help that they had decided to risk everything and refuse to help the war efforts of their country - even the best Armenian primary sources admit this.

It was in this desperate atmosphere that the Central Government decided on the Relocation Order, which had such dire consequences. A mere five weeks separates the crucial Naval conflict of March 18, 1915 from the relocation order of April 24th 1915. The massive Allied land invasion of the Gallipoli Peninsula occurred the very next day on April 25th 1915.

## *3.2. Circumstances attending the relocation*

Extensive documentary evidence is still extant showing that the Central Turkish Government not only sent out messages warning that the relocated Armenians were to be protected, but later carried

[12] The British War Council had ordered the attack in response to a request by Czarist Russian Government to draw the Turkish forces away from the front in the Caucasus where the battle was intense in the cold December winter of 1914. Armenian Revolutionaries had been lending great assistance to the Russians in the Caucasus and just a few weeks earlier,on November 5th 1914, on the occasion of a formal visit by the Russian Czar Nicolas II, the president of the Armenian National Bureau in Tblisi had proudly declared to the Czar "From all countries Armenians are hurrying to enter the ranks for the glorious Russian Army, with their blood to serve the victory of Russian Arms …let the Russian flag wave freely over the Dardanelles…". This was just a few months before the relocation.

through on threats to punish - even with execution- responsible parties who were negligent in their duty to protect the Armenians on their journey. Contrary to claims of Armenian Propagandists who omit all this important information from the story, this relocation order did not amount to a death sentence for the Armenians. It was a desperate, last-ditch effort to solve a seemingly impossible problem precipitated by the Armenian Revolutionaries, and the meddling of the "Great Powers" in the internal affairs of the crumbling Ottoman Empire. Although there were many deaths in this relocation:

- Many Armenians survived in their new location or emigrated to various locations.
- Many returned after a law was passed ending the relocation .
- Food was scarce, and non-Armenians (Turks especially) were dying of starvation everywhere.
- Many of the deaths resulted from an atmosphere of anarchy; outlaws roamed the countryside with impunity.

Finally, the intent here is not to absolve the 1915 Central Turkish Leadership from all blame, but to show that use of the "genocide" label in this case is not only wholly unjustified, but in general deliberately deceitful.

### *3.3. The deadly gamble*

Dr G. Pasdermadjian - who styled himself "Armen Garo" (Armenian Hero) had been a deputy in the Ottoman Parliament before defecting to the Armenian Revolutionary cause. After the war he wrote a pamphlet entitled "Why Armenia should be Free" demanding that the western powers make good on their promise to cede an independent nation-state to the Armenians. In this pamphlet he reveals the full motivation of the Armenian decision to revolt and side with Czarist Russia against their own Turkish government at the hour of great peril. He argues vehemently that if the Armenians had not sided with Russia, the massacres of the Armenians would never have taken place:

> "Had they bound their fate in 1914 to the Turco-German cause ...those frightful Armenian massacres would not have taken place. On the contrary, the Turks and the Germans would have tried to win the sympathy of the Armenians in every possible way until the end of the War." (Pasdermadjian p. 43)

He goes on to explain that the Armenian Revolutionaries knew full well of the dangers to which their people were being exposed by their national ambitions but they decided to take this calculated risk in their blind determination to establish an independent nation-state.

> "Each and every one of them had a terrible presentiment of the terrible responsibility they assumed. ...It was as clear as day to the Armenians that a Germano-Turkish victory could never satisfy their national aspirations. The most that those nations would have done for us would have been to grant nominal rights to the Armenia of their own choice. But it was very plain to us also that we should not have suffered such frightful human losses had we not sided with the Allies. We consciously chose this last alternative, namely: we tied our fate to the allied victory; we exposed our very existence to danger in order to realize the complete fulfillment of our national ambition, that is, to see the re-establishment of the United Historic Independent Armenia." (Pasdermadjian p. 43-44)

The Turkish people of today, generally, are not happy about the result of this grave miscalculation on the part of the 1914 Armenian Revolutionary leaders. No one can turn back the clock on the terrible events of 1915 and rationalizing the wrongs committed by either side will only delay the healing process. The narrative must be told as it happened, not as we wish it had happened.

## 4. Continued use of ancestral war stories

Armenian Propagandists make continued use of stories of the deaths of their ancestors, many of whom died in truly deplorable circumstances. The stories are repeatedly told in conjunction with Armenian attempts to have the events of 1915 labeled a "genocide." What can one say when confronted with these stories, many of which are undoubtedly true? On the one hand, one does not wish to show disrespect for these individuals or negate the seriousness of the situations. However, there are several serious problems with this continued use of these ancestral war-stories:

- Many Moslem Turkish civilians died at the hands of Armenian Revolutionaries under circumstances that were as bad -and often worse- than the circumstances under which the Armenian deaths occurred. The Turks are only too well aware of these stories because their families were affected for generations. However, the Armenians make it quite clear that it is the life of a Christian Armenian that should count. And stories of the tragic deaths of so many Moslem Turks are tightly suppressed by the Armenians.
- The implication of innocence is clear in the telling of these stories by the Armenians. It is true that many of the dead were non-combatant civilians, but it is also true that the whole episode was precipitated by the actions of Armenian Revolutionaries who brutally massacred Moslem Turks in a widespread campaign to establish a "Western Armenia" and "take back" lands that they regarded as hereditarily theirs - lands in which they constituted a very small minority.

## 5. Use of falsified documents

One of the most common "proofs" used by Armenian activists in support of their claim of "genocide" is a book known as The Memoirs of Naim Bey. This book is represented as proof that the Ottoman Government deliberately exterminated the Armenian population of Anatolia. The source of the book was a certain Armenian man named Aram Andonian who translated it into Armenian. He claimed that he came into the possession of official Ottoman documents, telegrams and decrees, many of which were supposedly signed by Ottoman Interior Minister Talat Pasha. Briefly, the list of authentication problems with this Book, and with Andonian's story of how he came into possession of the "documents" contained therein, is very long. And so is the list of reputable historians - specialists in this field- who reject them outright as forgeries. Even the British authorities charged with prosecuting Ottoman rulers after the First World War during the Malta Tribunal refused to use them. But the Armenian Propagandists continue to pass them off on an unsuspecting public as authentic proof of a program to exterminate the Armenians. See these websites for critical discussion of this forged work:

http://www.meforum.org/article/748
http://www.eraren.org/index.php?Lisan=en&Page=YayinIcerik&SayiNo=15

## 6. The Hitler Quote

Armenian activists often claim that Hitler said that he could get away with exterminating European Jewry because no one "remembers today the extermination of the Armenians." This "statement"

appears (in more or less these words) in the leaflets handed out by groups of demonstrating young Armenians, on the cover of books, and in articles written by Armenian authors. Furthermore, the "statement" is on display at the Holocaust Museum in Washington D.C., where millions of visitors every year read it, leading many vistors to believe that Hitler felt confident he could exterminate the Jews because the Ottomans had been successful with Armenians.

There is just one problem with the quote: Hitler never said it (Lowry, Heath, "The U.S. Congress and Adolf Hitler on the Armenians." Institute of Turkish Studies, Inc. Washington, D.C. Political Communication and Persuasion, Volume 3, Number 2 (1985)). Armenian activists have him saying it in a meeting with his German General staff. This was, they claim, brought to light in the Nuremberg trials. The problem is that actual transcripts of this meeting, (Hitler's speeches and recollections of leading Nazis accepted as authentic by the Nuremberg court) do not contain any such attribution to Armenians; they only have him calling them "unreliable" and "dangerous." Instead, the quote was taken from a book, written in 1942, by someone who was never able to authenticate his claim. It was later reproduced in an article by an unnamed writer for Times of London on Saturday, November 24, 1945, but it was most definitely not used by the Nuremberg prosecutors. In short; Hitler never said it, yet Armenians continue using it to back up their case against the Turks.

## 7. Representing the 'genocide' label as "settled history"

Armenian Propagandists often argue that the "genocide" label for the 1915 events is "settled" history, and that no one really disputes it anymore. There are two fundamental problems with this argument:

- It is patently false. There is a long list of highly reputable and qualified historians and intellectuals who reject the “genocide” label for the 1915 events (see below).
- The Armenian propagandists and the “Genocide Scholar" movement have a long, well-established history of launching viscous personal attacks on any historian who disagrees with their interpretation of the 1915 events.

Partial list of non-Turkish historians and intellectuals who do not subscribe to "genocide" characterization include: Bernard Lewis, Heath Lowry and Norman Itzkowitz of Princeton University, Stanford Shaw, formerly of University of California, Justin McCarthy of Louisville University, Guenter Lewy and Brian Williams of Massachusetts University, David Fromkin of Boston University, Avigdor Levy of Brandeis University, Michael Gunter of Tennessee Tech University, Pierre Oberling of Hunter College, City University of New York, Roderic Davidson, formerly of George Washington University, William Batkay of Montclair State University, Edwin A. Grosvenor of Amherst College, J.C. Hurwitz**,** formerly of Columbia University, Michael Radu of Foreign Policy Research Institute, Dankwart Rostow, formerly of Council on Foreign Relations, military historians Edward J. Erickson and Gwynne Dyer, Gilles Veinstein of College de France, Paul Dumont of Strasbourg University, Robert Mantran (RIP), formerly of Aix-Marseille University, Stefano Trinchese of Chieti University, Augusto Sinagra of Roma-Sapienza University, Eberhard Jäckel, formerly of Stuttgart University, Jeremy Salt of Melbourne University, Norman Stone of Bilkent University, authors Erich Fiegl (deceased) and Andrew Mango, and Judge Samuel Weems (deceased).

The End