

SÚLIM GRANOVSKY



Armenian Genocide

The Silenced Extermination



Translated by Elizabeth Birks

By request of the Raoul Wallenberg Foundation



To the Reader

You have every right to wonder what I have to do with the Armenians and why I should have decided, at the age of 86, to investigate the extermination they suffered as of 1915 at the hands of the Ottomans and Turks. It is not hard to understand. I grew up as a teenager during the war against the Nazi reign of terror and my Jewish roots led me to take part in militant activities in a youth organization that sought to create awareness in a small neighborhood of the city of Buenos Aires as regards the danger to humanity should Hitler and his supporters conquer the world. Only a few years after the defeat of the Third Reich I was able to travel to Germany and see the rubble in the streets of Berlin, the Reichstag gutted by fire, women driving tramways because the Nazis had condemned to death in foreign lands several generations of men trained to wipe six million Jews off the face of the earth, along with one million gypsies, thousands of democratic politicians, and many others, including the mentally retarded, homosexuals and disabled.

The 20th century was a genocidal century. Large-scale genocides began with the massacre of 1,500,000 Armenians and over the following two decades the Nazis instrumented the Shoah.

The Jewish genocide was judged at Nuremberg, but Raphael Lemkin, the Polish-Jewish lawyer who created the term "genocide", had already issued the warning before the Shoah: do not forget the Armenian extermination.

My mother, Paulina, lived in Odesa during the Tsarist regime. Once in Argentina she told us as children that when the Cossack pogroms started, the Armenians used to keep their Jewish neighbors in hiding. It was, therefore, my mother who was the source of inspiration for this work. From her I inherited this debt of gratitude towards the Armenian community.

Súlim* Granovsky

(*) if you are intrigued by my name, I'd like to point out it is a phonetic version of the word PEACE in Yiddish.

"Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?" Adolf Hitler

On 22nd August 1939 Hitler's troops were preparing to invade Poland, as a prelude to their march east, their real aim being to seize Soviet wheat and oil, and, as a repugnant ideological justification – which Hitler was fully convinced of – to obliterate along the way any expression of an "inferior race" defying "Aryan purity". At a meeting with the highest commandants of the Wehrmacht, he harangued them and made them undertake to "put to death mercilessly and without compassion men, women and children of Polish derivation and language". At that time Hitler's target was solely Polish origin and language.

Soon the other victims were to be added, in addition to the Jews: gypsies, politicians and public officials in the countries they invaded, mentally disabled, physically handicapped, homosexuals. Hitler said it clearly: "Our strength consists in our speed and our brutality. Genghis Khan led millions of women and children to slaughter with premeditation and a happy heart. History sees in him solely the founder of a State.

"It is a matter of indifference to me what a weak European civilization will say about me. I have issued the command – and I'll have anybody who utters but one word of criticism executed by a firing squad – that our war aim does not consist in reaching certain lines but in the physical destruction of the enemy. Accordingly, I have placed my death-head formation in readiness (referring to the SS) for the present only in the east, with orders to them to send to death mercilessly and without compassion men, women and children of Polish derivation and language. Only thus shall we gain the living space (Lebensraum) which we need."

And to tranquilize the consciences of his generals, in case they were to harbor some humanitarian prejudice, Hitler guaranteed them impunity with this cynically savage expression: "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

CONTENTS

PROLOGUE

- To keep silence or to speak out (Pascual C. Ohanian)
- Debt of gratitude towards the Armenian community
- Genocide: an international crime
- The whole of humanity shudders at such a heartrending account (William Saroyan)
- Notes on the history of Armenia.
- The Ottoman Empire 1300-1922.
- Destruction of the Armenian people's cultural heritage.
- Factors leading to the extermination
- Mehmet Talaat, an emblematic genocide
- Nothing changed with Mustapha Kemal. Are modernity and genocide therefore compatible?
- Before and after Kemal, slavery and bartering of women
- The genocides never concealed their intentions
- Human rights violations
- Martyr cities
- Resistance and repression
- Chronology of the extermination
- Erosion of memory. When genocide is forgotten
- Jewish holocaust and Armenian extermination
- Voices in solidarity with the Armenian cause.
- Turkish negation was never alone
- Amnesty International criticizes Turkish criminal legislation. Derogation of Section 301
- A jump forward. Switzerland 2009: Protocol to silence the extermination?
- Criticism of the Protocols
- Anatole France and the Extermination
- Greeks too were exterminated

DOCUMENTS

- Academic panel "The genocide of the Armenian people". Philosophy and Letters College (University of Buenos Aires)
- The Treaty of Sevres and the Armenian issue. Legal interrelationship between the Treaties of Sevres and Lausanne
- Doctrine on genocide (by Raphael Lemkin)
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (CPPCG) (UN, 1948)
- Argentina: 24 April "Day of action for tolerance and respect among peoples" National Law 26199

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

The author

PROLOGUE

TO KEEP SILENCE or to speak out

Mankind is made up of beings restricted by the length of our life and the environment where we conduct our activities; yet our personal past is added to that of generations that came before us, who submerge us in History and project us into the future with the legacy of their personal spiritual content enclosed in their written word. And today, more than ever, we can expand this without limit instantly to the whole world, thanks to the almost incredible means of communication. It is at this point where a person comes to a fork in the road. Because each of us has a choice to make.

In the face of a horrendous event that spells shame and dishonor to human nature, involving the massacre of multitudes simply because of their national origin, an event the perpetrators sought to conceal from the eyes of the world and today declare that what is an absolute truth affirmed daily by all never occurred, we are forced to choose between keeping silence or speaking out. Between saying nothing or communicating the truth to those around us. Súlim Granovsky has chosen to speak out, to write, to proclaim. And from that moment he has become one of a long line of people who uplift human condition, who have decided to show they are different from beasts, from monsters, from criminals.

Súlim Granovsky is, therefore, a Man. And with his choice, his name and surname honor not only Eva, his wife, and his children Martín, Paula and Jorge, and his grandchildren Julieta, Iván and Bárbara, but also those who pondering on what is set forth in the following pages value his companionship amidst the pain.

After perusing this book by Súlim Granovsky and reflecting on its profound significance, I am affirmed in the conviction that those who suffer ancestral grief are able to relate more easily with a feeling of solidarity to the experiences undergone by a nation awaiting justice, like Armenia.

Pascual Carlos Ohanian

Debt of gratitude towards the Armenian community

I am Argentine-born, son of Ukrainian parents who emigrated to this country in the early years of the 20th century. In my note to my readers I went back to my childhood and my mother's memory of her Armenian neighbor's solidarity during tsarist pogroms.

Her anecdotes often pictured the pogroms by the Tsar's drunken Cossacks, obsessed by an irrational hatred, who invaded the homes of Jews, disemboweling mattresses in search of whatever might be found other than dire poverty, destroying religious books, murdering men and children, raping women. My mother remembered that in those years when the proximity of violence was presaged, the Armenians valorously concealed neighboring Jews in their homes. My mother transmitted to me that debt of gratitude towards the Armenian people, which to some extent helps to explain my decision to write about the different stages of their history dating back to pre-Christian times and particular devote myself to their sufferings both before and after the Extermination of 1915.

Though I have earned my living as a journalist my resources as a researcher are modest, as will be seen in this paper. Understandably enough in the light of this I did what one of my college teachers waggishly advised when encouraging us to probe problems in depth, and not restrict our research to a single opinion. To free us of any feeling of guilt he admitted that resorting to more than two sources could already be called a creation. Which is what I have done. To be able to understand the facts I resorted to sources of scholars such as Vahan Adrián and Pascual C. Ohanian, among others. Reading their work and assimilating their lore allowed me to make use of it here - reinterpreted or simply repeated - in the hope that whoever reads this summary of tragic events against humankind is able to take it in, communicate it, and, if possible, go farther afield in studying what actually occurred.

Knowledge of the millennial Armenian culture is not, however, restricted to studying the extermination that took place at the dawn of the 20th century, for the tragedy of the Armenian people at the hands of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey leads to the sad conclusion that it was a mass extermination which took a long time to be recognized as such.

There have always been genocides...

A fatalistic view would hold that there have always been genocides. This is no doubt true, yet does not entitle us to accept that this will inexorably continue to be the case throughout the rest of the history of mankind. There are a variety of causes leading up to persecutions, some of which are simply a matter of convenience to conceal other covert purposes, and many of which respond to economic motivations eventually sparking off wars as a result of market disputes, or the need to control strategic raw materials, or vital living space, or, as held by the Nazis, for religious or political supremacy, or the unnatural view of ethnic superiority. Some genocides have been ignored, such as the gypsy holocaust or the silenced genocides – which is the case of the Armenian holocaust. History has likewise ignored the sheer magnitude of some holocausts, just as was done by the media and multinational agencies in charge of ensuring world peace, namely the League of Nations at that time. Witnesses seem to have had short memories, perhaps affected by the fear of being swept up by such terror, causing them to look the other way.

So many questions could be asked in connection with genocides. For instance, what went through the minds of neighbors living close to the concentration camps when they saw hundreds of Jews, gypsies, mentally retarded, physically handicapped, homosexuals descending from train cars, with family groups immediately dismembered by the Nazis? Did they neither see nor smell the fumes from the gas chambers? Entirely aloof from what was going on just beyond their walls, did they lift their glasses without remorse at Christmas? Turks not involved as accomplices in the genocide, how could they watch the Armenian caravans of death wheeling by? How could they see men who had been hanged along the roadside? Were they not aghast at seeing Armenian children set fire to like torches, or young women handed over as booty for harems? One wonders, were they not overcome with pity, did they not feel the humanitarian desire to offer a hand, or a crust of bread or a glass of water? Evidently not. It is likely they did not do so because the perpetrators spread a blanket of terror around them, capable of paralyzing any kind of humanitarian reaction.

It is imperative to take a stand in the face of such tragedy.

For exterminations of any nature not to be replicated – even though they still continue to occur – it is necessary to contribute to the creation of a collective awareness of respect towards human life, towards the lives of those around us, for it is their inalienable right. A country's laws on human rights are enacted to be kept; international conventions do not end these practices simply because nations ratify them as a formality: there must be real commitment to fulfill their terms strictly. Argentina witnessed a juridical paradox when one of the United Nations conventions on genocide was ratified by a de facto military junta which, despite the rulings of the international agreement ratified, persecuted its adversaries and abolished public freedom. The mere formality of an international ratification lacks any value without the political decision to fulfill it, unless the regulation itself contains mechanisms to necessarily bind the Nations ratifying it.

Reigns of terror such as that brought to an end with the "Never Again" in Argentina, a reign where 30,000 youngsters were murdered or went missing, must be avoided, outlawed and punished with all the rigor of the laws by democratic governments, appealing to the international remedies provided by the United Nations Conventions. Peoples all over the earth, and their political and social representatives should never, ever, allow these ideals to falter.

Súlim Granovsky
May 2010, in the City of Buenos Aires

GENOCIDE, an international crime

Raphael Lemkin*¹ is a Polish-Jewish jurist born in 1900 on a small farm close to Wolkowysk. As a spectator and scholar of the types of violence unleashed against ethnic, religious and social groups, in 1933 Lemkin broached these problems in international forums. He emigrated to the United States when the Nazis invaded Poland and was appointed professor at Duke University. In 1942 he worked as an analyst in the Washington War Department. In 1944 he published a book on Nazis crimes and coined the term genocide to describe the systematic assassinations perpetrated by Nazism and their decision to annihilate European Jewish communities. Years earlier he had sympathized with the horrors undergone by the Armenian people and the extermination of 1,500,000 Armenians between 1915 and 1923- at the hands of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey as the Nation succeeding it.

"Nazi leaders", says Lemkin, expressly acknowledged their intention of entirely destroying Poles and Russians; of demographically and culturally destroying the French element in Alsace Lorraine and Slav peoples. They were on the verge of achieving their aim of exterminating Jews and gypsies in Europe."

"Obviously, the German experience is the most shocking, deliberate and complete, but history has provided us with other examples of destruction of entire nations, and ethnic and religious groups, notably the razing of Carthage; the destruction of religious groups in Islamic wars and the Crusades; the massacres of the Albanese and the Waldensians, and more recently, the Armenian massacre."

Lemkin wonders, 'Would mass murder be an adequate name for such a phenomenon? How can one qualify an attempt to destroy a Nation and erase its cultural personality?' He holds the term 'denationalization' is inadequate because it does not emphasize biological destruction. For this same reason terms such as Germanization or Italianization are not valid because the Germans did not want to Germanize the Jews or the Poles in western Poland, they simply wanted to exterminate them entirely. However, the Turks managed to achieve this in their territory by physically annihilating the Armenians and usurping their territories and belongings.

Meaning of the term genocide

For Lemkin this newly created term, genocide, refers to "a coordinated plan made up of different actions aimed at the destruction of the essential foundations of the life of national groups with the purpose of obliterating these groups." He adds that genocide is not a national crime but rather a crime which the whole of international society, as such, should be virtually interested in. It is, from the legal, moral and humanitarian perspective, an international crime.

Cultural considerations, says Lemkin, uphold international protection for national, religious and cultural groups. Our entire heritage is the product of contributions from all nations. "We can best understand this when we realize how impoverished our culture would be if the peoples doomed by Germany, such as the Jews, had not been permitted to create the Bible, or to give birth to an Einstein or a Spinoza; if the Poles had not had the opportunity to give the world a Copernicus or a Chopin; the Czechs a Huss, a Dvorak; the Greeks a Plato and a Socrates; the Russians a Tolstoy and a Shostakovich."

Genocide in times of peace creates international tensions and leads to war, held Lemkin very accurately. "While society has focused mainly on crimes against individuals, or more precisely on organized crimes against individuals, little has been done to prevent and punish the death and destruction of millions of human beings."

As creator of the term genocide, Lemkin is initially doubtful as to whether this word is adequate to describe the gigantic homicide of human beings, because it does not emphasize the motivation for the crime, particularly when arising from racial, national or religious considerations. He feels 'denationalization' is unsuitable because it does not emphasize biological destruction. Denationalization means the loss of nationality without this necessarily involving violence or homicide. The same criticism can apply to terms such as Germanization or Italianization because they describe manifestations of power, used arbitrarily or with the consent of those involved (the example of Austria in connection with Nazism), but are equally incomplete as they do not define biological destruction.

Hitler often stated that Germanization could only be carried out with soil, never with men.

These considerations led Lemkin to sustain the validity of the term he had coined (from *genos* race/clan and *cide* Latin suffix, killing). If genocide is criminal because it destroys national, racial or religious groups, this is an even greater reason for the international society to be vitally interested.

An international crime

Having defined the scope of the term genocide, it cannot but be acknowledged that by its very legal, moral and humanitarian nature it must be considered an international crime. This is recognized by the Charter of the United Nations Organization when it provides for the international protection of human rights, indicating that the denial of such rights by any state is a matter of concern to all mankind.

How could genocide be given a legal framework acknowledging it as an act that demands international justice? There are precedents that recognize piracy, drug trading, money counterfeiting or human trafficking as international crimes. Lemkin was very clear as to the need for global repression and suggests as an example that if a money counterfeiter manages to evade justice in his own country by fleeing abroad, he may be validly punished in the place where he sought refuge. Extending his theory to war-time, he holds that if murdering a Jew is a crime, the murder of all the Jews and Poles is equally a crime, showing evidence of premeditation and a criminally systematical condition that requires aggravation of the punishment.

At the Nuremberg trials prosecution held that the accused "conducted deliberate and systematic genocide – i.e. the extermination of racial and national groups – against civilian populations of certain occupied territories in order to destroy particular races and classes of people, and national, racial or religious groups, particularly Jews, Poles, Gypsies and others."

As eventually happened, Lemkin foresaw that only after the cessation of hostilities could the whole gruesome picture of genocide committed in the occupied countries be reviewed. Certainly Lemkin's statements influenced the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg (1945) which judged the Nazis for their crimes against humanity and included the word genocide in their Statement, though without actually awarding it legal value. Lemkin himself was a protagonist at Nuremberg because he worked with an American team on preparing the lawsuits.

¹ (*) See complete text by Raphael Lemkin in DOCUMENTS

Personally speaking, the shadow of tragedy accompanied Lemkin when it was revealed at Nuremberg that 49 of his family members, among them his parents, had lost their life in the Warsaw Ghetto and in the death marches. Up until his death in 1959, penniless and wearied by his struggles, Lemkin strove to have the nation states ratify the Convention on Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, approved by the United Nations in 1948.

The term coined by Lemkin ceased to be simply descriptive when it was legally recognized that genocide is an international crime that the nations signing the Statement are required to avoid and punish.

United Nations statement

The United Nations defines genocide as "any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- Killing members of the group
- Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group
- Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- Forcibly transferring children in the group to another group

For the UN genocide is the juridical subject (a state, government authority) that plans and executes, or orders the execution of mass killing, destruction or intentional subjection of a national, ethnical or religious group.

I understand it makes little sense, unless legal tools are required to judge a genocidal government, to enter into a semantic play on words differentiating a typical genocidal event from similar savagery executed without an official public order for extermination. Whichever the manner used, the consequence is the same: a criminal act is committed against a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as judged by the UN.

This collection of events and information from different sources is dedicated to the extermination of the 1,500,000 Armenians, which Lemkin deemed genocide. Towards the end of 1880 there were about 2,500,000 Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire. Following the First World War the number of Armenians in Turkey hardly reached 100,000. This difference can be understood given the large number of Armenians who were massacred or forced to emigrate to other countries in the period comprising 1894 to 1921.

"The whole of humanity shudders at such a heartrending account..."

William Saroyan

"There can be no Armenian on Earth who does not shudder at what happened to their forefathers. The struggle must continue, and has need of us all, beyond internal conflicts, beyond each date, each ideological or philosophical discussion, this date is the most important to Armenians. 24 April marks an attempt at obliteration of an entire nation... but that nation refused to die, and did not die.

***"I should like to see any power of the world destroy this race,
this small tribe of unimportant people,
whose wars have all been fought and lost,
whose structures have crumbled,
whose literature is unread,
whose music is unheard,
and whose prayers are no more answered.***

***"Go ahead, destroy Armenia.
See if you can do it.
Send them into the desert without bread or water.
Burn their homes and churches.
Then see if they will not laugh, sing and pray again.
For when two of them meet anywhere in the world,
see if they will not create a New Armenia."***

William Saroyan (1908-1981) US writer, son of an Armenian immigrant

Notes on the history of Armenia

The soil of the Armenians harbored the embryo of human civilization. From 6000 BC to 1000 BC there is archeological evidence of tools and objects made of iron, copper, bronze, stone, ceramic, rupestrian inscriptions, used in everyday life and which were used, perhaps, as currency for bartering with peoples from neighboring lands. Armenia even seems to have been the birthplace of agriculture for carbon 14 testing has shown the existence of rye in the area. The mountains lie around Mount Ararat, which according to religious texts was the place where Noah's ark rested after the Flood. The first mention of a country by the name of Armina (Armenia) is found in cuneiform writings dating back to the times of King Darius I of Persia (6th – 5th century BC). Armenian roots flourished in the Bronze and Iron Ages. Researchers discuss Hurrian influence in nascent Armenia, but the Armenians unquestionably belong to the group of Indo-European peoples while Urartu is in the Hurrian-Urartian family. With the crumbling of the state of Ur, the ancient Armenian kingdom rose up in its place. The first Armenian governors were Satraps (viceroys) for the shahs of Persia. Xenophon, who described the beating back of 10,000 Greeks by Armenia in the years 401-400 BC, speaks of Armenia having agriculture (wheat fields), horticulture, cattle-farming, grape and fruit crops.

Yerevan, the modern capital of Armenia was founded in 782 BC, earlier than Roma, by King Argishti I of Urartu. Around 600 BC the kingdom of Armenia was established under the Orontid dynasty and continued throughout several local dynasties until the year 428 AD.

"Following the destruction of the Seleucid Empire, which succeeded the empire of Alexander the Great, a Hellenistic Armenian state was founded around 190 BC. Following Artashes the first kings and the founder of the Artashesid dynasty emerged (190 BC). With the Zariadris dynasty, a new state, Lesser Armenia broke away from Greater Armenia."

The kingdom of Armenia reached its maximum expansion between 95 BC and 66 BC under Tigranes the Great of the Artaxiad dynasty, when it became one of the kingdoms with the broadest projection of its time. According to the influence received from contemporaneous empires Armenia enjoyed periods of independence and autonomy. In the same way in which empires imposed kings or not, they founded or destroyed dynasties, such as the Arsacid dynasty established as of the year 53 by Tiridates I. It was inevitable that the location of Armenia between two continents should have exposed it to invasions by Assyrians, Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, Arabs, Mongols, Persians, Turks, Ottomans and Russians.

In the year 301 Armenia became the first country in the world to adopt Christianity as its official religion due to the influence of St. Gregory the Illuminator, first pontiff of Armenia, today considered the patron saint of the Armenian Apostolic Church. Tiridates III (238-314) was the first ruler who officially proposed Christianizing his people, and his conversion occurred ten years before the Roman Empire extended official tolerance to Christianity under Galerius and thirty six years before Constantinople was baptized. In 405 Mesrop Mashtots created the Armenian alphabet. When the Armenian kingdom fell in 328, most of Armenia became part of the Sassanid Empire. After an Armenian rebellion in 451, Christian Armenians kept their religious freedom and Armenia gained autonomy and the right to be governed by an Armenian, while other imperial territories were governed solely by Persians. The situation changed when in 630 the Arab caliphate destroyed Sassanid Persia. Following the Arabian conquest, Armenia emerged as an autonomous principality within the Arabian Empire, adding the Armenian lands previously conquered by the Byzantine Empire. The principality was governed by the prince of Armenia, acknowledged by the Caliph and the Byzantine emperor. It was part of the Arminiyya administrative emirate division created by the Arabians, which also included parts of Caucasian Georgia and Albania and had its center in the Armenian city of Dvin. The principality of Armenia lasted until 884, when it recovered its independence from the weakened Arabian Empire.

Armenian culture in the 20th Century

Armenian culture is one of the most ancient because it started in the third millennium BC. It remained almost invariable despite the ten centuries of Armenian dependence on the Persian Empire, the Roman Empire, the Ottoman Empire, the Russian Empire, and even as a republic inside the Soviet Union. A review of cultural Armenian life during the 20th century cannot ignore the difficulties that stunted its development during that long period of Ottoman and Turkish discrimination and oppression for the Armenian people in general, and for intellectuals in particular. Here it is important to remember that the first victims of the Armenian holocaust were cultural personalities. Armenia possessed a cultural history which dated back further than its existence as a Nation, with logically lower progress during the times of Persian and Turkish dominations. It was the task of Armenia in the diaspora to preserve cultural traditions of the past by including cultural advantages obtained in the countries where they were able to settle and develop freely.

Constantinople, India and Venice, among other centers, were focus points irradiating Armenian culture in exile. There was a constant struggle for social freedom among the Armenian people, and this cause had its cultural and political echo. Politically speaking greater sensitivity was awakened for the way people lived and to seek freedom from Turkish oppression, with all their eyes set on the aim of a single united Armenia. Culturally, literature took on particular significance, with writers of the stature of Daniel Varuyan, Siamanto, Zohrab, educational centers began working, newspapers were published, and printing presses flourished.

Another singular feature of Armenian culture in the 19th century was the lapsing of the "learned" Armenian language used in certain high conservative enclaves to be replaced by what was wrongly known as the "vulgar" language, Krapar, which was already the linguistic means of communication among the most numerous strata of the population.

Culture by region in Armenia

Territorial division marked cultural expressions in different ways: western and eastern Armenia, on the one hand, and the diaspora –actually a third territory –which contributed significantly to the country's culture. Eastern Armenian culture was influenced by Russia. The main centers were Tiflis and Moscow, and to a lesser extent Baku, Petrograd or Crimea. Russian gymnasiums were as important as those in Western Europe; from there students carried on directly into universities. Armenians and other nationalities had expedited access to middle education, but that did not open up the path to higher education. A relevant fact is that after almost a decade of sharing secondary education with the Russians, national cultural traditions among Armenian students were to some extent lost, which is clear evidence of a natural assimilation process.

The exception as regards cutting off any possibility of higher studies was the Lazarian Institute in Moscow, where students received Russian and Armenian education. A Lazarian graduate could enter Russian university without having to take a prior admission examination.

Eastern Armenia projected its influence on Iran and Southeast Asia while the occidental sector influenced the Middle East, Egypt and America. In Europe, Paris was an appealing center to Armenians youths who studied the political and social problems of their Armenian motherland, as happened in Geneva, London and Berlin, while centers of interest in North America were Boston and New York. In Venice research in human sciences centered round the Mekhitarist congregation whose priests conducted scientific analyses of history, philology and pedagogy and, a no minor merit was the creation of their own works and the translation of works by other authors. In Eastern Armenia under the Russians a large number of educational establishments had their place, most of them depending on the bishoprics. Armenian schools taught in Crimea, Nor Nakhichevan. There were centers in Samarkand, Kokand, Merv, and other cities. In 1915 Russian schools had around 40,000 Armenian students. Religious establishments brought together the people though they lacked any political power.

Caucasia was another educational center for 8,000 Armenian students, where parish secondary schools were opened. In Astrakhan the gymnasium was inaugurated at the Aghababian Institute. Kervokian, an Armenian research center, was closed in 1917 only a short time after it was created.

In Caucasia close to one hundred beneficence societies were the backbone of regional education. There were some 500 Armenian religious schools catering to 31,000 scholars (one third of which were female).

The intellectual class in Western Armenia was influenced by Europe, particularly Paris, but the Turks in the region refused to believe in the patriotic fidelity of the Armenians whom they saw as spies or collaborators of the Russians who opposed the Turks. The exacerbation of this mistrust led to the physical disappearance of Armenian intellectuals. The epicenter of Western Armenian culture was in Constantinople and Smyrna whose educational centers accepted modern teaching principles but had traditional roots that were a stumbling block to

modernization.

As of 1886 Constantinople was the home of the Central College which spawned a profusion of high level intellectuals, politicians, philologists and professionals in other disciplines. The Armash Convent was founded in 1889 in Izmit, a town close to Constantinople. With time the Convent became a Higher School of Theology. It was not devoted solely to teaching religion; it also dealt with philosophical knowledge, the study of natural sciences as well as the study of Armenian, French and Turkish languages. Many of their students were active protagonists in civic life. The Turkish terror destroyed the Armash convent in 1915 and deported the members of the religious congregation. Constantinople was also the home of the Hindlian-Malatian school. In Aintab an educational institution operated at three levels (school teaching, medicine and religious seminary).

There were also Armenians in some 700 Evangelical institutes and 500 Catholic institutes. In 1992 one fifth of the students in German universities were Armenian.

When the Turks launched their genocide, they closed down Armenian schools and any national institutes belonging to the countries allied against Turkey. Slaughterhouses or orphanages were the destiny of thousands of young school-goers. The Turks in Western Armenia were neither unaware of nor indifferent to those signs of what to them was dangerous progress, and decided to exterminate the entire Armenian people, and among those who fell in the first line of the genocidal combat were the intellectuals.

Concurrent objectives for both Armenian regions

While it is true that the cultures of Western and Eastern Armenia developed along independent lines, they did belong to a single Armenian people with a single ambition: the freedom and independence of their own unified territory. The influence of religious centers, which had the role of bringing people together, as mentioned earlier, was taken over by intellectuals who had studied in European countries and by Russia. They imported laicism which, against all odds, was supported by the Church. The stream of Armenian intellectuals from the large European cultural centers not only brought laicism, but social proposals for building human progress, claiming justices and imbuing a doctrinal sense to their barely disguised revolutionary ideas.

Armenian books were translated into foreign languages while works considered classics of universal literature were likewise put into Armenian. Máximo Gorki directed the publication of an **Armenian Literature Compendium**. Its poetry had a romantically realistic style reflecting the sufferings of the Armenian people, the social injustice, the effects of oppression.

Taniel Varuyan

One of the architects of modern Armenian literature, Varuyan received in Venice the influx of Armenian priests concerned about man and national culture. He attended Ghent University located in an industrial center renowned for its spinning workshops where he had access to politics and to economic and social theories. From his passage through Venice he returned marked by Italian art and Renaissance painting. At the age of 19 he became acquainted with the work of Father Ghevont Alishan –Armenologist and poet – who helped him to take in the significance of Armenian conscience, and their aspirations to freedom and independence. But Venice also showed him the other side of the coin, the situation of impoverished artisans, dehumanized by social injustices.

It was there he became aware of the social injustices concealed behind liberal power, and their forms of corruption. His first poems are a song to the rustic natural environment where peace is lived in liberty, in contrast to the turbulent relations with the Turks in power and the humiliations they submitted Armenian peasants to. He turned to revolutionary socialism but his life was cut off by the Turks who assassinated him when he was just 31 years of age.

Siamanto

His real name was Atom Yarjanian. His work was largely influenced by the extermination and the massacre of Adana massacre. He held that rebellion must concentrate hatred as a condition to achieve victory and liberation. As acknowledged by Pascual Ohanian – the source of inspiration for this other long chapters in this book – the muse of Siamanto “was neither mournful nor pessimistic for he trusted in the moral strength of the people and their future.”

Torches to Agony and Hope clearly shows his literary thinking inspired in the Armenian people’s desire for freedom:

Sculpt the pain, if you yearn to do so, over the centuries. But do not forget to offer its pupils, and its mouth and spirit, with candor, to the breasts of rebellion.

It is a fact recognized by Pascual Ohanian: the killing of Armenians between 1849/96, the Adana massacre in 1909 and the overall extermination policy directed by the Turkish government, created a profound sense of tragedy on the one hand; on the other it engendered indignation and hate, the will to fight against evil, and hope in victory and liberation.

Siamanto described it all with an energetic quill; his heroes, “the precursor colonists” who can “between their pulverizing teeth” “crush the hot daggers”, cry out to the poet not only for a documentary song of lamentations so they will be remembered in centuries to come, but also wish for a call to vengeance over the centuries, a horseman fighting without quarter unto victory”. Siamanto was assassinated by the order of the Turkish government at the age of 37.

Krikor Zohrab

Zohrab studied engineering at the Galatasaray University, in Constantinople, with classmates who were mostly Armenian, French and Greek. They all used French as their everyday language. The Red Sultan argued that the Christian majority inside the university involved a potential danger, and therefore encouraged the enrollment of Islamic students to dispute their places, combated the use of French and established Turkish as the mandatory. When it became evident he would be unable to fulfill his objectives he transferred the university to Istanbul. After concluding his engineering studies, Zohrab decided to study law. After graduating as a lawyer, in 1883 the chief of the Turkish police forbade him to continue his career as a lawyer, with the excuse that the Armenians were conniving with the Russians. In 1908 he was able to enter the Istanbul Law School teaching criminal law until he was assassinated in 1915. Krikor refused to be controlled by sultan Hamid who was set on ottomanizing him, and, after refusing to listen to the valorous advice of a former minister for the Empire recommending he should flee, he was imprisoned on May 20, 1915. He was a fiery orator who did not fear retaliation for speaking at political meetings where he denounced the sultan’s regime as chauvinistic in combating minority nationalities and opposing the use of French by intellectuals. He spoke openly about the way everything was dominated by silence and darkness, like a cemetery whose keeper feared the dead might rise from their tombs. He appealed always to equality, liberty and fraternity among nationalities whose differences lay in their religion but which were united by their faith in freedom. He confronted the Union and Progress party and accused them of practicing a mistaken policy. “There is a Turkish mentality”, he said, “that bases its own rising on the dissolution of nationalities more progressive than its own, which rejoices at the misfortunes those nationalities suffer; something both inside and outside Union and

Progress seems to enjoy the misfortunes of these national groups. That is their ruling mentality." His principles were clear: respect, maintain and defend the dignity of man no matter his nationality or race. There can be no spiritual freedom, he held, without material freedom.

Avetik Isahakyan

This Armenian poet, writer, scholar, member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences was born in Armenia in 1875. In 1893 he attended the University of Leipzig and two years later returned to that German city and became a member of the Alexandropol Committee belonging to the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, and supported and sent financial aid to the armed groups. Only a year later he was imprisoned at Yerevan. Upon his release from the prison in 1897 he published the first compilation of his poems, *Songs and Wounds*. Accused of activities against Russia's Tsar he was again arrested and forced to seek exile in Odessa. His poems are full of sorrow, meditation and laments concerning the fate of humanity and the injustices of life. Right from the start Isahakyan refused to believe the progressive announcements of the Young Turks concerning the autonomy of Western Armenia. He was sure that Pan-Turkism would encourage the total extinction of Armenians. In Berlin warned the German allies about the Turks and received active support from intellectuals in Germany, with whom he created an Armenian-German movement which published the journal *Mesrob*. The slaughter of Armenians at the start of World War I was soon to confirm his warnings. In **The White Book** he uncovered the atrocities of the genocide, the worst part of which had taken place between 1915 and 1922. His unfinished novel *Usta Karo* was symbolic for he used to say it would not be completed "until the day when the Armenian cause is resolved". Avetik returned to his Armenian land, now a Soviet republic, in 1926 where he published new collections of his poems and stories. During World War II (1941-1945) he wrote patriotic poems which were awarded with the state prize in 1946. He was the president of the Armenian Writer's Union between 1946 and 1957. His works have been translated into many languages and some of his poems became the lyrics of songs. During his political career he became a representative on the Supreme Soviet in Soviet Armenia.

Other manifestations of Armenian culture

It was no easy task to develop an Armenian musical culture when its prospective creators were weighed down by a popular education with an evident dearth of teachers, in addition to the significant influence of Persian, Arabian and Turkish music during the periods of greatest domination. In the middle to late 19th century the reconstruction of their music began based on popular songs and medieval religious history. Their music went from soloist to choral polyphonic, with this musical rebirth particularly marked by the work of Father Komitas who delved deep into liturgical music in an effort to fathom its popular roots. He created Armenian musical ethnography defining his own personal aim as: "I shall achieve my true purpose: to extract from the archaeological ruins the voices of our popular music." He succeeded in this and managed to rid his popular melodies of the deformations it had accumulated over time, eradicating any sign of foreign linguistics, particularly Turkish and Arabian.

"The greatest creators are the people; go and learn from them." "Peasants are the legitimate children of Nature; in their songs Nature finds its voice for in them she has spoken. In their soul the sea of nature is touched for the peasant too wanders over its waves. Their songs are their life, for their entire life is inspired in their singing, and peasant songs are ultimately varying regional mirrors which separately reflect the position, the climate, the nature and the very life of the places they were born."

On 24 April 1915 he was arrested during a raid on Armenian intellectuals. He witnessed the annihilation of his companions in martyrdom and the destruction of several of his unique works. Death was exchanged for deportation. Father Kristoris Balakian wrote in his memoirs entitled *Armenian Golgotha*:

"It is Saturday. We trudge through towns and the fragrance of baking bread drives us crazy with hunger. The bakers offer to sell us bread. That the sergeants, like rabid dogs, ordered the tradesmen off and we carried on walking, our strength ever waning, exhausted. Because of my protests against the guards I was sentenced to punishment by the police. Indescribable injustices and cruelties affected the delicate sensibilities of Father Komitas, his tender soul. At sundown we came to town, we were crowded together in a room in a high-windowed house; the gendarmes locked the doors and left... We all sought out a corner and tried to make ourselves comfortable. It was Saturday evening: we decided to pray the vespers prayers. After prayers Father Komitas sang the *Miserere*. Shedding bitter tears, we wept amidst groans and sobs. At his request I said the prayer asking for divine protection before the holy priest."

It is necessary to grasp the influence of this cultural wealth to even begin to understand how the Armenian people, with or without land, managed to strengthen their memories so as to survive in the diaspora.

THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE the stages that paved the way to extermination

A study of the Ottoman Empire (approx. 1300-1922) is required for a fully documented understanding of the Armenian Cause.

The Ottoman Empire bordered on Hungary to the north, Aden to the south, Algeria to the west, and Iran to the east. The territory of what is now Turkey was the center of power. Ottoman power extended across the Ukraine and the south of Russia. When the Seljuk sultanate of Rum disappeared, a series of principalities emerged, one of which was the first Ottoman State. Islam contributed its warriors from the Holy War (Jihad) and the Ottomans joined them in their struggle against the Christian Byzantine Empire. The Ottoman profile was gradually defined by its successes on the warfront and the alliances woven to consolidate it. Following the expulsion of the Ottomans from Anatolia, they expanded south and east, taking over Ankara in central Anatolia and Gallipoli (Gelibolu) in the Dardanelles strait, as they moved across southeast Europe. Adrianople (Edirne) was the capital city and, following the defeat of the Serbs in the battle of Kosovo, Thrace, Macedonia, part of Bulgaria and Serbia were also appropriated. The Mongol Tamerlane (also known as Timur) defeated the Ottomans around 1402; after recovering from this setback they expanded their power into Constantinople (Istanbul), the last Ottoman capital. They appropriated territories at the expense of the Iranian Safavids and the Syrian and Egyptian Mamluks, thanks to whom they were able to reach the sacred areas of Arabia, the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean. In 1534 Suleiman I the Magnificent included Iraq in the empire achieving control of the Mediterranean through Algiers. His next step was to advance across Europe, Belgrade and Hungary, but he failed in his attempts against Austria. The Holy League (the Papacy, Venice and the Hispanic monarchy) defeated the Empire's fleet at the battle of Lepanto.

Army and Administration

War contributed to the conquests and turned the army into the central institutional axis. Thanks to the resources created by the land concessions they were able to pay the Turkish cavalry which grew as other lands were taken over. Mercenaries, slaves, prisoners of war and

janissaries increased the numbers of the well-disciplined Imperial infantry. Artillerymen and engineers were added in the late fifteenth century. This to some extent explains why there are Turks today who are fair and blue-eyed, and not slant-eyed like the Mongols. In an institutional system centered round the army, the entire administration operated on the basis of the needs of their armed forces: obtaining funds, recruiting soldiers, building roads and bridges. The pyramid of power had the Sultan at its apex, with the Grand Vizier as his prime minister, controlling the religious institution and likewise responsible for education and legislation, and the Kadis who were in charge of central administration and criminal law. Free Muslims, who served particularly in the religious area, and converted Christians (known as slaves to the Sultan) recruited for the military forces, made up the rest of the administration.

The official language used on an everyday basis was the Ottoman Turkish tongue, with writings made out in Arabic characters. There was tolerance for cultural, linguistic and religious differences. The European provinces contributed faithful to the Orthodox Church, which was less onerous than the Catholic Christian Church. Muslims, Christians, Greeks and Armenians lived at peace, grouped into tribes, and into unions in the cities for economic reasons, religious communities – having an acceptable degree of autonomy – with landowners and tribal chiefs recognized as outstanding citizens. Cultural development was brilliant in literature (history, geography and poetry), painting and architecture.

Decline of the Empire

The fall of the Ottoman Empire began towards the end of the seventeenth century when the wars lost against Austria and Russia reduced its territories. To regain its splendid past civilian bureaucracy suggested imitating the military advances of the European states. Mahmud II understood this, but the goal would be impossible to achieve without major changes in the government and in society. For while the institutional plane involved the army, modernization demanded a change in structure. Having done away with the old-fashioned army in 1831, the Sultan opted for a modern, well-paid force, educated for discipline. Bureaucracy had to grow to be able to efficiently collect taxes and create an educational system suitable to provide professionally trained officers and government officials. Investments in the telegraph and railways demanded ever increasing amounts of money, and when the State could no longer afford this, it resorted to European financial dependence, and, as was usual at the time and still occurs today, the financial centers exercised control and administration over the resources borrowed. Administrative centralization and a certain degree of individual liberalization (citizen rights, more freedom, equal rights for Muslims and non-Muslims) meant the changes caused an even more profound effect.

Any reform creates opposition with many sectors doubting the effectiveness of the results if these are not carried out with popular support. Young people identified as the new Ottomans appeared on the scene, claiming further reforms, including a Constitution which, though promulgated in 1876, was nullified only two years later. As mentioned previously, however, the seed had taken root and was germinating: revolutionaries known as the Young Turks led a revolution in 1908 that caused the downfall of the totalitarian government of Abdul Hamid II. Sultan Abdul Hamid II does not go down in history as a son and brother in a long line of sultans but rather for his proven inefficiency as a ruler. History will remember him as being the start of the fall of the Ottoman Empire, and the beginning of the Armenian Cause preannouncing the genocide. His authoritarian rule refused to acknowledge elementary principles of equality and respect towards ethnic minorities that had been included under the first Turkish Constitution of 1876. One of the results of the Russian-Turkish war was an influx of Caucasian and Tartar immigrants who joined the Kurdish minority in divesting Christians of their property and killing them off with impunity and legal tolerance. In the midst of such a scenario a cultured Armenian enlightenment arrived from Tiflis, stimulating the formation of revolutionary political groups, as will be recounted later.

Abdul Hamid II marked the beginning of the end of the Ottoman Empire as well as the beginning of what has come to be called the Armenian Cause. With the fall of Abdul the Constitution was restored. The revolutionaries joined forces with the opposing Committee of Union and Progress which in 1903 took over the Empire and introduced radical reforms.

Fall of the Ottoman Empire

The issue arising in the last century of the Empire's existence was how to make modernization satisfactory to non-Muslims and keep the political system united. This proved impossible because the provinces achieved their autonomy (Greece, Serbia, Rumania, Montenegro, Bulgaria, Moldavia) to resist as Christians the advance of the Islamists. Additional losses came later with the separation of Macedonia, Albania, Thrace, Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Italy and Libya. The Ottomans kept the Asian provinces and increased their influence in Arabia. The First World War precipitated the downfall of the Empire. The defeat of allied Germany led to the fall of the Ottomans and the situation was aggravated by Russian intervention. British offensives in Iraq and Syria accelerated the decline of the Empire, and after the signing of the Armistice of Mudros in 1918 only Anatolia was left to them. Under the 1920 Treaty of Sevres the Empire lost the Arabian provinces and suffered the division of Anatolia. Mustapha Kemal led an armed nationalist movement that defeated and routed the Greeks from Anatolia and the east of Thrace. In 1922 the Ottoman dynasty was abolished, and a political system that had survived for 600 years was replaced by the Republic of Turkey.

Influence of Ultra-nationalism within the Ottoman Empire

Ultra-nationalism is clearly present in the evolution of the Ottoman Empire, firstly, because it gave rise during the 19th century to the independence of Greece, Serbia, Rumania and Bulgaria (independent de facto as of 1878, though not de jure) and to the loss of Bosnia-Herzegovina (1878), Tunisia (1881), Egypt (1882) and important territories in Caucasia and the Balkans; secondly, because the permanent political, military and financial crisis of the Empire - the "sick man of Europe", as it was named by Tsar Nicholas I – led to the appearance as of the 1860's of a liberal reformist western Turkish nationalism, which saw in the creation of a unified State, secular, constitutional and centralist, i.e. a modern, national State, the only option for saving and reconstructing the Ottoman world. The attempt at a reform by Midhat Baja in 1876-77 – which had led to the 1876 Constitution, proclaiming Empire indivisibility and introducing individual freedoms and a parliamentary regime – had failed. Sultan Abdul Hamid II (1876-1909) reestablished absolute power, even though, because of the events, in a nationalist gesture he encouraged the Turkeyfication of the Empire and even initiated a timid modernization of the empire centering on the reconstruction of the railways. But the disparagement and weakening continued. The pro-Bulgarian uprising in Eastern Rumelia led to the Serbian-Bulgarian war in November 1885 and a new eastern crisis from which Bulgarian nationalism emerged clearly strengthened. The Armenian insurrection in 1895-98, which was harshly repressed by the Turks, shook world opinion. The proliferation of terrorist activities in Macedonia starting in the 1890's caused by different nationalist factions (pro-Bulgarian, pro-Serbian and pro-Greek) led to Russia and Austria imposing on Turkey in 1903 the creation of a mixed Muslim-Christian gendarmerie for the region, led by foreign officers. The pro-Greek revolt in Crete in May 1896 gave rise to a Greek-Turkish war the following year: the discredit this caused led to a resurgence of Turkish reformist and constitutional nationalism.

The Young Turks movement – whose militants were mainly exiles, revolutionary students, masons and young nationalists – had inherited the spirit and ideas of '76, and was reborn in 1896. In 1907 the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) was set up in Salonika. This clandestine organization brought together different groups who opposed the Sultan and included representatives of non-Turkish minorities. In July 1908, in the face of rumors that Russia and Great Britain were planning to share Turkey between them, army officers stationed in Salonika, and linked to the Committee, revolted and on 24 July forced Abdul Hamid to restore the 1876 Constitution. A few pages ahead we will return to the role of the Young Turks in the Armenian Extermination.

The events of 1908 (and their aftermath) provided clear evidence of the transformational, and destabilizing, potential of nationalism. As shown above, the nationalism of young Turkish officers led to a revolutionary change in the Ottoman Empire. In response, Bulgaria immediately proclaimed its independence on October 5, and Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia-Herzegovina. This in turn caused concern in Russia, irritation in Serbia, and indignation and tension inside the annexed province: the most radical groups of pro-Serbian nationalism, like The Young Bosnians Movement or The Black Hand, frequently and ever increasingly started to resort to violence and terrorism. The 1908 Turkish revolution came nowhere near to resolving the problems of empire unity and territorial organizations. The differences between non-Turkish nationalities and the Turkish military nationalism became even greater from the time Parliament gathered in December that year.

Resistance from subjected nations

As of 1909 resistance began among subjected nations (Armenia, Albania, Kurdistan, Christian Syria and even Yemen). The Young Turks – who in April 1909 had managed to smother an attempted coup d'état by reactionary militaries supporting Abdul Hamid, who was to be deposed by them – gradually abandoned their 1908 ideals and took refuge in policies which became more and more openly nationalist (among other reasons due to the intense international pressure exercised on the country). In fact, between September 1911 and August 1913 Turkey thrice went to war: in 1911 against Italy that had reclaimed Libya; in October-December 1912 and February-May 1913 against Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece and Montenegro which had demanded reforms in Macedonia; in June 1913 against Bulgaria, this time as an ally of the Rumanians, Greeks and Serbs, and once again as a result of the differences between the different Balkan countries concerning Macedonia and Thrace. The results were dire for Turkey: it lost Libya and most of its European territories; Albania was created in 1913 as a new independent state. The internal situation was untenable. On 23 January 1913 the Young Turks led by Enver Bey gave another coup d'état: an ultra-nationalist military regime took over the country and during World War I aligned Turkey with Germany and the central powers.

In short, in Hungary and Russia State nationalisms had caused the reaction of nation nationalisms. Austria, the confrontation between Austro-German and Czech nationalisms had led to the fall of a potentially multinational regime. In the Ottoman Empire the weakness of the central State towards Slav nationalism had encouraged the emergence of Turkish ultra-nationalism which rejected other national components and was Imperialist in nature due to the destruction of the Armenian nation and the subsequent usurpation of their territory. As mentioned above, in one manner or another, the growth of nationalism turned central and east Europe into a focus of instability and permanent tensions.

How six centuries of coexistence were destroyed

Some contemporaneous Turkish allegations break faith with historical truth by referring to the "Armenian Betrayal", despite the six hundred years of Turkish and Armenian coexistence inside the Ottoman Empire. This coexistence did not, however, come to a happy ending for one of its protagonists: the Armenians. The Armenians contributed to the cultural, economic and political progress of the Ottoman Empire. It is necessary to repeat this at the risk of being unable to comprehend what came to happen. The counsellors of the greatest Ottoman Sultans were always Armenians because as ancient inhabitants of the region they had advanced strategic knowledge. The Ottoman Empire gradually lost its European territory and this situation led Ottoman authorities to reinforce the only thing left to them: Asia Minor. With this purpose in mind they drew up its PanTuranic plan which involved reuniting in a single territory a broad imperial belt of peoples of Turkish-Mongol origin (Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and others). They were reverting to their great roots. The stumbling block to all this were the ancestral inhabitants and connoisseurs in the area, the Armenians, who at the beginning of the nineteenth century were influenced by progressive illuminist ideas from Europe which proposed autonomy for the Empire's population obtained by countries like Bulgaria. Armenians were now subject to heavy taxes, unequal treatment, constant plundering and a variety of other situations, yet they refused to be considered second-class citizens in their own land.

The Empire began to stifle Armenian resistance, starting with the massacre that culminated in the meticulously programmed extermination plan. We will be returning presently to Armenian resistance. While there were diverse circumstances that led up to the extermination, there is no doubt that prime responsibility lay with the main heir to the Empire, the Republic of Turkey. At that time it was not only Turks and Armenians who coexisted in the Empire, but also Kurds, Circassians, Çerkes, Sephardic Jews, and there were groups expectantly waiting to see whether the clever Armenian people would disappear culturally and economically from the Empire. Efforts were made to achieve this by Sultan Abdul Hamid II, the Ittihad Triumvirate (Union and Progress Party) and on to Mustapha Kemal. The Armenian genocide took place over a period extending from 1880 to 1923, not to mention other repressive and disruptive actions that took place after that time.

The beginning of the end of the Empire under Abdul Hamid 1878-1908

His government marked the beginning of the end of the Ottoman Empire as well as the beginning of what has come to be known and the "Armenian Cause". The wrath ignited by the order to annihilate 300,000 Armenians between 1895 and 1896 was caused by this character history was to baptize the Red Sultan or the Great Assassin. His first crime was to reject the creation of the long-awaited Ottoman parliament. His brother, Murat V, had proposed this along with the Turkish constitutionalist Midhat Pasha, creator of the first Turkish Constitution in 1876. The arrival of Hamid signified the start of extreme authoritarianism, of heinous absolutism, where the power is concentrated entirely in a single person. The Turkish constitution which granted clear prerogatives for all the ethnic minorities in the Empire was derogated and Midhat Pasha sent into exile never to return.

Consequences of the Russian-Turkish war

The Russian-Turkish war (1877-1878) led to several consequences that created enormous tension among the different ethnicities coexisting in the Empire. One of these consequences was the immigration of Circassians and Tartars to the Anatolia region. These groups, like the Kurds, were protected by totalitarian laws like that known as Haffir or Right to Protection, which granted permission for pillaging against Christians. Sadly, one of the most retrograde permits granted by Hamidiye absolutism was that "any Muslim had permission to test his sabre

on the neck of a Christian". Russia had advanced against the cities of Batum, Ardahan and Kars. The Armenians were already being accused of treason for having helped the advance of the Tsar's troops. As a punishment Sultan Hamid encouraged the Kurds, Circassians and Tartars to make up attack squads known as "Hamidiye", who were given the task of looting Armenian homes and killing the inmates if they resisted (in the 19th century they were to be known as paramilitaries). The Russians wanted to annex the cities they had occupied to their Empire, on the condition they would duly protect the Armenian population. On March 3 1878 the Treaty of San Stefano was signed, where the Ottoman Empire promised the Russians under Article 16 of the Treaty that they could leave the territories occupied in exchange for improvements to the provinces inhabited by Armenians. Months later, on 13 July, the Treaty was signed in the Congress of Berlin, but the article number was inverted, replacing 16 for 61, an ambiguous text without any actual specifications for improvements among the population. It was the first time world diplomacy took any action concerning the subject of Armenia. Sultan Hamid understood the Armenians would take advantage of the administrative reform of the Empire's territory in 1864 which established Van, Erzurum (Karin or Garin), Bitlis (Paghesh), Sivas (Sebastiá), Diyarbakir and Kharput (Kharpert) as the six provinces of the Ottoman Empire, so that together with the tsar they could achieve autonomy as Bulgaria had done several years previously.

The Armenian Age of Enlightenment in the Empire

The Armenians glowed from Tiflis (the current capital of Georgia and historically the cultural center of Armenian intellectuality and aristocracy) spreading illuminist ideas towards the entire Armenian people. The concepts of freedom and revolution were introduced by writers like Hakob Melik Hakobian (Raffi) and Jachadur Apovian, among others. A national awakening was imminent. From 1885 on the main Armenian political parties would be formed abroad though intensely active inside the Ottoman Empire. The main exponents were the Armenagan party, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, the Hunchakian party and the Ramgavar party which is analyzed in greater detail later in this book. Resistance started to become stronger in a variety of cities and towns like Zeitoun and Sasun. The Armenians responded to Kurdish attacks ordered by the Sultan, who could no longer bear the fact that the Armenians should have contacts with the outside world and with Protestantism via the evangelistic missionaries who inhabited the whole of Anatolia in search of new followers. Thus, around the middle of 1895 the Red Sultan ordered the massacre of Armenians all over the Anatolia region, particularly those linked to political parties and religious missions of any nature. The expected reforms never materialized. In early 1896 the Armenians lashed out against the Kurds for the first time in the Battle of Janasor, and on August 14 in Constantinople (Istanbul) a group of Armenians took over the Ottoman Bank and threatened to blow it up if the promised measures were not fulfilled. It was a wake-up call to the powers who financially dominated the Bank. The men never detonated the bomb but they did detonate the fury of Abdul Hamid who ordered further massacres against the people around Istanbul. The popularity of Abdul Hamid all over Europe and in America collapsed as a result of the slaughter of Armenians and religious missionaries sent by the different powers. Concurrently, the Prussian emperor and British businessmen were disputing the layout of railway lines in the Ottoman Empire. Great was the discontent and insurmountable tension caused by the territorial losses in the Balkans. Against this backdrop a secret movement was spawned in Salonika (today Thessaloniki, Greece), supposedly progressive and rational: the Ittihad or Young Turks Party already mentioned on previous pages.

His connections with members of a variety of secret and diplomatic organizations in Europe and the United States were to be the downfall of Sultan Hamid. On 24 April 1908 the entire Ottoman population, including the Armenians, celebrated the change in regime, never suspecting that the destructive seed planted by Abdul Hamid II would grow exponentially with the Young Turks. In the early 1900's the masses were demanding constitutional rights and guarantees. Workers and peasants refused to be exploited. The ethnic peoples and minorities making up the Ottoman Empire likewise demanded they should not be treated as second-class citizens with only limited rights and no guarantees. They insisted the authorities should put an end to the constant private property violations and attacks their people suffered. When the Armenian claims became louder, Sultan Hamid II reacted with further massacres against Armenian towns and villages. New forces were starting to emerge in the Empire, some of which promised to build a secular state with equal rights and guarantees even for ethnic minorities. In 1905 in Salonika the Dönme community (Sephardic Jews converted to Islam) had developed secret groups that sought to disembark in Istanbul to take over the Empire and put an end to the predominant trade presence of the Armenians. In the meantime the Young Turks' Union and Progress Party was coming to life. The Party was led by Ismael Enver, the War Minister, Mehmet Talaat, the Home Affairs Minister and Ahmed Djemal, the Navy Minister and Governor.

Birth of the Union and Progress Party (PUP). The Young Turks

All the members of the PUP were closely related: Halil Mentese was an uncle of Enver's and commander of the Ottoman forces, as was y Nur Killigil; Jevjedt Bey was Enver's brother-in-law and Governor of Van, while Mustapha Abdul Halik Renda was brother-in-law to Talaat and governor of Bitlis. They all knew the Armenians well. They were aware of the power of their intellectuals and poets capable of organizing any type and form of resistance, and of the bravery of their men and women when defending themselves and attacking the enemy, as had been proven over and over again inside the Turkish army (the Balkan war). The Party promised a parliament with participation of all the minorities in the Empire. The goal was set to amputate the tyranny of the Red Sultan. The Armenians never doubted in supporting the Young Turks in their project to bring down Abdul Hamid. On 24 April 1908 (an emblematic date for Party decisions), the Young Turks fell on Salonika against the Sublime Porte of Abdul Hamid, achieving his downfall. In an effort not to lose the significance of the sultan's figurehead, the Union and Progress Party leaders appointed Murat V, a brother of Hamid, as Sultan a. These leaders had everything planned from the time of their secret formation in Salonika. They set up a parliamentary pantomime gathering representatives from different fronts, including several who were Armenian in origin. Nevertheless, the ideas of Union and Progress did not seek to promote cohesion and development of all the peoples in the Empire, and their actions cloaked the posthumous idea of entire Turkeyfication of all the social strata in the Empire. Turkeyfication was a synonym of Pan-Turanism (imperial craving for union with the Mongoloid races of Central Asia) and represented the seed of the future Armenian genocide. At secret Party meetings Dr. Nazim (ideologist and outstanding member) and Dr. Bahaeddin Shakir spoke of the Armenians as internal enemies who had shown it would be impossible to Turkeyfy them by force and who would, as history had shown, support any power in the world that assured them of the recreation of an independent Armenian state. The Bulgarian cause led to the creation of Bulgaria, and the same happened with other causes and peoples seceding from the Empire in the west and gradually destroying it. Yet they would never allow an Armenian Cause.

Pan-Turkism, cutting off the path towards an Armenian State. The Adana genocide

Towards the east and under the control of Russia in central Asia, there were various towns of Turkish origin which aimed at restoring the Ottoman Empire by setting up a common Turkish market. This project, known as Pan-Turkism, had an outlet into the Mediterranean Sea, with only two obstacles that could get in its way: the Armenians and Russia. The Armenians could interrupt the project by achieving the independence of their State and raising a geographical barrier between Turkey and the rest of the peoples of Turkish origin. This would open up the possibility of any of Turkey's enemy powers facilitating the restoration of an Armenian State and settling in the area. The hope of enjoying worthy civil, economic and social rights went up in thin air with the slaughter of 30,000 Armenians in the city of Adana in 1909. By that time there were already self-defense groups that recognized that the re-constitutionalization inspired by Midhat Pasha was once again a farce. Many self-defense groups organized by Armenian political parties began their own struggle. The Turks asked Armenian leaders to convince their peers under the dominion of Russia to support the Turkish army during a probable invasion carried out by them into the Caucasus region. Armenian leaders responded that in the event of a new confrontation between Russia and Turkey, the Armenians would be loyal to their own respective states, even if this meant a war between compatriots recruited into opposing armies. Thus there was a tempestuous advance against the Turks in 1917. With the aid of Russia the Armenian army slapped down the War Minister Enver Pasha, who was to resort to genocide as a response to the defeats he suffered at Mush and Sarikamish. The Turks had a secret plan against the Armenians which they would put into practice when the opportunity was ripe, and unfortunately, the start of the First World War was precisely the opportunity they were awaiting. In honor of their Mongol ancestors, the plan involved a great massacre, more organized and lethal than any recorded during the time of Sultan Hamid II. The plan was premeditated, well-thought out, planned and systematically executed. Genocide had been experienced previously, but it became institutionalized on August 10 1910 in the Salonika Congress. Its execution was put on hold until the beginning of the war, which could already be felt in the air.

Stages leading up to the Extermination - Disarmament. The great majority of the weapons that had been distributed to the population for the Russian-Turkish war were confiscated.

- Intellectual beheading of the people. First they would do away with the intellectuals, politicians, poets and religious leaders, to avoid the Armenians efficiently organizing a rapid defense. The kidnapping of more than 600 intellectuals began precisely on 24 April 1915 in the city of Istanbul.

- Emasculation (physical male destruction). Nothing was left to chance. With the excuse of the Great War all Armenian men between the ages of 15 and 45 and strong enough to hold a firearm they never received were recruited into the army. The soldiers were only used as labor to build trenches which were soon to become their own graves.

- Eternal caravan towards death. That was the deportation. The Turks had to obliterate the Armenians and any vestige of Armenian culture from the face of the earth, to ensure there would never again be an "Armenian Cause" based on territorial claims or guarantees and rights for minorities. The orders were given by Home Minister Talaat himself and had to be "complied with, without hesitation and ignoring any pangs of conscience", pursuant to the words of the horrifying telegram he sent. The orders were so inhuman that some Turkish soldiers or army chiefs could not believe what they were being ordered to do, and requested explanations or clarifications. The response was the firing squad for anyone refusing to carry out orders. Talaat had been very clear, "the Armenians had lost any right to life in the Ottoman Empire," but as ammunition could not be wasted due to the war effort, they were to be stabbed to death, or drowned in the river Euphrates, among other abominable methods. All that would be left in the towns and villages were men who were ill, teenagers, women and the elderly. They would be faced with the other part of the plan: deportation. A notice was hung in the central square of each village ordering the population to depart for "relocation". The pretext was to make the Armenians believe they would be gathered together and taken to a war exclusion zone to protect them from the effects of the war that was currently raging. Hitler placed across the front of concentration camps "Work makes people free"...

All the routes for deportation were planned. Towards the north they would be drowned in the Black Sea; those who lived in the center of Anatolia would be taken without food rations on foot to the Deir-Ezzor desert where they would be thrown into natural pits and then burnt. The annihilation methods were really horrendous and obviously neither the gender nor the age of the victims was taken into account.

The orders issued by Talaat made it clear that not even babes in their mothers' wombs were to live. For days the crystal clear waters of the river Euphrates ran red with the blood of the bodies it washed away. Thousands of women and children ended up serving as slaves in the harems of the Turkish Pashas (chief), which is why many Turkish citizens today are unaware of the fact that their real origin is ethnically Armenian.

The survivors. The plan to exterminate the Armenian people was perfect, but what prevented its full consummation were the rebel Armenian forces made up of male and female volunteers kept the Turks at bay, at least for several months, in some towns and villages. This is the reason there were survivors of the genocide. Others survived because they were thought to be corpses or because they managed to hide during the deportation or were purchased by the Arabs. There were many who survived thanks to some Turkish or Kurdish neighbor who refused to accept the policy the Empire was implementing, even though the death penalty awaited any Turks who gave shelter to an Armenian.

The Ottoman Empire consumed in a shameful war defeat comes to an end

The Greek, French, English and Italian temporarily shared out the remains of the Empire. In the meantime many Armenians started to return to their ancestral homes, never suspecting that with the resurgence of Turkey the genocidal plan would continue. Even though the Young Turks were finally sentenced to death by a Turkish accused of organizing and executing the genocide against the Armenian people, the continuation was already in the making. While the Young Turks enjoyed their exile and false condemnation, the Turkish government was taken over by force and remained in the hands of Mustapha Kemal who meticulously carried forward the genocidal plan against the Armenian people.

The first steps taken by Mustapha Kemal

At the age of 25 Mustapha Kemal received his diploma as a captain of the general army staff. His arrival in Istanbul occurred in times of political tension, when the unrest was clear under Sultan Abdul Hamid II. Kemal along with other young people formed a secret association by the name of VATAN (Fatherland) where they expressed in papers by the same name their malaise against the Ottoman caliphate and encouraged the democratic reform of the Empire. Kemal almost lost his life when the group was broken up. The Empire recognized the coup: the Young Turk insurrection pounced on Istanbul, and as mentioned previously, many Armenians full of hope embraced in the streets

of Istanbul with the arrival of this group. The Triumvirate was not at yet set up, but command was concentrated in the figure of Enver Pasha, who was to compete against Kemal. Union and Progress named Mehmet V as a symbolic rather than operational Sultan, creating a parliament and a cabinet some of whose members were Armenian in origin. Assassinations began around the power structure of Abdul Hamid II. The first Balkan war and the Italian-Turkish war were in fact what gave rise to the total loss of the European territory, in other words the beginning of the end of what was once the great Ottoman Empire. At the beginning of World War I Kemal was in charge of following the movement of the French forces. Meanwhile, Russia was advancing across the Caucasus region to the Lake Van area. The Russian advance was a slap in the face for war minister Enver, who felt humiliated and blamed his disaster as a strategist on the Armenians who overwhelmed the Turkish army in the battle of Sari-Kamish in early 1915. Enver had express instructions from the Germans to start building the railway towards Baku; his administration was by no means efficient. As a result of this, Enver, along with the Triumvirate he had already set up, had found the pretext to conduct their systematic extermination plan. Talaat and Djemal were the ones in charge of consummating the plan and concealing it from the eyes of a world otherwise occupied with the chaos of WWI. There is something very important worth noting: Kemal had already joined the Party, and though a member who did not conceal his displeasure towards the Triumvirate, he was vocal in expressing his antipathy towards the Armenian Cause. Later on, during 1918, when he accompanied government official Bahaeddin to Germany, one of the German governors put forward a complaint about the predicament of the Armenians, Kemal answered: "I am surprised that a German governor, a man of worth like yourself, should have chosen such a topic for conversation with an ally, in favor of the Armenians who are trying to deceive the world and reestablish a national existence that was lost in the mists of time. We have not come to talk about the Armenian issue but to understand the situation of the German army, which is our very breath and support." This was around the time the allies attacked the Dardanelles. Kemal began to win favor and was promoted to the position of coronel, after which he triumphed on the west coast, in the battle of Anafarta. After their defeat at Gallipoli the allies withdrew with their tails between their legs. Kemal took only a few weeks to recover part of the proximities of the Caucasus, that is, the cities on the plains of Mush and Bitlis, where Enver Pasha had been unable to achieve a victory, infuriating both Enver Pasha and the American evangelizing missions with the treatment given by the Turkish army to the Armenian population. There is something that must be kept in mind: with the PUP supporting him, Kemal cannily managed to entrench in the power of Turkish society the former Sephardic Turkish caste which at the beginning of the century had denounced that the Armenian people were the only economic, social and political stumbling block in the entire region. Annexing the Panturanic concept of Zia Gok Alp, one of its most fervent propagandists, would clearly reveal the desires of that group of leaders: "My Attila! My Genghis! Hero figures who are the glory of my race! Oguz fills my heart. The Turkish fatherland is not Turkey; nor is it Turkestan. It is a vast and eternal region: Turan!"

The 1917 Russian revolution substantially changed the panorama for Ottoman Turkey. Eastern Armenia was left exposed and weak against any Turkish army attack. This was an excellent excuse to achieve the long-yearned for Panturanic dream. The same did not occur with the vast western area of the agonizing Empire which again being besieged by the allied powers. The armistice of Mudros was to bring to an end the hostilities against the Empire, or better said, what was left of the Empire. It was then resurgence began. While Armenia lived in confusion between the rise of the Bolshevik movement and the creation of the trans-Caucasian SEIM which lasted only a few months, the Ottoman Empire was drawing to an end. Russia and Germany entered into the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, which handed over to Turkey the provinces of Ardahan, Kars and Batum. The Turks did not delay in occupying these lands, using barbarous tactics against Armenian citizens who fought far beyond their strength. By this time the government had put an end to Kemal's military mission in the First World War. Kemal is by no means satisfied with this decision, imagining the allied forces would soon disembark on the Dardanelles and penetrate the entire region of Anatolia. Sultan Mehmet V died and his place was taken by the last Sultan with Osman roots: Mehmet VI Vahdettin, who had travelled a few months earlier with Kemal to Germany. Soon there would be national-military congresses to plan the future of the present disaster. Meanwhile, the Armenian people resisted heroically at the battle of Sardarabad, and the small part of the Turkish army that reached Baku found that leftwing ideas had found a foothold. Later on, Mustapha Kemal would not hesitate to flirt with the incipient Soviet Union. Congresses and assemblies were conducted while the French forces were strengthening their position in Cilicia, English forces were maintaining their power in the north of Iraq, specifically in the city of Mosul, and both Italy and Greece were preparing to disembark in the Dardanelles. Thousands of Armenians banished from Cilicia returned believing the "noble" world powers would be there to protect them for life. Dr. Taner Akcham (a Turkish historian) was right when he said: "the military created modern Turkey and are in charge of the custody of any taboos and incongruence in their history, by means of force, obviously. It was thus they started, first in Amasya, then in Erzurum, and leading up to the key event: the Sivas Congress. Kemal was conspicuously present there, with his idea of ordering a military dictatorship to safeguard what remained of the Empire. Europe has been lost, Syria has been lost, practically the whole of Anatolia and the Dardanelles is about to be lost. The sword must once again come into action. The National Covenant is drawn up and approved, outlining as its objective the country's frontiers." It is important to remember, in connection with this historical narration, that the Union and Progress Party was dissolved and its maximum representatives and bureaucrats were condemned to death; this did not prevent many of its members from enlisting in the nationalist-military branch. The war-mongering Pro-Kemal cliques needed the information managed by the former Ittihad, which is why the number of impeachments fell until they were entirely interrupted. The allied forces occupied Istanbul and the Greeks took over Hadrianopolis. The Empire was reduced to Central Anatolia and to the concentration of power emanating from Ankara. Discussions started around the historical contractual champion for justice of its time: the Treaty of Sevres was signed in August 1920 (see Attachment). American president Woodrow Wilson projected an independent Armenia containing seven of its historical provinces, while granting Greece the city of Istanbul and a large part of the Dardanelles, and Italy part of Thrace. It was a proclamation of the yearnings for freedom of a people who had never given up the fight; the Kurdish people and a free Kurdistan were established in this Treaty signed by Turkish delegates. Yet while they were signing the treaty with their right hands they were preparing their bayonets with their left hand. For instance, Armenia was granted seven provinces it would have to repopulate. British Prime Minister Lloyd George explicitly made it clear the allies would not keep up a war especially for the Turkish situation; the Armenians would have to invade those lands to regain them.

At the same time the Turkish army was rearming and starting out on its last great offensive. The expedition was named Campaign to Armenia. It was to be the final blow in their quest for "wiping out Armenians in the area". The Armenians who had deposited their trust in the allied forces were entirely unprotected, and submerged in the political indifference of the great powers. It would not be ridiculous to ask the Standard Oil Company to explain the business deals it entered into at the time. A pro-Sephardic-Turkish government negotiating the future of Armenia along with the most important Anglo Saxon oil company, though Rockefeller tried to conceal it by granting large sums of money to the Armenian refugees of the time. Wilson's popularity soon vanished, and this, in addition to his health problems, kept him away from the Sevres issue.

Kemal and his army resumed their offensive. They recovered Marash, Hadjin, and Urfa, among other towns. The epic valor of the Armenian towns was indescribable. They fought till the breath died within them. At Aintab a battle was fought against the Armenians who refused to abandon their lands once again. Naively they clung to their motto: "Mère des Armeniens France notre esperance", unaware of the covenants the French had signed with Ankara granting them the protectorates of Musa Dag and the surrounding territories. Kemal confronted the city, which was renamed Gaziantep because of the "brilliant" (Gazy) capture, while Kemal was referred to simply as "Gazy", for the same reason. The Turkish army entirely devastated historical Armenia; it took its revenge at Sari Kamish and incarcerated or subjected to mass murder any person of Armenian origin, as though they were war criminals. The Military Dictatorship law was implemented while Kemal pushed his forces towards the west of Ankara. He dove into Smyrna [Izmir], burning the Armenian and Greek neighborhood and fighting against the Greek forces under Eleftherios Venizelos. Though unsuccessful, Kemal staked everything on withdrawing his forces to the river Sakarya where he waited to make the final charge against the Greeks. The move achieved his aim. He wiped out the entire area, leaving thousands of massacred bodies. His army was not new; it was the same one used by the Union and Progress Party made up of mercenaries entirely lacking in discipline, and unscrupulous towards any foreigners or Christians. The allied forces stepped aside, their only interest now the new modern Republic of Turkey, the bridge that would link the powers to the oil in Baku.

In 1923 the Treaty of Lausanne was signed, ratifying the frontiers of what is currently Turkey thanks to the perseverance of Kemal's close friend, Ismet Pasha, in charge of international relations.

Who does Turkey belong to? Lausanne, 1923: "Turkey for the Turks!"

Some years previously a pro-Kurdish magazine had posed the question: Who does Turkey belong to? It listed peoples of different ethnic origin inhabiting it at the time: Greeks, Armenians, Kurds, Circassians, Nestorians, Assyrians, Tartars, Lazes, Turks-Osmanlis, etc. The article pointed out how they all celebrated festivities together in Soumela, Trabzon. There was respect among them until a watchword began flare after Lausanne in 1923: "Turkey for the Turks!" On October 29, 1923 Mustapha Kemal was voted into the Presidency. Section 1, subsection 3 of the Principles and Purposes of "Atatürk" announced "respect for human rights and the fundamental freedom of all, without any distinction on the basis of race, gender, language or religion". Armenians had been put to death and persecuted constantly by the army, the Greeks in the Dardanelles along with the Lazes from Pontus (Pontus means "sea", in this case the Black Sea) as well as the Kurds were eternally persecuted during the government of Kemal until they were no longer recognized as such but as "mountain Turks", and the Assyrians were subsumed in oblivion. However Kemal, after his fateful work of destruction by force, started to weave a veil to cover the carnage against the peoples interfering with his battle cry "Turkey for the Turks". That veil still conceals a variety of taboos; it involved westernizing Turkey for the world. Kemal injected the western alphabet into popular schooling and life, abandoning the Arabic characters previously used. He transformed their society accepting reforms in fashion (forbidding the use of a fez, for instance – an insignificant renovation which can easily be replaced with a cap). There is something that few are likely to ever forgive him for, and which still makes Turkey tremble: the abolition of the caliphate and the religious tribunals.

Destruction of the cultural heritage of the Armenian people Cultural genocide

There are Armenian cultural testimonies that do not appear in Turkish negationism because they involve material property that survived the cruelest periods of the extermination. The loss of human capital is irreversible, but this is not what happened with the monuments and buildings – churches, mosques, chapels, fortresses, stone carvings – which were the work of Armenian architects.

Benjamin Whitaker - Special Rapporteur appointed by the United Nations Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities – drew up a report in 1985 on the issue of prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, approval of which involves recognition of the Armenian situation by the UN. The Cultural Genocide concept set forth in the report and subject to future modifications and additions, is defined as "any premeditated act committed with the intention of destroying the language, religion or culture of a national, racial or religious group by reason of national or racial origin or the religious beliefs of the members thereof, including:

- 1 Forbidding the use of the group's language in everyday relationships and exchanges or at schools, or forbidding the communication of publications drawn up in that language;
- 2 Destroying libraries, museums, schools, historical monuments, places of worship or any other institutions, and cultural objects belonging to the group, or forbidding the use of any such objects".

There was a deliberate omission by the Turkish government in connection with buildings of Armenian origin, involving neglect and indifference leading to total abandonment and deterioration of these buildings, some of which were several centuries old. In other cases they caused direct destruction, such as on the monuments under the "Military Action Zone".

Turkish propaganda has distorted history by assigning any origin other than their authentically Armenian origin to monuments of significance to the international community, such as the city of Ani. Another affront to culture is enforced religious conversion, which is likewise forbidden by Islam, but this was done by transforming large churches into prisons, stables, mosques, hotels and even gymnasiums. Confiscation of cultural heritage by the State of Turkey is endorsed by its national laws which have their source in Ottoman decrees of 1906.

Disavowal of Armenian heritage

Crimes can be perpetrated by commission or by omission. A person may be killed by a direct action or by not receiving the help that could have been given. It is a severe omission to allow valuable monuments to crumble as a result of the effects of the weather, for instance. But it is a crime against the historical heritage of humanity not to attempt to safeguard them, when the means to do so are available. This is a responsibility that a country like Turkey, which is a member of the UNESCO, can under no circumstances elude. There is a veritable catalog of cultural monuments in danger of crumbling or which have already done so in some way or another:

- St. Giragos Church in Dikranagert (today Diyarbakir, in Central Anatolia), whose seven altars have fallen entirely into disuse
- Havav Cathedral (in the Central Armenian Mesa), of which only the remains are left
- Kumbet Kilise Church, on the road between Erzurum and Kars (Central Armenian Mesa), sunk into sepulchral silence and solitude
- Aprank, located between Erzindjan and Erzurum, sheltering the San David monastery and as yet in good condition
- The churches and monasteries of St. Garabed, St. Tateos and St. Arakelots in the city of Mush (west of Lake Van, in southeast Turkey), which are in a calamitous state.

In Van, Ani and Gars there are some churches that somehow managed to escape the cultural genocide. In Ani many churches remained within the Military Zone used by the Turks for their warfare exercises which even barbarously made use of the church steeples and domes as targets.

Turkish negationism reached the absurd extreme of making substantial investments to conceal the Armenian origin of certain buildings. This distortion of history occurred in Ani and in Akhtamar, where there are rich architectural testimonies of Armenian art developed over the centuries which the Turks have attributed to other civilizations.

The new inhabitants of the fields and homes snatched off the Armenians who had been hounded out of them contributed other signs and habits that changed the original features. The homes of Kurds living in Mush have been erected, for the most part, using the remains of what was once St. Garabed, the Armenians' second spiritual home after the Mother Cathedral of St Etchmiadzin. The churches of Guesaria (now Keyseri) fared no better: one of them was covered over and the other is now used as a gymnasium. In the late seventies the Armenian Cathedral of Hetesia (now Ourfa) was turned into a colossal mosque, while since 1986 the Cathedral of Aintab (now Gaziantep) has been used as a prison. An Armenian chapel by the name of Kaymankli in the north of Turkey, between Erzurum and Trebisonda, is today a private farmstead, where farm animals are bred.

Consequences of the overt and covert expropriations

This issue was dealt with in the "Provisional report by the Special Rapporteur for the Human Rights Commission on the elimination on all forms of intolerance and discrimination based on religion or beliefs", prepared in Turkey a few years ago and which read, among other things, as follows: "As regards the alleged confiscations of two Armenian places of worship, the Turkish Foreign Affairs Ministry responded, after the visit from the Special Rapporteur, that the Home Ministry had confirmed that the Manuk Armenian church in Karasun/Iskenderun was open for worship."

This church was declared "permanent property and cultural heritage" by the Superior Council of Permanent Ancient Estates and Works of Art on 8 June, 1979.

"The Armenian Orthodox Church in Kirikhan was likewise open to the public and currently served as a place of worship. It had been placed under protection by the decision of the Superior Council of Permanent Ancient Estates and Works of Art since 10 September 1997. (...) The code on trust funds provides that management thereof, which in the practice should not offer any type of profit, should be transferred to the General Trust Fund Board. In the event the Foundation were to choose an administrative council within a term of five years, it could regain its previous legal regime, after fulfilling any formalities required before the competent authorities." Reading between the lines it is clear this is a subterfuge by the Turks to limit the rights of the minorities in making use of their own cultural or religious heritage.

Legal requirements Turkey has not fulfilled

Given that Turkey is one of the States belonging to the UNESCO it is required to protect any cultural heritage within its boundaries. Let us see whether it fulfills this undertaking.

Convention for the Protection of Cultural Heritage in times of War, The Hague May 14 1954 - UNESCO

Countries signing the Convention undertake to safeguard any culturally relevant property from any vandalism it might suffer from combatants in times of war. Article 28 provides for the processing of any persons performing acts of pillaging before law courts in their country of origin. The truth is that Armenian monuments are the stage for the war Turkey is waging against the forces of the Kurdistan Workers' Party in the southeast of the country.

Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of any Imports, Exports or Illegal Traffic of Cultural Heritage - Paris, 14 November 1970 - UNESCO

This provided protection for these elements depending on the origin and importance attributed to them by the countries who signed it, which meant Turkey was free to exhibit Armenian monuments as fruit of the ingeniousness of the Ottoman Empire or other empires. They name the Ardzrouni (from the region of Van) or the Pakraduni (from the region of Ani) not as Armenians but as reigns that took over the riches found inside those monuments. The most salient examples of this attitude are the gospels of Jarpert and Mush, which were found after considerable time had elapsed.

Convention for the Protection of the World's Heritage for Humanity

The countries signing this convention were required to declare what places inside their territory can be deemed of considerable significance to humanity and should be given protection. The Turkish state could have mentioned the churches at Ani, but failed to do so. The writer of the special Report in Turkey said the following about the application of the Lausanne Treaty (24 July 1923) in this connection: "The Treaty, while establishing the principle of equality among citizens, without any distinction of race or religion, includes the minority statute for non-Muslims. Therefore, it acknowledges the religious identity of non-Muslims, as well as their rights as individuals and as minorities. Articles 37 to 45 of this Treaty refer to the protection of minorities. Article 37 points out that the provisions contained in articles 38 to 44 of the Treaty are fundamental laws and, therefore, no law, regulation or official action can contradict or prevail against them. (...) Article 40 guarantees non-Muslims the right to create, direct and control, at their own expense, any type of charitable, religious or social institutions, any type of schools and other teaching and education establishments, with the right to freely make use of their own language and exercise their religion in that language. By virtue of article 42, minorities have the right to regulate any issues concerning family or personal legal regime according to their own customs. Likewise, the Turkish government undertook to protect any minority places of worship, to grant all the facilities and authorizations for pious foundations and religious and charitable establishments belonging to minorities, and not to refuse any facilities required for the creation of new establishments."

National Turkish law

The Decree on Ancient Works belonging to the Ottoman Empire (1906) established that any ancient piece of property located inside the frontiers of the Empire belonged to the Empire. Now the only difference was that instead of the Ottoman Empire it was the Republic of

Turkey that declared itself to be the owner of all the historic buildings in the country, resorting to the foundations that case of this. The Turkish Criminal Code would incriminate its own government in articles 176 and 177, the first of which determines that anybody who "demolished or undermined or in any way damaged objects located in temples, or used force against religious people, or insulted with the intention of denigrating any religion, shall be punished with a one to two-year prison sentence and a fine. (...) When the crime is perpetrated against religious people while performing religious rites or in connection with their religion, the punishment established by law for this crime will be increased by a sixth." The second of these articles establishes "a one to three-year prison sentence" and a fine against anybody "causing deterioration to monuments or similar works in temples or tombs in cemeteries, or damaging the tombs", while anybody "soiling any of the abovementioned objects shall be punished with three-month to one-year sentence and fined."

Statement by the Armenian Patriarchate of Istanbul

"We are not allowed to preserve our monuments". The phrase used by Patriarch Mutafyan was replicated in Armenian newspapers the world over because with the celebration of 1,700 years of Christianity in Armenia many proposed to visit Historical Armenia. United States Archbishop Ashjian showed pilgrims the condition of the churches where many of their grandparents had been baptized. The Patriarch explained that the buildings belonged to the Turkish state and the Armenian Church of Istanbul did not have the legal capacity to move independently since the acknowledgement given to them is simply de facto and they are able to carry on thanks to the donations made by the Armenians in that city.

"A people who has had its past destroyed is further from choosing and acting freely than another able to take a place in history by its own means. This is the reason, or at least one of the reasons, why the entirety of art in the past has become a political affair".

Preserving humanity's cultural heritage is a commitment undertaken by the Land and Culture Organization that has worked hard in Armenia to preserve and create new religious and educational buildings, among others, tasks in which the young people of the diaspora participate actively. The Greek cultural heritage was no more fortunate than that of the Armenians. One example is the Monastery of Soumela, in the vicinity of Trapezounta, a few miles from the Black Sea, which was the area belonging to the Pontian (sea) Greeks.

Greeks, Armenians, Lazs, Circassians and even Kurds and Turks drew near to take part in the festivities held in that monastery, created several centuries back by Saints Barnabas, Sophronios of Athens and Cristopher of Trebizond. In 1923 the monks in the monastery anticipated what was to be a fulminating attack by Kemal supporters and decided to bury all the relics in a secret site. Years later they were rescued by an initiative of Greek religious men, who urged Turkey to allow this very significant cultural legacy to return to its original owners. Today Soumela can be visited and is one of the most important pilgrimage locations, for it is built at a considerable height on the edge of a cliff.

The Special Rapporteur who wrote about Minorities in Turkey mentioned that "after the Republic was set up, nationalism, one of the components of which was the rejection of Christian minorities, carried on, and was particularly clear in the following events: in 1932 a law prohibited the Greeks from exercising certain professions (for instance, that of a lawyer); in 1942, a fiscal law against the wealthy was aimed essentially against non-Muslims, economically very active, with the aim of Turkeyfying the economy with prohibitive taxes which forced those involved to sell their goods". Advertising campaigns with the slogan "one language, one race, one culture" continued in place. "My heart is like those destroyed homes. The beams have been broken, the columns moved. Wild birds will build their nests there." Anuni, by Gomidás DARON OGOSDINOS.

Factors Leading up to the extermination

Need to comprehend the historical context

Contemporary historians wonder whether the Armenian genocide by the Turks and their Kurdish allies, among other groups, was limited to the 1915-1918 period. Clearly genocide began before that time and reached a peak during this tragic time. If this were not the case, this would be but a reduced view of the problem, for between 1820 and 1890 the Turks were the protagonists of a great massacre involving almost 100,000 souls, including Armenians, Greeks and Bulgarians. Starting in 1894 in only two years 300,000 Armenians were killed in Constantinople and 30,000 in Adana.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century the Grand Vizier Kamil Pasha spoke in straightforward terms of the physical extermination of the Armenians:

"If in the European part of our Empire we were feeding vipers, we should not incur in the same error in our Asian Turkey: the intelligent option is to annihilate and extirpate those races that could one day make us face the same kind of danger and provide the foreigner with the opportunity to intervene in our affairs. Today, at least, British interests claim that in Asia Minor neither England nor we ourselves fail to acknowledge the existence of the concept of Armenia, but also we should destroy the jaws that dare to pronounce that name. The lands we possess must be free of any likelihood of foreign intervention, and with this sacred aim in mind it is our obligation as government to ensure no traces or future remain of any race that could be suspect. And we have the required means prepared: Kurds, Circassians, provincial governors, judges, tax collectors, policemen, in other words, everyone. We shall declare a Holy War and it will be an easy fight against a people such as this, lacking any weapons or army, and having no one to defend them. We, instead, have weapons, army and one of the great nations of the Earth, the wealthiest, that nourishes and supports us. And if the Armenian race disappears, then when Christian Europe seeks a coreligionist ally in Turkish Asia and is unable to find it, we shall be able to live in peace and devote ourselves to our internal affairs as it should be."

A few years later another Grand Vizier made it even clearer: "Getting rid of the Armenian Issue means getting rid of the Armenians". And he finished off his threat: "It is necessary to destroy their families and the foundations of their family organization. The family is the bulwark for a people's resistance, especially for Armenians. If this bulwark is destroyed, without resistance they will be annihilated and no slaughtering will be required for their national institutions will automatically disappear". It is surprising to see the lack of knowledge prevailing so many years after the genocide perpetrated by the Turks (supported by Kurds and other ethnicities) against the Armenian people. The factors leading up to such a massacre were the growing Turkish chauvinism (the dream of a Great Turkey), the ethnic differences (the Turks descend ethnically from the Mongol hordes that invaded Asia Minor, hence the Turks' opposition to acknowledging

an Armenian state that would separate from others of the same origin), but also their lack of tolerance towards any religious differences (most Armenians are Christians, whereas the Turks are mostly Muslims). But it is not true that the Armenians were persecuted for being Christians, for after the deportations, when they managed to settle in Islamic countries, they never experienced any problems. At the end of 1880 there were approximately 2,500,000 Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire. Following the World War the number of Armenians in Turkey was just over 100,000. The difference can be understood by the large number of Armenians massacred or forced to emigrate to other countries between 1894 and 1921. The account starts with the decadence of the Ottoman Empire: the Armenians' desire of having a government of their own began to materialize with the creation of two political parties: Hnchak and Dashnaktzutiun. During this time Sultan Abdul Hamid II, the leader of the Ottoman Empire, was promoting nationalist feelings among the Turks and animosity towards the Armenians among their Kurdish neighbors, hoping to surprise the revolutionaries. The first outbreak of violence stimulated by the Sultan took place in Sasum when they revolted refusing to pay unacceptably high taxes. Thousands of people were murdered by the Kurdish troops, and several Armenian villages were burnt down. Two years later they again revolted against Turkish autocracy, taking over the Ottoman Bank in Istanbul: 50,000 Armenians were massacred by government troops.

Aided by international indifference during the First World War, the Turks continued massacring Armenians, with mass deportations to Syria and Palestine, including Armenian soldiers fighting in the Turkish army. The extermination methods used were hunger, physical abuse or, simply, machine guns. As can be seen from the chronology of the Armenian extermination in this study, crushing the Armenian will to resist involved eliminating its main thinkers. Thus, on 24 April 1915, 254 Armenian intellectuals were deported to the provinces of Ayash and Chankiri, and then assassinated. With no military or intellectual resistance, the order was given for the deportation of all the Armenians from Asia Minor and Armenia. As the villages were evacuated, the men were shot and the women and children who survived raping were forced to walk long distances to concentration camps. The most notorious of these was Deir ez-Sor, in Syria, where the Armenians suffered hunger and were tortured and assassinated without mercy by the guards. On other occasions, for instance at Trebizonda, they were embarked and thrown overboard into the Black Sea. Even in 1921 the slaughter continued, when the supporters of Mustapha Kemal "Ataturk", founder and first governor of what is now Turkey) were accused of abusing and starving Armenian prisoners to death. It should again be noted that the Treaty of Sèvres (see Annex) was signed in 1920 between the powers who won the First World War and the Ottoman Empire. The treaty acknowledged the existence of the Democratic Republic of Armenia (already an independent state since May 28th, 1918) which included Turkish Armenian territories and those which are today the Republic of Armenia. However, the Kemalist movement did not acknowledge this treaty, which remained without effect, and the existence of the Democratic Republic of Armenia was but brief. After 28 years of Turkish harassment, the number of Armenian victims assassinated is estimated at 1,500,000 people. Yet another half a million or more fled to other countries and made up communities which have reminded the world of the massacre, despite the Turkish government's systematic denial throughout the years, at one time pressuring world governments into downplaying the massacre with the purpose of saving face and preserving the Turkish nation's identity, attributing the events to defensive measures taken in the face of suspicions of an enemy inside their frontiers.

The Armenian massacre

Repeat it I must. The Armenian genocide, the great calamity or the Armenian massacre, was the enforced deportation and massacre of an unknown number of Armenian civilians, calculated at more than a million and a half souls, during the government of the Young Turks, in the Ottoman Empire, between 1915 and 1917, during the First World War. What most characterized these massacres was the brutality of those who conducted them, and the use of forced marches in extreme conditions, which so often led to the death of many of those who were deported. Other ethnic groups were also massacred by the Ottoman Empire during this period, the Assyrians and the Pontian Greeks; some authors consider that these acts are part of the same extermination policy.

The start of the genocide is commemorated on 24 April 1915, the day the Ottoman authorities arrested 250 Armenians intellectual leaders in Istanbul. The Ottoman militaries then uprooted the Armenians from their homes and forced them to march hundreds of miles across the desert in what is today Syria, deprived of food and water. The massacres did not consider age or gender, and rapes and other types of sexual abuse were frequent.

Situation of the Armenian minority

The Armenians were known of old as Millet-i Sadika ("Loyal nation") by the Turks, for they lived in harmony with the other ethnic groups in the Empire, without any significant conflicts with the central authority, despite their ethnic and religious differences and even though they had less rights than the Muslim subjects in the Empire, for they were not given consideration under the Islamic laws.

During the second half of the nineteenth century some nationalist movements began to spread among the Armenians. The Ottoman Empire, which had had to accept the San Stefan Treaty marking the independence of Rumania, Serbia and Montenegro, in addition to the semi independence of Bulgaria, wanted at all costs to avoid the creation of an Armenian state, which they expected would be favorable to Russia, in the east of Anatolia. Between 1894 and 1897 the "Hamidian massacres" were perpetrated under Abdul Hamid II (hence their name), who was therefore known as the Red Sultan, as mentioned previously in this study. The number of Armenian victims in the Hamidian slaughters was calculated by ethnographer William Ramsay at around 200,000, though today there are many who hold it was closer to 300,000.

Hamid was never directly implicated in the slaughters, but it was suspected he gave tacit approval to them by not taking any action to put an end to them. Frustrated by European indifference to the killings, the Armenians in the Dashnaksutyun political party took over the Ottoman Bank on August 26th 1896, an incident which attracted sympathy and compassion for Armenians in Europe and was praised by the European and American press, who referred to Hamid as "the great assassin" and "the bloody Sultan."

Adana Massacre

Retaliation came on 13 April 1909. Some military elements of the Ottoman Empire, with the collaboration of Islamic theology students, sought to return control of the country to the Sultan and to Islamic law. Disturbances and combats abounded between the reactionary forces and the CUP forces until this latter was able to suppress the revolt and arrest the leaders of the opposition. The movement initially led by the nascent Young Turks government was perceived as support for smothering violence and reestablishing order and government. However, some sources hold that the Ottoman troops took part in plundering the Armenian enclaves in the province of Adana, during which between 15,000 and 30,000 Armenians were assassinated.

Testimony of the New York Times

(December 1915, on the Armenian genocide) The Ottoman Empire entered the First World War on October 29th 1914. At the end of that year the government approved compulsory military service, according to which all adult men under forty-five and fit to use weapons were required to enlist in the army or pay a special tax to be excluded. Under this law most military aged men were taken away from their homes, where only women, children and the aged remained. The Ottoman army attacked the Russian forces that surrounded the city of Kars, in what was then Russian territory. In early 1915 the Turks were defeated at the battle of Sarikamis and the Russian forces commanded by General Vorontsov counterattacked, plunging into Turkish territory, in an area where inter-ethnic friction had already occurred between Armenians and Muslims. Numerous militants in nationalist Armenian organizations (Dashnak and Hungak) collaborated with the Russian troops with the intention of attacking the Ottoman eastern front and the southeast of Anatolia. Nationalist organizations made up of Armenian combatants sought to establish an independent State at the eastern tip of Anatolia with the aid of the Russians. Availing itself of the common religion and the recent unrest among the Armenians within the Ottoman Empire, Russia promoted Armenian nationalism (it is worth remembering that there were also Russian-Armenians among the czarist army ranks). At the same time, the Armenians had begun to defend the creation of an independent Armenian state. With the approach of the Russian army there was an Armenian uprising against the Turks and in favor of the Russians on 20 April 1915 close to Lake Van, in the city of Van, where a large number of Muslims died, and an independent Armenian republic was briefly established.

The Russians took over Van in May 1915. In August, the Russian army retreated and the Turks reconquered the city. In September Van was again conquered by the Russians. Between February and April 1916 the Russian forces under the orders of General Yudenich seized the cities of Erzurum and Trabzon. The Turks, commanded by Abdul Kerim, attempted to recover these cities in the summer offensive, but their troops were defeated, despite the triumphs of Mustapha Kemal. Russia won another battle at Erzincan, in July. Combat around Lake Van continued throughout the summer and fall, and cities like Mush and Bitlis were conquered and then again lost. In 1917, due to the chaos following the Russian Revolution, both sides ceased military operations in the area. The Turks sent the majority of their forces south to fight against the British in Palestine and Mesopotamia. The Russian army also gradually lost interest. In early 1918 the Russian army in the region had practically disappeared and the Turkish forces easily reconquered all the territory that had been lost, and overstepped the boundaries, snatching Baku in the Caspian Sea away from the British, in September 1918. When the war was over the Turks had full control over eastern Anatolia.

Revenge following defeat

Enver Pasha reacted against the crushing defeat in the battle of Sarikamis blaming it on the Armenians. It was then he gave the order that all Armenian recruits in the Ottoman army should be disarmed, demobilized and sent to labor camps. Most of them were executed or made to work as road-menders. A short time later, on 24 April 1915, four days after the Van revolt, the Young Turks' government deemed it was confronting a nationalist popular uprising inside the boundaries of their Empire following the euphemistic model of Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria, and opted for deporting large sectors of the Armenian population to southeast Anatolia. According to Armenian sources it was that same day the arrest of 250 Armenian intellectuals was ordered, most of whom were executed immediately. This was followed shortly – starting on 11 June 1915 – by orders for the deportation of hundreds of thousands, perhaps even more than a million, Armenians from all over Anatolia (except the areas on the western coast) to Mesopotamia and what is today Syria. Many went to the city of Syria de Dayr az Zawr and the surrounding desert. Obviously, the Turkish government did not provide the means to protect the Armenians during their deportation nor at their destination.

The recruiting of most of the men and the arrest of hundreds of intellectuals was followed by systematic massacres across the entire Empire. At Van, governor Cevdet Bey ordered irregular troops to commit crimes and force the Armenians to rebel and thus justify the siege of the city by the Ottoman army, according to the account by Venezuelan mercenary Nogales, who served in the Turkish army. Cevdet Bey ordered all Armenians males in the city should be assassinated. The Turks held that what happened at Van was simply an Armenian revolt repressed by Ottoman troops during those dates.

It is calculated there were some 26 concentration camps to confine the Armenian population (Dayr az-Zawr, Ra's al-'Ain, Bonzanti, Mamoura, Intili, Islahiye, Radjo, Katma, Karlik, Azaz, Akhterim, Mounboudji, Bab, Tefridje, Lale, Meskene, Sebil, Dipsi, Abouharar, Hamam, Sebka, Marat, Souvar, Hama, Horns and Kahdem), located close to the Syrian and Iraqi frontiers. Some Armenian sources hold that some of them could have been only the location of common graves, and others confinement sites where they died of epidemics and starvation.

The British occupation force was actively implicated in the creation of wartime counter propaganda (during the First World War the Ottoman Empire fought as part of the "Central Powers" coalition, made up of Austria-Hungary, Germany and Bulgaria). For instance, Eitan Belkind was a British spy belonging to Nili (the Jewish espionage network supporting Great Britain against the Ottoman Empire during the First World War), who infiltrated the Ottoman army as a government official. He was based at the central office of Hamal Pasha. He vows he witnessed the incineration of 5,000 Armenians in that camp, according to Armenian sources. As previously mentioned, between 24 and 25 April 1915 many personalities including writers, poets, lawyers, physicians, priests and politicians were imprisoned and then deported and put to death over the following months.

Reaction of the western world to the genocide

In 1918 **Ambassador Morgenthau' Story** was published in the form of a newspaper series and then as a book in 1919, written by Henry Morgenthau, who was United States ambassador to the Ottoman Empire between 1913 and 1916. The Venezuelan mercenary Raphael de Nogales Méndez, former officer of the Ottoman army during the First World War, also left a testimony of the massacres in his book *Four Years beneath the Crescent*.

English historian Arnold J. Toynbee and British jurist, politician and historian James Bryce published a work known as the **Blue Book**, which includes accounts by US, German, Italian, Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Greek and Armenian eye-witnesses – both diplomats and missionaries. The book has been disallowed on several occasions by Turkish researchers who argued it was a work of advocacy and counter-propaganda

How the genocidal project was put together

Let us return to circumstances previously referred to, so as to engrave them on our memories. The Young Turks gave life to the Union and Progress Committee, a nationalist party which, with them, headed the fall of the totalitarian regime of Abdul Hamid II in 1908.

It has already been mentioned that Abdul Hamid made a name for himself in history because under his sultanate came the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the start of the Armenian Cause as a prelude to the genocide. Blinded by his authoritarianism he ignored elemental principles of equality and respect for ethnic minorities included in the first Turkish Constitution in 1876. He was bloodthirsty in his actions which is why he is remembered as the Red Sultan. As an aftermath to the Russian-Turkish war Caucasians and Tartars immigrated to Turkey, and joined forces with the Kurdish minority to rob Christians of their belongings and kill them without impunity, with the tolerance of the law. The Young Turks were military cadets and university students, members of masonic lodges who, because of their confrontation with the Red Sultan, were understood to defend progressive ideals. They gathered in secret societies where they discussed the modernization of the Ottoman Empire, something Mustapha Kemal would also do several years later. I would like to make my point of view clear right away: modernizing a country should not be limited to adopting certain civilian and material measures that would no longer be "modern" if they did not occur within the framework of a country under the rule of the law, with all the obligations this involves. From a partial viewpoint it could be said that the German national-socialist government modernized Germany because it undertook a state of the art technological development and created a military-industrial complex aimed at subjugating the countries coming under its aegis.

Democracy in Portugal with the Carnation Revolution. The Young Turks impose an authoritarian genocidal regime

Certain historical circumstances are not symmetrically comparable because they take place in different historical scenarios. In what came to be known as the Carnation Revolution (Portugal in the '70s) the revolutionaries were university students, young militaries and reserve officers, (we cannot be sure whether there were also masons, as happened with the Young Turks), working class leaders. What is certain is that they destroyed the dictatorship, broke imperial chains, freed the colonies and opened up the road to a democratic discussion of political ideas and, subsequently, the establishment of a social-democratic government, respectful of human rights and of political, racial or national differences. In 1975 the writer of these pages had the privilege of being a journalistic observer, but a witness yet, of the Carnation Revolution that defeated the ancient medieval-style Portuguese monarchy, one of the last bastions of European fascism along with its Falangist neighbors. A single popular song broadcast at a particular time on the radio was the countersign signaling an uprising that was not to install a paper democracy, void of content. Precisely the opposite. The red carnation uprising was the trigger for the establishment of a new regime which, with the help of the popular parties, was to give an important role to workers, field hands and students, historically repressed by two successive dictators who sustained a senile totalitarianism that plundered the popular masses on the peninsula and in the country's colonies, keeping them ignorant of any civic matters. There was a poster doing the rounds at the time which summarized the spirit of the soldiers carrying a shotgun crowned by a red carnation. It pictured a young officer belonging to this new stage introducing a long line of world eminences to a speechless farmhand: Freud, Chaplin, Lenin, Einstein, Picasso, musicians, poets, and other illustrious representatives of art, literature and politics heretofore ignored. The "carnations" represented modernity in democracy. The Young Turks, instead, brought exterminations, which in latter times they disguised as modernistic.

The Turks did not put carnations on the tip of their shotguns as the Portuguese did

In a secret session held in January 1915 the Young Turks decided to:

- 1 On the basis of articles 3 and 4 of the Union and Progress Committee, dissolve all the Armenian associations, arrest any Armenians who had at any time worked against the government, send them to provinces such as Baghdad or Mosul and do away with them on the way, or once they had reached their destination.
- 2 Confiscate any weapons.
- 3 Exacerbate Muslim opinion using appropriately adapted means in districts such as Van, Erzurum or Adana, where the Armenians had, in fact, awakened the hatred of the Muslims, and provoke organized slaughters as the Russians had done in Baku.
- 4 Make use of the population in provinces such as Erzurum, Van, Mamuret-ul-Azzis and Bitlis in doing so, and only deploy military law enforcement forces (such as the gendarmerie) to appear they were attempting to put a stop to the killings; these same forces would actually be required to actively aid the Muslims in areas such as Adana, Sivas, Brusa, Ismit and Smyrna.
- 5 Adopt measures to exterminate male Armenians under the age of 50, priests and teachers; allow youngsters and children to be converted to Islam.
- 6 Deport the families of those who had escaped and act in such a way as to cut off any communication with the native city.
- 7 Alleging that Armenians officials could be spies, remove them and exclude them entirely from any important position or service in State administration.
- 8 Have any Armenians in the army exterminated in the most convenient manner, a task to be entrusted to the military.
- 9 Put the operation into effect simultaneously all over the land so as to impede them from adopting any defensive measures.
- 10 Keep these instructions strictly confidential so they would be known only to two or three persons."

The genocidal triumvirate

Some of the well-intentioned Young Turks were coopted by the extremist nationalistic triumvirate made up of Enver Pasha, war minister, Jemal Pasha, Navy minister and Talaat Pasha, home minister. Together with others, they were the armed branch of the extermination and responsible for banishing the Armenian population. Yet another factor was added: the jealousy or envy Armenian intellectuals awakened in Turkis gendarmes and their miserable Kurdish allies. Years later, the Nazis would do the same with the most retrograde elements of the countries they overran, training them as fifth columnists, characters who were even crueler than the Germans themselves in exterminating not only Jews but gypsies, Slavs, politicians, priests and other minorities that had fallen into disgrace. After the invasion of the Nazis that fifth column known as *quislings* for the name of the "protector" of Norway, took over State government on behalf of National Socialism.

As mentioned, on 24 April the Young Turks started the extermination with the elite arrest of hundreds of men in Istanbul who were assassinated without concealment. That elite selection of notable men, widely acknowledged by the Armenian community, were just the

preface to the mass genocide being prepared for the Armenians. The repressors were quite clear in their idea: first rid the community of its men and then generalize the extermination. As pointed out in previous pages, the genocide began on August 10th, 1910 though it had been decided on at the Secret Congress in Salonika, and suspended until the beginning of the war, which they could see was coming.

In October 1911 Union and Progress Committee meeting had resolved on the sole dominance of the Turks who were to start out on the path to full Turkeyfication of all Ottoman subjects and eliminate any different religious beliefs. Only the force of weapons could replace persuasion and at most the least significant nationalities could preserve their own language, but should be initiated into speaking and praying in Turkish and would not be allowed to own weapons of any nature. There would be no political party other than the Union and Progress Committee. No minority nationalities and even less autonomous peoples. It was time to displace the Armenians and repopulate the area with Turkish-Ottoman immigrants. In other words, make the project more robust with a strong pan-Islamic summons (which would later be known as panTurkey or Pan-Turianism).

The truth as told by Morgenthau

The U.S. ambassador to Turkey, Henry Morgenthau, secretly reported to the authorities in this country, as yet neutral, the magnitude of the genocide in a document that was declassified after the end of the war. In *The Muder of a Nation*, Morgenthau describes the strategy of the genocides: first mobilizing "battle-age" Armenian men and putting them at the service of the Turkish army; then immediately make them lose their military condition, disarm them and strip them of any civil rights. They were sent to work in extreme conditions building roads and railways, where they received corporal punishment from their overseers. Hundreds of thousands would die under these conditions of forced labor, starvation, diseases that were never given medical assistance and life out in the open with no protection against the snow in winter of the burning sun in summer. They would all be stripped of the few belongings they had been able to keep and eventually any survivors who had not entirely exhausted their strength under the strenuous labor would be eliminated entirely devoid of clothes. Once the extermination of the young men who had been mobilized into the military forces, the remainder of the male population would be imprisoned and exterminated in cold blood. Morgenthau tells how the murderers further refined their suffering by forcing them to dig their own graves before they were shot. He describes an episode that took place in July 1915. In the city of Harpoot, 2000 former soldiers were taken off to do roadwork. Knowing that many had died doing this work led the women of the town to beg the military chief for mercy. He not only undertook to respect the lives of these two thousand Armenians, but also reaffirmed this before the religious authority in the region. Then, deriding any promise made, they were almost all massacred and the few survivors who managed to escape gave public testimony of what they had undergone. Another two thousand youngsters followed the same path, and to ensure any possible fugitives would be lacking the strength required to escape, they were deprived of food before the Kurds were given the order to massacre them.

This death sentence condemning young men clearly aimed at ensuring there was nobody capable of resisting and rebelling - or, of course, multiplying. Inevitably, however, there were survivors; men who managed to elude this homicidal recruitment. These were promised banishment, but when in groups of four, of all ages, they started out they found themselves in caravans of death where they were mercilessly hacked to death with axes and knives to spare the cost of gunpowder and bullets. All the male population in Angora between fifteen and sixty were first stripped of all their property, castrated to ensure they could never procreate and eventually wiped out, with their bodies left to be fed on by scavenger birds. For both Morgenthau and Toynbee women's destiny involved multiple tragic facets. Younger women were enslaved in the homes of the Turks, others forced to become part of the harems, likewise enslaved. Women deemed unacceptable were run through with bayonets or thrown over cliffs. Thirst, hunger, sunburn, disease and madness was the lot of those who ordered to march, who were then murdered wherever they fell, skeleton thin and exhausted. Those who resisted the death marches arrived in the camps of Syria and Iraq in conditions that were humanly unrecognizable.

The trial against the Turkish genocides, which was no trial at all

With the end of the First World War, the new administration needed to be able to provide an international image entirely separate from the atrocities committed against the Armenian population by the Young Turks, by other members of the Union and Progress Party Central Committee and the provincial administrators who were directly responsible for the genocide. Most of those mainly responsible were suspiciously able to find the time to elude the action of justice and flee from Turkey. They were judged in absentia and some were sentenced to capital punishment. The attempt to block their money funds failed because, although they did not act clandestinely - for they were part of the repressive government - their accounts were in the hands of front men it was impossible to locate, as so often happens in modern times with dictators. The Young Turks were condemned because their guilt could not be denied, but they eventually not only evaded the weak hand of justice but had their sentences commuted by Mustapha Kemal, and many of them returned to become part of those who continued with the extermination.

MEHMET TALAAT

Emblematic character in the genocide

Mehmet Talaat Pasha (Kircaali, Edirne, Turkey, 1872- Berlin, March 1921) was a member of the Young Turks movement, a government official, Grand Vizier (1917) and one of the main leaders of the Ottoman Empire between 1913 and 1918.

Mehmet Talaat was the son of an outstanding Ottoman military leader. Because of his social position, he was very carefully educated. He graduated from Edirne Institute, and started working in the city's telegraph company, but was arrested in 1893 for his involvement in subversive activities with the resistance group against the despotic regime of Sultan Abdul-Hamid II. When he was freed two years later, he was appointed Chief Post and Telegraph Secretary in Salonika, where he provided important services to the cause of the Young Turks. Between 1898 and 1908 he held different positions in the Salonika Post Office.

He was dismissed in 1908 for being a member of the Union and Progress Committee (CUP), the nucleus of the Young Turks movement. After the 1908 revolution, however, he became a representative for Edirne in the Ottoman Parliament, and in July 1909 he was named Home Minister. He was also Post Minister and secretary general for the CUP in 1912.

After the murder of Prime Minister Mahmut Sevket Pasha, in July 1913, Talaat Pasha once again became Home Minister for Said Halim Pasha's cabinet.

Before the outbreak of the First World War, Talaat supported the allied powers. In 1914, however, under the influence of the War Minister, Ismail Enver Pasha, the Ottoman Empire came into conflict with the allied powers when it gave its support to Germany. As Home Minister,

Talaat was mainly responsible for the deportation of the Armenians in the eastern provinces of the Empire, (from whence, he speculated, they could collaborate with Russia) towards Syria and Mesopotamia. Some historians consider the deportation was part of a strategy of mass extermination of the Armenian people from the Ottoman Empire. A series of telegrams addressed to the governor of Aleppo with unequivocal orders of doing away with the Armenians is attributed to Talaat.

At a meeting of the CUP, Talaat put forward a motion that was unanimously approved: "to exterminate the Armenians down to the last individual". The Committee's program inspired by Talaat and Behaeddin Shakir was grimly macabre. At the first session of the Special Formations (equivalent to the Nazis' SS) the Union and Progress Committee undertook "a grave and important responsibility, and if we do not fulfill this responsibility as it is due we shall not be able to escape the revenge of the Armenians. We must decide with the Home Minister (Talaat) what towns and villages belonging to the Armenians will be the first to be exterminated and we shall send to each of those areas the groups of forces required to await the arrival of the Armenian contingents at various points along the road established". Talaat, the Home Minister will in turn order the executive officials of those cities along the designated route to evacuate any resident Armenians towards the location indicated, at a rate of two groups a day, under the vigilance of the military police; he will lie to the Armenians promising this action is necessary to keep them away from the scene of the war. After receiving this order, police officers will muster the Armenians and start to exile them, under vigilance, in batches and along certain routes. Once they reach the location where the groups of Chetteh (bandits) are stationed, the guards will hand them over and return. Then the Chetteh units will kill all the Armenians and, to avoid any negative consequences to public health, will throw them in previously dug pits and cremate them. They will thus have entirely completed the task of extermination. Any money, jewelry and other belongings of these Armenians will be distributed among the Chetteh." During the government of Talaat rationing was imposed among the Turkish population who certainly did not benefit from the extermination of the Armenians. The Turks received vouchers and had to stand in line for hours since before dawn to get bread. But as not everyone was given vouchers there were Turks who were left in total indigence and their only alternative was to resort to begging in the streets.

Monopolies covered a broad spectrum such as textiles, supplies, tobacco trading, production and export; at the head of these monopolies were the Union and Progress government leaders, with Talaat prominently among them. They were not only the executives but also the investors in these companies, determining at their own decision the price of goods and services.

In 1917 Talaat became the Grand Vizier, but resigned on October 14th 1918, a short time before the Ottoman capitulation before the allies and the armistice of Mudros. In November he was exiled in Berlin along with Ismail Enver Pasha and Ahmed Cemal Pasha, as the three members of the murdering triumvirate. When he was brought up for trial before the Court investigating the massacres he declared with apparent honesty "those sad events that occurred in Armenia kept me awake for many nights. We have been accused of not being able to distinguish between innocent and guilty Armenians, but it is basically impossible to do so, for the innocent of today could well be the guilty of tomorrow."

A careful reading of Talaat's defense should make the reader wonder what some Armenians might have been guilty of, and what innocent Armenians of today might be blamed for tomorrow. Talaat was slain in March 1921 by Soghomon Tehlirian, a 47-year-old evangelical Armenian. On Hardenberg Street in Berlin Soghomon took out a pistol and shot Talaat in the head. Shocked passersby, unaware of the drama behind his action, gave him a beating that was then repeated at the police headquarters. In very bad German, Tehlirian simply tried to make it clear "I Armenian, him Turkish, I not harm Germnay" but his poor command of German was insufficient to explain that it was an act of revenge against Talaat who had had his entire family massacred in the village where they lived. Three days before his death Talaat had an encounter with British diplomat Aubrey Herbert.

Talaat was buried in the Turkish cemetery of Berlin. In 1943 his remains were transferred with all the honors to Istanbul and buried again at Sisli. Once again, historical amnesia prevailed.

NOTHING CHANGED WITH MUSTAPHA KEMAL **Are we to understand, then, that genocide is compatible with modernity?**

The father of what is known as modern Turkey was born an Ottoman in occupied Greek territory. In this time as a ruler he was only able to accumulate titles of his passage through military institutions and his political experience begun in the Young Turks Party. He completed his secondary schooling at a military lyceum in Greece. He completed his higher level studies in 1905 when he graduated from the Military Academy of Monastir. A short time after taking his over his role at the military base where he was stationed, he began to dabble in political life by joining the Young Turks and the Union and Progress Committee (CUP) and sharing in the group's conspiracy projects.

As already mentioned, the first step taken by the CUP was to dethrone Sultan Abdul Hamid II, who in 1896 had been responsible for the mass murder of at least 200,000 Armenians. The politically inexperienced Armenian leaders assumed that following the fall of the Red Sultan would usher in a new age of tolerance and territorial respect for minorities. They were very soon to regret the support they had given to the uprising. The nationalist triumvirate made up of Enver, Cemal and Talaat took over the CUP and the Young Turks – cadets and young military officers and university students – abdicated from their progressive past and were the instigators and executors of the Armenian extermination, with the lame excuse that they were allies and accomplices of the Russian enemy.

Kemal: a military past for a Republican leader

As a military officer Kemal won two victories, one in Tripolitania during the Italian-Turkish war (1911-1912) and the other in the Balkan war of 1912-1913. As a general he was the victor in the Dardanelles (1915) in spite of the eventual Turkish defeat. He was against the armistice of Mudros and organized resistance from the Nationalist Party he had created. As president of the National Assembly he led the military confrontation against the Greeks and the Armenians and stripped them of the territories they had been granted under the Treaty of Sevres, a usurpation subsequently completed with the Treaty of Lausanne.

He proclaimed the independence of the Republic of Turkey and promised a Europeanized country. His main feats, which though not minor were insufficient, were the abolition of the sultanate, the implantation of monogamy, a lay educational and legal system, and the introduction of the Gregorian calendar and the Latin alphabet. Very significantly he forbade the use of the popular fez as a headgear.

Are these reformist measures sufficient to acknowledge that a country has achieved modernity?

A society is modern when the rule of law applies, people can express themselves democratically through its representatives, justice is independent, State resources are used to guarantee health, housing and decent work for its inhabitants, there is no discrimination of any nature (ethnic, religious, human or political). Modernization is completed once the country achieves scientific and industrial development for the country generating wellbeing for their people and an economy developed for peace.

Was Nazi Germany modern?

During the Nazi government Germany underwent significant military and industrial development requiring a high level scientific and technical base, and achieving spectacular results. In aviation they manufactured the first jet plane, their fighter planes were copied after the Second World War by the American Sabre F-86 and the Soviet Mig-15. The U-boat submarines caused considerable losses to British vessels. The renowned von Braun, who ended his career working for his former American enemy, created the remotely guided missile using alcohol and oxygen as fuel. Also among German inventions is the first tape recorder which was to be of great use in espionage and in broadcasting Hitler's impassioned speeches. In all of these areas it was truly an industrially advanced country which no doubt, for as long as it lived in peace, generated job opportunities, which during the war were filled by slave labor. Yet this great development was placed at the service of persecuting to extermination what were deemed "inferior" races as they described the Jews, or "subhuman" races as they referred to the gypsies, and of invading countries and subjecting their inhabitants by terrorizing them and plundering their wealth. Was the Third Reich a modern state?

Modern Turkey

Mustapha Kemal is acknowledged as the founder of "Modern Turkey" established as of October 29th 1923. The official story of the Turkish State invariably attributes this much discussed "modernization" to this general from the former Turkish-Ottoman Empire that governed Turkey between 1923 and 1938. There is no doubt he introduced inspired reformations in western experiences, but he unconditionally took part in the atrocities involving the extermination of 1,500,000 Armenians, and which led to other genocides in the 20th and 21st century. And it was he who continued with these atrocities. When he faced the Constantinople Court Martial on 28 January 1919 during the trials brought against genocides, he sought to conceal his responsibility in the extermination by lying about his past: "I have obediently responded to the summons by this court set up by imperial decree. Those who know me would be amazed to see me here. The pashas who perpetrated those terrible crimes, and dragged our country into the current situation to ensure their own personal interests, are still causing problems. Our compatriots have committed crimes as yet unheard of, they have resorted to all conceivable kinds of tyranny, organized the deportation and massacre, poured kerosene on infants and burnt them alive, violated women and young girls in front of their parents whose hands and feet had been tied, driven their unfortunate victims to Mesopotamia (Iraq and Syria) and oppressed them in the most inhuman fashion, after having appropriated their property and belongings. They embarked thousands of innocents on launches and threw them into the sea. They had heralds announce the obligation of the non-Muslims loyal to the Ottoman government to renege on their religion and embrace Islam, forcing them into this conversion; they made starving elderly women walk for months on end and then dragooned them into forced labor. They threw young girls into tolerance houses established in gruesome conditions and inflicted on the Armenians such unbearable conditions as no people have ever known throughout their history."

The catalog of atrocities recited by Kemal is accurate. What Mustapha Kemal seems to "forget" is that he was party to those acts, taking part in the extermination like an additional member of the Union and Progress Committee. His biography reveals a dark character, who can hardly have left the seed of a modern State ruled by law, when the whole world knows the Turkish Republic usurped Armenian territories and set the genocide in motion. This is one of the reasons why Turkey should not be subject to photographs but to X-rays, to see the millions of corpses who were never given decent burial crying out to the world for justice, simply justice, and nothing more than justice.

The defeat of the Turkish Empire in the First World War created the conditions for Mustapha Kemal – at the time a senior officer in the defeat-plagued expansionist army – to discover the political gifts which allowed him to negotiate both with Lenin and with France and England, undertaking to leap over the remains of the Empire and raise a republic on that base.

Mustapha Kemal and his partisans are responsible for:

- 1) The extermination of the Armenian populations in Cilicia and the profanation of their temples and monuments;
- 2) The fire and destruction of Smyrna in September 1922, where hundreds of thousands of Greeks and Armenians lost their lives;
- 3) The historical vindication of Talaat, who was mostly responsible for conducting the Armenian genocide. Talaat, the genocide executed in the streets of Berlin in 1921, whose remains were returned to Turkey by Hitler in 1943. Today Talaat has a mausoleum in Shishli, Istanbul, on Hurriyet Tepesi (Eternal Liberty Hill). On the 60th anniversary of his death he received official honors. Would it be possible to imagine a monument to Eichmann or Himmler in Germany or to one like Videla in Argentina?
- 4) Having left without effect the sentences imposed by a Turkish tribunal (1919) on the officers responsible for the Armenian killings;
- 5) Forced slavery of over one hundred thousand Armenian children and young girls, orphans of the genocide, in Turkish harems and the enforced Turkeyfication of Armenian children at special schools where they were stripped of their identity. Mustapha Kemal entrusted this job to the activist and identity "converter" by the name of Halide Hanum;
- 6) The slaughter and deportations of Kurdish people between 1923 to date, which reached its greatest intensity during 1926;
- 7) Ignoring the obligations undertaken under the controversial Treaty of Lausanne (1923) in connection with the minorities who lived in what is now Turkish territory (the Armenians were the majority population in these territories prior to the genocide)
- 8) Applying Section 301 of the Criminal Code (punishing any direct or indirect reference to the extermination)

"Modernization" is not a synonym of democracy. Was Hitler likewise "modern" because he modernized mass extermination weapons and used them to subdue peoples and destroy their countries? Perhaps we should consider whether the meaning of "modernity" includes the

usurpation of the territories and wealth of invaded countries, and the murder of those considered inferior races. Before becoming the founder of the "modern" Turkish Republic, Mustapha Kemal had already taken part in the Armenian extermination. He did this before and after the Republic. The official history of the foundation of the "Modern Turkish State" stands by section 301 of the Turkish criminal code which punishes any public affront to "Turkish identity", while tacitly forbidding the use of the term Armenian genocide which is punishable with prison.

BEFORE AND AFTER KEMAL women sold into slavery

During the government of the Young Turks the young and adult Armenian population was decimated. Mothers died as a result of the punishments inflicted, and the hunger and cold they suffered during their march into banishment in Syria. Their children were wrested from their breast and ended their childhood either in orphanages or as the property of Turkish families where they were constrained to give up their identity and embrace a religion and a civil status that denied or concealed their Armenian past. The destiny of women, little girls and young maids involved a different kind of martyrdom: slavery. This occurred both before and during the times of Kemal. A report drawn up in 1925 by US citizen William T. Manning for what was then the League of Nations (the organization replaced after the Second World War by the United Nations Organization) denounced that "over 100,000 Armenian women and girls are kept captive under vile and abhorrent conditions in Turkish harems. This means these women whose husbands were murdered are locked up by force together with the murderers' "wives". It means that little girls whose Armenian fathers were massacred are on sale for whoever may wish to purchase them and subject entirely to their will. "Armenian girls as refined and well-educated as anybody in the United States, without fathers or brothers to protect them, are living in slavery in conditions to them much worse than death, with no hope, in the hands of their Turkish owners. "It is inadmissible," declared Manning, "that we should be obliged to establish friendly relations with Kemalist Turkey, for having ratified the Treaty of Lausanne it would mean our country would be a silent spectator to these abominations, which would absolve the politics of the current Turkish government, who would pay little heed to their promises and obligations."

A special cable for **The New York Times** dated 23 December 1925 related that "various missionary societies are buying (Armenian) Christian young girls at 5 dollars a head to save them from the horrors involved in being made prisoners of the Turks, although there are at least 3,000 already captive. The girls' faces are tattooed to show they are fugitives who should be returned to their owners if they managed to escape. "Girls of about 14 are taken to the Turkish harems while those who are younger are rented out to Kurds and Arabs to work the fields until they are old enough for sale to the Turkish harems. By that time the estimated number of Armenian young girls and children enslaved in Turkish harems ranged between 100,000 and 400,000.

George Horton, US consul general and an eye witness to the destruction of Izmir in 1922 is of the opinion that Kemal massacred at least 125,000 Armenians in the region and enslaved thousands of young girls (the number in this latter case exceeded 25,000).

It has been made clear in previous pages how older Armenians were put to death. Instead, younger women and children of both sexes under the age of 12 were put up for sale to the highest bidder. There were numerous cases of suicide among Armenian women whose education, social upbringing and religion made marriage to a Turk ignominious, for in this situation they were forbidden to speak their own language and were subject to serve the other Turkish wives. Those who had the good fortune of being rescued, in Aleppo among other places, bore tattoos on their faces that would mark them for life. Armenian white-skinned girls were "fattened" until the age of 14 to be sold later like cattle at a fair.

Kemal's responsibility cannot be concealed. He attended the negotiations at Lausanne two months after looting and setting fire to the Armenian neighborhoods in Izmir, raping and enslaving thousands of Armenian women and children, massacring 100,000 defenseless civilians, driving out over 300,000 Armenian men, women and children who were only allowed to take with them the clothes they were wearing. Kemal was crueler than Abdul Hamid, known as the Great Assassin of the East. In fact, he perpetuated the holocaust initiated in 1915. Kemal created the Commissions for Abandoned Properties which actually sold to the Turks properties that legitimately belonged to the Armenians Kemal murdered or drove out.

THE GENOCIDES never concealed their intentions

Their own testimonies

"By virtue of the rights granted under the Constitution, equality was established between Muslims and Christians, but it was an unrealizable ideal. In the face of the Shariat, in the face of our great history and the feeling of hundreds of thousands of Muslims, Christians take pleasure in opposing Ottoman interests and set up an insurmountable wall to legal equality.

"We have fruitlessly tried to transform the infidel into a true Ottoman; yet those attempts will undoubtedly fail to the extent the small countries in the Balkan peninsula devote themselves to spreading separatist ideas among the people of Macedonia. There can therefore be no question of equality as long as we have not Ottomanized the Empire; as regards our task – which is long and hard – I dare to hazard that we shall, however, triumph... Today there is but one way to achieve this: annihilating them by force of arms.

"It is necessary to adopt a centralizing policy and impose Pan-Turkism resorting, if needs be, to the extermination of any dissidents."

(Statement by Talaat, Turkish Home Minister, in the Secret Congress of the Union and Progress Party, Salonika, 31 August / 14 September 1910)

"The Young Turks cannot grant the freedoms acknowledged in the Constitution reestablished in 1908. The Young Turks cannot solve the issue with partial eliminations such as those conducted during the Hamid regime. The Young Turks cannot apply the reforms required by the Armenians and abort the objectives of the government, for those reforms would lead to the independence of the Armenians. I therefore propose to the Congress the total extermination of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire; it is necessary to annihilate them. To achieve this

purpose it is necessary to take action in the face of all the difficulties, free of conscience or any feelings of humanity, for this is not a matter of conscience or humanitarian feelings: it is simply political in nature, closely linked to the benefit and future of Turkey. This will immediately put an end to the Armenian Question. The Turkish government will be free of any foreign interference in its internal affairs. The country will be rid of the Armenian race and provide a broader field for the Turks. The wealth of the Armenians shall become the property of the Turkish government. Anatolia shall be a territory inhabited solely by Turks. This will put an end to the greatest obstacle to achieving the Panturanic ideal."

(Dr. Nazim Feheti, CUP secretary. Statement unanimously approved at the Salonika Congress on 14 September 1910)

Suffice these two resolutions adopted by the secret meeting in Salonika by the Union and Progress Committee to understand the clear decision to simply exterminate the Armenians. The following texts explicitly confirm this decision.

"It is likely the corpses floating southwards along the river Euphrates belong to Armenians killed during the movement. To the military commanders: In view of the current situation, by Imperial edict, the total extermination of the Armenian race has been ordered. With this purpose in mind the following operations will be carried out: 1) Ottoman subjects over the age of five having an Armenian name and residing in the country, will be removed from the city and killed; 2) Armenians providing services in the imperial armies will be separated from their divisions without creating incidents, conducted to deserted locations, away from the public eye and shot; 3) Armenian army officers will be imprisoned at the respective military bases until further notice. Forty eight hours after these instructions are communicated to the military commanders specific execution orders will be given. No action shall be taken in this connection, with the exception of the preliminary preparations"

(Enver, Commander in Chief and War Minister. 27 February 1915)

"Are accounts being adjusted with the Armenians deported from that place? Inform us of the details of their death or annihilation or if they are simply being removed from the city and banished"

(Behaddin Shakir, president of the Special Formations, 21 April 1915)

"It has previously been communicated that the Government, by an edict of the Assembly, has ordered the total extermination of the Armenians living in Turkey. Whoever is opposed to this edict will not be allowed to carry out any function in the government. There will be no consideration for women, children or disabled persons, however tragic the means of transferal, their existence must come to an end."

(Talaat, 15 May 1915)

"To get rid of the Armenian question it is necessary to get rid of the Armenians"

(1881, Grand Vizier Said Pasha)

"The Young Turks cannot grant the freedoms acknowledged in the Constitution reestablished in 1908. The Young Turks cannot resolve the question with partial eliminations like those conducted during the Hamid regime. The Young Turks cannot apply the reforms demanded by the Armenians and abort government aims, for the reforms would lead to the independence of the Armenians. It is necessary to destroy their families and the foundations of their family organization. The family is the bulwark of the resistance of these peoples, particularly the Armenians. If that bulwark is destroyed their resistance will be annihilated and it will not be necessary to resort to slaughter, for the national institutions will naturally disappear."

(Ahmed Bey Aghaiev (1909, at the secret congress of the Union and Progress Party)

"I therefore propose to the Congress the total extermination of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire; it is necessary to annihilate them. To achieve this purpose it is necessary to take action in the face of all the difficulties, free of conscience or any feelings of humanity, for this is not a matter of conscience or humanitarian feelings: it is simply political in nature, closely linked to the benefit and future of Turkey. This will immediately put an end to the Armenian Question. The Turkish government will be free of any foreign interference in its internal affairs. The country will be rid of the Armenian race and provide a broader field for the Turks. The wealth of the Armenians shall become the property of the Turkish government. Anatolia shall be a territory inhabited solely by Turks. This will put an end to the greatest obstacle to achieving the Panturanic ideal."

(August 1910, Dr. Nazim Feheti, secretary general of the Union and Progress Party)

"If this time they are not wiped out entirely and definitely, from the practical point of view it will bring nothing but disturbance. It is necessary for the Armenian nation to be uprooted, to ensure not a single Armenian remains in our territory. We are at war: never shall we have a better opportunity. The interventions and protests of the great powers shall be forgotten and non-transcendental in the face of the consummated act. This time the annihilation of the Armenians will be complete."

(Dr. Nazim Feheti, member of the Tripartite Executive Body along with Minister for Shukr  and Dr. Behaeddin Shakir, liaison between the government and the Party)

"Burn, smite, kill"

(Order given by Home Minister Talaat Bey)

"The decision was made to exterminate all the Armenians, not leaving a single one of them alive. The Union and Progress Party has acknowledged full legitimacy for the government in this connection. The government will give the governors and commanders of the army the necessary instructions in connection with organization of the slaughter. Party representative will be in charge of collaborating, wherever they may be, in this affair and preventing any Armenian from receiving help or cooperation."

(February 1915. Dr. Behaeddin Shakir liaison between Government and Party)

"Total annihilation of the Armenians has been decided and for this reason we have no option but to resort to excessively sanguinary measures. To start with exterminate outstanding Armenians"

(May 1915. Dr. Behaeddin Shakir, liaison between Government and Party)

"Therefore, to protect our country, our nation, our government and our religion against the possibility of such danger, the government that represents Islam and the Turkish people, and the Union and Progress Committee, come what may, to anticipate the presentation of the Armenian Question anywhere and in any manner, and taking advantage of the facilities the state of war is providing us with, have decided to put an end to this question once and for all, deporting the Armenians to the deserts of Arabia, thus exterminating those that are spurious under the secret instructions received.

For fulfillment of the plan the following arguments were held to be valid:

- Voluntary Armenian forces serve in enemy armies
- Armenian political parties have activities in the interior of the country to attack our army from the rearward
- The innumerable amount of weapons and warfare supplies found all over our territory.

With these arguments, we, the government and the Central Committee send out a summons to each of you and your love for our country and order you to cooperate with all the means at your disposal with the local delegations of the Union and Progress Party, which as of dawn on 24 April will be executing this order, according to the secret instructions. Any official or agent opposing this sacred patriotic labor and fails to execute the obligations imposed, or protects or shelters any Armenian in any way shall be deemed an enemy of our country and our religion and duly punished."

(Home Minister, Talaat. War Minister, Enver. Executive Secretary of the Union and Progress Committee, Dr. Nazim"

"It has been previously communicated that the government, by order of the Assembly, has decided to entirely exterminate Armenians living in Turkey. Whoever opposes this order shall not be allowed to exercise any role in the government. There will be no consideration for women, children or disabled persons, however tragic the means of transferal, their existence must come to an end."

(Mayo 1915. Telegram from Talaat, Home Minister)

"Any Muslim has permission to test his sabre on the neck of a Christian."

Abdul Hamid II

(NB: It should be remembered that Armenia converted to Christianity in 301 A.D.)

"It is necessary to act promptly and decisively. Armenians are as dangerous as the plague. At first this venomous wound may look as if it could be healed, but if a good physician does not act immediately, it could lead us to death. If we settle for the local killings, as happened in 1909 in Adana, we can lose everything, for doubt will appear in those we are willing to believe in for the future. I refer to the Arabs and the Kurds. Thus the danger increases and it will be difficult for us to conduct the killings. It is imperative to exterminate the entire Armenian nation, and not leave a single Armenian alive in our territory. Even the word "Armenian" is to be banished from our memory. The war will provide us with an excellent possibility, for we need not fear the interference of the great powers or protests from the international press. They will not have managed to leave their posts before this has been completed. The slaughter must be general and not a single Armenian should be left alive."

(Dr. Nazim Bey, influential Young Turks leader)

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS holocaust of fire and poison

Infanticides

In their defenseless situation, children perhaps suffered greater cruelties than adults during the Armenian extermination. Those who masterminded and carried out the holocaust, either directly or with the support of Kurds and Chechens, were coherent in their actions. This has already been told. Their first target involved young and adult men who were in better physical conditions to resist the general massacre and protect the rest of the family, women and children, who would be the next victims. Likewise, by eliminating the men the natural possibilities of procreation were cut off.

In this premeditated plan everything cinched to perfect the perverse circle to ensure no Armenian remained in Turkish territory. There were no differences between the direct homicides and the deportation, for this latter likewise aimed at destruction. When the new commander of the Third Army, Mehmet Vetiip, took over, his predecessor had completed the destruction in the Armenian provinces and in Trebisonda. Vehip himself, one of those who conveniently "repented" told the Court: "The massacre and destruction of the Armenians and the plundering and robbery of all their property were the result of decisions taken by the Central Union and Progress Committee. The atrocities were committed within the framework of a program that was clearly premeditated."

But premeditation and the final option for genocide would only be feasible with organisms and staff that were trustworthy. For this purpose four groups were directly commissioned: party leaders with clearly recognized authority and power sometimes above that of the governors; Responsible Secretaries; Inspectors; Delegates. In general all of these were Partisan authorities or directly militaries operating as a parallel government where it was no longer clear who the real authority was.

Death at Trebisonda

At Trebisonda, one of the main extermination centers, a resolution by the governor to except children and the weak and ailing from deportation was ignored. The deportations continued, despite awareness of the sad end awaiting those who had previously traveled in the caravan of death. With this knowledge General Mahmud Kamil was able to declare that "after the war the Armenian Question will no longer exist".

Perhaps even crueller than the military genocides themselves were the bands of murderers recruited expressly because they had criminal backgrounds (condemned criminals who had been freed and encouraged, exacerbating their anti-Christian hatred with the promise of rewards). They were considered to be provided a service for their country. They all worked together directly or indirectly in the Special Organization: the government, the CUP as a monolithic party, and bandits recruited from jails. In these hands lay the destiny of the children.

When a Turkish leader says "this time we will do the job thoroughly" he is issuing the warning that no Armenian, of any age, is safe. For the Nazis, Jews and Gypsies, both adults and children alike, were members of inferior races and should be eliminated for the good of Aryan purity. At times the Turks cared little what ethnic or religious group a child belonged to. The child's ethnic character mattered little, what did matter was the possibility of converting him at an early age to turn him into a future Islamic Turk, circumcised and renamed. This was the price for saving children's lives. Yet even these cases were scant. Armenian children suffered murder, tortures and deportation on their way to death, the same as their adult compatriots did. Obviously cruelty was exacerbated in these cases for a child is naturally unable to put up with as much as an adult on forced marches, suffering hunger and thirst, corporal punishment from the very gendarmes who clubbed or stabbed their mothers to death in front of them, to save on bullets. The cruelest episodes took place in Trebisonda and the six provinces of Anatolia (Sivas, Diyarbakir, Harput, Erzurum, Bitlis and Van, these two latter the birthplace of Armenia), in Urfa and Marash.

The treatment the captives were given in Trebisonda includes the spectrum of the direst murders imaginable. Perhaps the most heartless was the psychological pain inflicted on children forced to witness the deportations of women and the ailing and elderly in caravans supposedly destined for banishment in the deserts of Syria.

Child genocide physicians

Once of the directors in charge of public health, doctor Ali Saib, decided to poison the drinking cups given to adults telling them they were being given a vaccine, and to children telling they were being given medicine. Those who refused to take the "medicine" were drowned in the Black Sea. That same physician thought up another manner of death locking the children up in closed rooms for a 'steam bath' in autoclaves supplied by the army, a steam so hot it killed babies and infants in the act. But the same children's hospital was turned into a warehouse at night where little girls and even little boys were raped and sexually misused. They were then drowned in the sea. The commander at Bitlis actually accused the little girls of sexually exhausting his soldiers and of transmitting infectious diseases to them, which made them deserving of death.

"The Armenians have no other burial place but the Euphrates"

Another way of exterminating the hundreds of children snatched away from their families was to place them semi-naked on rafts in the port of Ordu, in Trebisonda, to have them thrown into the Black Sea and the river Degirmendere. In areas with no sea or rivers the children could likewise be drowned in lakes. In Jaipur they were separated from their mothers - their fathers had already been exterminated - and were kept for a time in orphanages to create the illusion they had managed to escape death, but a short time later they were taken and drowned in lake Goldchluk some 30 kilometers away. Some of the bodies showed signs of bayonet stabs on their neck, abdomen or thorax. Thousands of innocent victims died this way.

Deir-Zor was the Armenian Auschwitz. The police of chief chose the prettiest girls for his agents to rape on bridges and then drown in the river.

In other cases sadism was such that family members were forced to watch as their young girls were subjected to indignity, sometimes in Armenian churches which were used for these perversions. There were thousands of homosexual rapes, often at the homes children had been adopted into and converted to Islam. They were not saved because of the original sin of having been born Armenians. In a city in the province of Jaipur it was the physicians and pharmacists who were in charge of the poisoning or 500 orphans. One of the poisoners is alleged to have stated that "the Armenians have no other burial place but the Euphrates."

Abdul Hamid, the Red, took active part in the Armenian extermination. However, his cruelty by no means reached the extremes of those who came after him. The later genocides were amazed at the way those who survived the punishments managed to recover to some extent their vitality, perhaps because there were offices who were disgusted by the methods used in the extermination. Mistrusting some of the military, they decided to free imprisoned criminals so that they, together with Kurds and Caucasians could mercilessly complete a large amount of the dirty work perpetrated against women, children and elderly people. Once the extermination of the adults had been consummated a solution had yet to be found for the children. The governor of Diyarbekin found one: he locked 800 children up in a building and set fire to it with the little ones inside.

In Furuncular, which was likewise in Harput, pits were dug and the children thrown in alive. At another location in Harput the department supervisor burnt 800 children from another region. Another ruthless way of taking children's life used in Deir-Zor was to spray them with kerosene and burn them alive. The same was done by the governor of Trebisonda who gathered 1,000 children and set fire to them in sight of a crowd of witnesses who were forced to watch, while he cried out that for the safety of Turkey the name of Armenia should be erased forever from his province. The spectacle was replicated in Mush, Siirt, Cumming and a large number of other places, always with a savage degree of brutality. The miserly Chechens were told it was not necessary to collect bribes for they would receive all the property belonging to the dead.

22 death sentences, 20 hanged

"At the trial in absentia held before the War Court, it has been proved that the accused organized criminal attempts with the aim of creating an independent autonomous Armenia, seeking to separate part of the Empire's territory by inflaming foreigners against the Ottoman Empire, and with this purpose in mind have summoned at different points in foreign countries clandestine meetings while issuing publications, incitement and correspondence.

Therefore, pursuant to the provisions of Section 54 of the Criminal Code, the following have been sentenced to death:

Sabah-Gullian	Aram Hrant
Varztad	Karekin
Maeteços Sarquisian	Boghos
Agop Cazazian	Hagop
Minas	Tovmas
Sembad	Eremenian
Vahan Boyadjian	Mgrdich Kegham
Dr. Bedros	Iervant
Armenag (trader)	Hovhannes
Apraham (cobbler)	Karnig

whose death sentences have been ratified by the Sultan. Except for Sabah Gulián and Varztad, who are fugitives from justice, the rest were hanged on June 15 at about 3.30 a.m., in Sultan Baiazid Place, next to the War Ministry, after fulfilling the legal, political and religious formalities. The search for first two on the list, who have both been condemned and currently fugitive from justice, will continue."

Last words of those condemned to the gallows

Dr. Benné: "They may hang our twenty bodies, but not our ideas. You may be sure that tomorrow there will be twenty million people following us and our ideas"

Iervant Topuzian: after handing his handkerchief to the priest administering extreme unction he said: Reverend Father, deliver this dry handkerchief to my mother and tell her it was never wet by a single tear."

Kegham Vaniguan: "It is my solid belief that the only path and best for man is that of fighting. Fighting for the victory of the worker. Seeking happiness for mankind. In a word, fighting for man to be able to live in the most advanced manner. This is the ultimate goal of life."

Paramaz: "The Armenian dies drop by drop. If he does not wish to die drop by drop, if he wishes to live, the Armenian must die once again... Wherever the gallows stand freedom raises her head; wherever the dead lie, resurrection approaches. You can only hang our bodies: our ideas – socialism – cannot be hanged. Tomorrow you will see on the horizon to the east the dawn of socialist Armenia"

The dismay of a military physician in the Ottoman army

Dr. H. Toroyan reported in June 1915 that "my unhappy compatriots deported to Mesopotamia, whose women and children die daily, decimated by suffering, hunger and sickness and subject to the diabolic cruelty of those in charge of them in their place of exile, have beseeched me to send out a call in their favor to the entire civilized world, to the Armenians in the Caucasus in particular, and especially to the Armenians in North America. This concentration camp was as yet congested when I left, with Armenians from Adana and Cilicia, mostly women and children. Two of them, whom I knew but had some difficulty in recognizing, for such was the condition they had been reduced to, threw themselves at my feet: Tell the valiant soldiers (of the allies) to come soon to Mesopotamia, for we are worse off than dead. These poor people were in rags, their clothes hardly covering their bodies, and had nothing to protect them from the elements. Some, curled up on the floor, tried to protect themselves under tattered umbrellas, but most of them had nothing.

"I asked my gendarmes about those piles of earth we could see all over the place with dogs hanging around them: "they are the graves of the infidels," was the calm answer I was given. "How strange," I said. "So many graves for such a small village?" "Oh, you don't understand," the gendarmes said, "those are the graves of those dogs that were brought here in August; they all died of thirst."

Testimony of the Vicar General for the Catholic diocese in Sivas

"...Upon our arrival at Sivas there was still a regiment of workers comprising about one thousand Armenians, plasterers, cobblers, tailors, blacksmiths, etc. Among them was a good number of Catholics whom I came to know personally and who one after the other came to see me in the evenings to confess and take communion. One day one of them came to me and I said to him "Good day, Mikel, how are Stepan Agop and the other Catholic friends? I haven't seen them for some time."

"Ah Father," he answered, his eyes wet with tears and fearing he might draw attention to himself. "What can I say? The bloodthirsty governor, under the pretext of sending the regiment to another location, had all their throats slit just a few minutes away from the city."

Order by telegram to the night chief of police at Caesarea

"On the borders of your jurisdiction, some Armenian spies who betrayed our country were deported; in other words they were killed and the Military Commander in the same area gave the order to remove the bodies before noon the following day and conceal them."

A survivor reported that "when we left Caesarea we witnessed a disgusting spectacle: the Turks had some time before started the extermination of the Armenians; they imprisoned them in jails in groups of two to three hundred; they then made them go out into the neighboring countryside where the gendarmes had the order to exterminate them, rape their women and daughters, massacre their children before their very eyes and commit many cruelties that my quill is reluctant to describe. That day (17 July 1915) our souls were torn apart at the sight of the human remains in those lugubrious caravans of Armenians; they were pushed and tortured by the gendarmes who chivvied them along with blows from the butts of their rifles. Their clothes hung about them in rags, they were dying of thirst, exhausted and deprived; we gave them our edible supplies and what little money we had. The spectacle was so searing we had to turn our eyes away - blood, despair, and the weeping of so many souls.

CITIES OF MARTYRDOM

One of the emblematic imprints of wars is the destruction of civilian cities immolated in spite of not being military bases. Spain (Guernica), Europe (Lidice, Dresden), Asia (Hiroshima and Nagasaki). The Armenians likewise had cities of martyrdom following 1915.

Spain

During the war against Francoism, **Guernica** suffered an air bombing on 26 April 1937 by the Condor Legion (Spanish Falangist commanded by a German military) and the Savoia (Italian Fascism). With the excuse of blowing up a bridge, this town of 5,000 inhabitants and numerous refugees turned into a pillar of smoke where the last bombs were dropped blindly for nothing could be seen. Two days after the bombing the Francoists occupied the town and accused the republican troops of having caused the destruction. Picasso immortalized in a notable painting the martyrdom of Guernica.

Japan

Hiroshima and Nagasaki were destroyed by the atomic bombing by US airplanes. The death tally in Hiroshima was 120,000 people out of a population of 450,000 souls. In Nagasaki out of a total population of 195,000 inhabitants, 50,000 died and 30,000 were injured. Not counting subsequent deaths due to radioactivity, Japan was virtually defeated and neither of the cities had any strategic value. An innocent population was massacred and radioactivity marked the lives of the remainder. But it was a clear warning for the Soviet Union as to the future.

Germany

Dresden was an extremely beautiful German city with no military value. It had no warfare industry and no forces were deployed in the city. British bombardiers, who had respected the large industrial complexes with multinational links, destroyed Dresden, which had no strategic value for the "glory of the RAF and as proof of allied power.

Czechoslovakia

Lidice was a village which was not a military objective for any of the contenders. Reinhard Heydrich was appointed as "Protector" of Prague by Hitler and unleashed blood terror in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. Two combatants of the resistance murdered him as a revenge for the victims of the occupying Nazis. In retribution Hitler ordered that the day of Heydrich's funeral the inhabitants of Lidice should be exterminated and the village razed to the ground, flattened to a condition such that it could be plowed. The clues to the murder were

false and no connection of any nature was ever proven between the exterminated town and the perpetrators of the murder.

In all these cases these defenseless townships paid the tribute of war and were used as excuses for performing inhuman acts.

Armenia

In the extermination of the Armenians, particularly after 1915, there is a long list of martyr cities where the mass murders and deportations of Armenians were committed in the caravans of death, all victims of the Turkish terror. Pascual Ohanian studied the tragedy, city by city. The following testimonial cases are extracted from his research.

Zeitoun

A mountainous city in the north of Cilicia located on a high peak that was believed to be inexpugnable. Like Van, Cilicia was a great Armenian center in Turkey, with a village whose inhabitants were shepherds though intellectually highly developed. Strategically located for trade exchanges, its flourishing growth stimulated migrations from other territories.

The extermination in Zeitoun began deliberately in 1909 long before the Armenian self-defense in Van, with the dates thus proving the Turkish attempt of associating Zeitoun with the rebellion in Van. The exercise that started in Cilicia was reproduced from then on extending to neighboring towns with a variety of corporal punishments, deportations, raping of women, murders.

Ayash

A town located in a valley close to the hill of the same name. It was no coincidence the Turks targeted intellectuals and politicians, because they had to prevent the birth of new leadership. They were locked up in a public building converted to a barred prison where they remained until the time came to march them to the gallows. Others were "deported" to the forested valleys where they were assassinated in the presence of Turkish civilian and military authorities. Not even death closed the circle of martyrdom for the bodies were then profaned.

Tokat

In this town surrounded by fruit trees and wheat fields west of Sivas, the Turks pressured the Christian primate into convincing the Armenians to give up their ownership of weapons which, according to the Turks, would be employed against the authorities. Aware of the trap that was being laid for them many attempted to refuse to listen to the advice of this religious authority, though eventually they all hand over everything, including their kitchen knives. The primate himself paid for his naiveté with his life at the hands of bandits who tortured him to death. From among the 30,000 people living in the city, all the men were weeded out, whether merchants, craftsmen or operators, and were imprisoned and eliminated. The women and children were killed on their way to banishment or died of thirst (they were offered the option of buying water – people who had no money, and they were not allowed to approach the river). Hunger and the adverse weather conditions did the rest. In the water and on the coast they came across thousands of dead who had gone before them in this calvary.

Erzurum

This city, the link between the two critical zones of Bitlis and Van, was the home of a Kurdish population and other almost savage ethnic groups that undertook the task of murdering their Armenian neighbors. The Turks gradually did the rest. An Armenian uprising was forged to justify the banishment of some 400,000 Armenians who were snatched from their villages and systematically slaughtered. Armenian teachers and young men serving under the flag were given their license and died as a result of the forced labor they were required to do building roads. The spectacle must have been Dantesque: elderly women thrown alive into a pile and covered over with earth, their death throes causing the mounds to heave. To take the population by surprise and avoid resistance, the deportations had started in neighboring villages. Banishment or death was the fate of 99% of the population.

Arabkir

The farce of the search for weapons continued leading to intellectuals and merchants being beaten and even axed to death, people without the remotest knowledge of how to use pistols and rifles. Even the tombs in the cemeteries were profaned. The Euphrates ran red when on 6 June, the Day of St Gregory the Illuminator, the naked men were shot on the boats and their bodies thrown into the water.

Diyarbakir

Here there were 35% Armenians over a population of almost 300,000. That 35% had 200 schools, some 7000 students and 250 teaching staff. The Turks expressly formed a Commission for the extermination of Armenians made up of the mayor, government officials and legislators.

In revenge for a non-existent consignment of 40 bombs allegedly sent by the Armenians to Van, the persecutions began: knifings, drownings, shootings (after first having dug their own graves), deportations, women sequestered in the harems of wealthy Turks.

Hadjin

This city of 50,000 inhabitants was so Armenian that even its Turkish inhabitants spoke the local Armenian dialect. The finding of 65 rifles was sufficient to justify the slaughter. After 20,000 Armenians were killed or deported until they died on the road, only 350 Armenian families were left in Hajdin made up of widows, children and disabled people.

Erzindjan

This was the concentration camp where all the Armenians deported from the north of Asia Minor were thrown. Once they resumed their path to exile, they were stripped of the few items they still had on them and left at shooting distance of the Kurds who were awaiting them by government order.

Caesarea

The Turks degraded their representative who refused to comply with the deportation order. The new governor hanged outstanding Armenians on the gallows, physicians, merchants, priests. With burning irons they tried to make the leader, Vishabian, betray his comrades. A poster in the street announced that Catholic and Protestant Armenians would be deported to Syria.

Baiburt

A cluster of 30 villages inhabited by around 20,000 Armenians who practiced their Christian faith in 36 churches were destroyed. Those being deported were deceived with the promise of being removed from their villages to protect them from the actions of possible assassins. On their way to banishment they were robbed by the gendarmes who "cared" for them, and murdered by bandits. Any survivors were drowned.

Sivas

This was an agricultural region with craftsmen skilled in manufacturing products. Not a single Armenian remained in the capital after the deportations that left the villages vacant. Stores were pillaged, livestock stolen and their homes were occupied by Turkish officers. Ohanian said it clearly: Sivas was the scene of the largest number of deportations towards the four points of the compass. As they went

exterminating detained Armenians, their places were again occupied by other batches of prisoners who would suffer the same fate. Former Armenian soldiers were subjected to serfdom and when they were no longer strong enough to work they were forced to dig their own graves.

Gürün

With the excuse of searching for weapons, the most affluent Armenians were arrested and their homes and personal property taken over. Those subjected to torture were revived with freezing douches and hung head downwards. Dozens of gendarmes led the chained prisoners to death, and no one was saved, even the head of the Christian churches.

Bitlis

This town westwards across the lake from Van, was particularly punished because its Armenians inhabitant dared to attempt a rebellion. No caravan of death was necessary: they were simply tortured and slaughtered and their bodies were left to be dealt with by carrion birds.

The list of Armenian martyred cities could be increased with other equally dramatic accounts and testimonies. A final note applies: nothing was improvised. The plan was orchestrated by the Turkish government and the Young Turks Party. The assassins had, like Talaat. The victims stood in line: first the Armenians, then the Greeks, and then the rest of the Christians.

RESISTANCE AND REPRESSION first political expressions

Khachatur Abovian

The middle of the nineteenth century saw the gradual growth of Armenian intellectuality (men of letters, writers, playwrights, journalists) with the conviction they could play a significant role with their works by creating awareness of the need for a national liberation process. They did not aspire to be the sole architects of this process for the fronts opened by such a movement do not involve them alone, but required diplomatic activity – which time would show was elusive – because of the need to create organization and expression currents through political parties and jointly confront armed resistance and self-defense when the time was right.

To be able to generalize these ideas among the population it was necessary to open up the path towards comprehension using language, but their sacred ancient tongue could not play this role. This was achieved by Khachatur Abovian with *ashkarapar*, the vulgar Armenian language used massively by the population. Khachatur managed to grasp that this was the path intellectuals should walk, for he had all the conditions required from his broad view as a man of letters, historian, humanist, playwright, ethnographer and educator. His command of several languages provided him with access to foreign thinkers, in particular to German realism, whose ideas would help him to transmit his own experience to his colleagues so they would plant the seed and make it germinate, generalizing the idea of national liberation.

It is not easy to spread light in the midst of Tsarist obscurantism which knew exactly how to repress among the Armenian provinces any type of labor or social vindication by the peasants and urban craftsmen who were the victims of the misappropriations by their government officials. Even more serious, since it was not allied to the central power, was a feudal system endowed with the prerogatives to apply the same policy. Abovian's favorite tribune was the school, which he understood as the seedbed for citizens who would in time become players in the national liberation process.

Raffi

Another intellectual known as Raffi, (Hakob Melik Hakobian) inherited the ideas of Khachatur and radicalized them assuming that a different kind of struggle was necessary, leaving aside submission to the tsar's officers, the Ottoman yoke and the utopic assumption that the grave Armenian problems could be resolved by diplomatic avenues, on the understanding that these were played out elsewhere. "Without tears, without sacrifices, there can be no redemption." He called for confrontation of Czarist Russification of schools and culture, and the suffocation of minority economies by a confiscatory financial capitalism. As if this were not enough, Czarism stimulated interethnic confrontations by encouraging Russian peasants to settle on Armenian lands. When Ottoman totalitarianism became stronger, the Armenians accompanied the struggle of the Turkish people because such suffering and abuse creates solidarity. They had no illusion that at the end of that battle the Armenian Question difficulties would be resolved, based as they were on territorial possession unrecognized under Turkish laws. If this issue could be resolved, security would likewise be conquered. The banner raised by Raffi was "armed patriotism and freedom to save the Armenian Nation".

The Turks were getting stronger with instruments that supplemented military oppression: abuses by usurers, ignorance and cultural backwardness. The liberation process involved eradicating such adversities from the Armenian nation. Raffi held that freedom is the daughter of tyranny and arbitrariness and "when the people are persuaded that freedom is indispensable to them, it is impossible to dominate them: they will raise their heads and shake off their yoke, they will break their chains and reconquer their freedom." He appealed to the leaders to breathe new life into the people and make them see freedom is necessary to break internal ties and submission to foreign rule.

Arzruni

Krikor Arzruni was a Russian journalist who descended from an Armenian family in Van who embraced the Armenian Cause influenced by the humanistic education he received in Europe and his progressive revolutionary temperament. He advocated education for women, renewal of the language, increase in economic production within the framework of cultural development and freedom of thought and expression. For religion, which had a great deal of power over communities, he urged modernization eliminating the anachronistic solemn Armenian language the people were unable to understand, changes in the treatment of marriages, greater involvement of lay people and the formation of new clergy that were neither authoritarian nor privileged. He sought to vindicate the figure of St Gregory Illuminator.

His ideas on economy were progressive: going beyond basic agriculture and seeking to exploit the forests; leaving behind the position of intermediaries in a losing trade with foreigners and develop locally manufactured production. He cleverly encouraged the creation of a national bourgeoisie not only dedicated to manufacturing goods but also interested in educating their children thus providing their society with intellectuals, scientists and, obviously, community, political and government leaders. He set forth his ideas in a newspaper that had such repercussion that when he died in the last days of the century 50,000 people paid him posthumous homage.

Reshad Bey, Chief of the Political Section of the Constantinople police force drew up a list of 2,000 renowned Armenians in the capital including biographies, photos and other details of candidates for the death roll. In order to avoid international repercussion and the intervention of foreign diplomats, the government announced the censure of all telegraphic communications and eventually closed down foreign postal services. With the excuse of contributing to the war effort the plundering of non-Muslim (i.e. Armenian and Greek) businesses was undertaken in Sevan and Diyarbakir. Nazareth Chavush, the most outstanding Armenian leader was murdered in Zeitoun, responding to a command issued by Haidar Baja, governor of Marash. The bands of Turkish irregulars started the pillaging, with rapes and child kidnappings in Erzurum. The Primate of the Armenian Apostolic Church in Erzincan was assassinated in the village of Kanli-Tas, close to Shabin-Karahisar by six bandits under the orders of Ahmet Muammer, governor general of the province of Sivas where the prelate was travelling. The progressive execution of Armenian origin conscripts began, while public hospitals were being built with Armenian donations for military use through the Red Crescent Moon, equivalent to the Red Cross. All government officials of Armenian origin were dismissed from Ottoman public administration.

CHRONOLOGY of the Armenian extermination - 1915-1923

Talaat spuriously stated in the **Osmanischer Lloyd** (German newspaper in Constantinople) "To the Armenian nation – whose loyalty to the imperial government is well-known – goes this expression of my satisfaction and recognition". Turkey repaid Armenian loyalty by betraying their citizens; in the zones occupied by Turkish troops the Armenians, Greeks and other minorities were sacked and annihilated. The Supreme Court of Justice in the Argentine Republic echoed the demand by Rodolfo Bobrik, Consul General for the German Empire against Emir Emin Arslan, Consul General of Turkey, requesting consular property should be handed over, at the request of the Turkish government. Consul Emin Arslan, of Russian origin and Arabian culture, had been one of the founders of the Young Turks Committee, and used his weekly publication *La Nota* and his articles in the Argentine press to criticize the Constantinople regime, denouncing crimes against the Armenians and other minorities. The Turkish Home Minister, Talaat, visited the German ambassador Wagenheim, to explain the measures that were to be taken against the Armenian Nation, and request Germany should not stand in the way. The disarmament of Armenian soldiers in the Turkish army then began, followed by imprisonment of senior officers whose loyalty was put in doubt by the genocides; specific training was given to the "special forces" who would be in charge of the operative part of the coming genocide. The Young Turks Party Central Committee met with Talaat and Zia Geokalp, and adopted the final resolution in connection with the way the genocide was to be instrumented, appointing a triumvirate as the Supreme Executive Committee, made up of Education Minister Sicuri and Drs. Azim and Behaeddin Shakir, who were to oversee the general extermination plan. On the day the meeting started military authorities deported some 1,600 youngsters from Dort-Yol (Chork Marzbank) to do forced labor building roads.

Seventy gendarmes attacked the village of Koms to murder Ruben Derminassian, one of the chiefs of the ARF [Armenian Revolutionary Federation] resistance. Derminassian resisted with his comrades and they were able to escape the attack and get to the Caucasus.

U.S. Secretary of State, William J. Bryan, ordered his country's ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, to try to obtain a decree from the Turkish government to the authorities in Palestine and Syria, whereby they would be considered responsible for the lives of Jews and Christians in the event of sackings. In an interview with the U.S. Ambassador Morgenthau Talaat assured him that there was no danger threatening Armenians and Jews, that "they are well protected". Yet that same day the secret orders for the extermination of Armenians were signed and sent to special envoys in all the provinces of the Empire. The Ottoman Parliament was dissolved to evade controls or any possible opposition to the government's racist policy. Only weeks later the Turkish government forbade Henry Morgenthau to send ciphered messages to the U.S. consuls and deprived them of their prerogatives as diplomats for foreign countries, so far neutral, to receive uncensored communications. The ambassador sent a report to his government characterizing the arrests and deportations as a great action against the minorities by the Turkish government. Assassins and homicides freed from prison continued to be added to the "special formations". Their first mission is to kill Armenian soldiers in Erzurum, in the middle of May.

A dispatch from the Ittihad Central Committee (CUP) communicated the beginning of the extermination plan. Mass arrests were conducted among the Armenians in Dörtöl, who after being taken off to do road-building work on the outskirts of Aleppo were never again heard of.

Enver traveled to Berlin for an interview with Kaiser Wilhelm II, whose expansive militarist policy caused the First World War. A commission of former Turkish-Ottoman parliamentarians made up of Dr. Fazil Berki, chosen by Chankri; Ubedulla, chosen by Smyrna and Behaeddin Shakir, member of the Djemiet (Young Turks Central Committee) were assigned the mission of stirring up the Turkish population in the mosques, accusing the Armenians of being internal enemies who had to be exterminated.

Six Armenian soldiers in the Turkish army from the town of Gürün were publicly hanged as internal enemies who had to be exterminated. That same day Greek recruits in Smyrna were massacred. A police commission served a summons at the home of Murad de Sebaste (Sivas) the resistance nickname used by Murad Jimian, one of the ARF chiefs. Sensing the intention of the Turkish agents, he managed to evade arrest, and started out on a rough journey to Baku, fighting all the way against the genocidal forces.

An order from War Minister Enver prohibited the publication of the metropolitan monthly Azadamard (Freedom Fighter), issued by the ARF in Constantinople, and arrested the editor. The day after the murder of Ishjan, in the town of Hiro, the Turks and Kurds attacked the town of Tagh. The same day the entire town of Shadaj started on a heroic resistance of forty days, which came to a successful end on 10 May when the Turks fled before the Russian offensive.

April marked the start of the deportation and exile of the Armenians in Zeitoun. Minister Talaat assured Patriarch Zaven in an interview that the government was not planning any special policy for the Armenians. That very same day he ordered the army to start the general disarmament of the Armenian soldiers. Only a few Armenian survivors reached the malaria-ridden swamps close to the historical city of Konia.

On 20 April the deportation of 25,000 Armenians from Zeitoun concluded, and on the same day the mass arrests in Diyarbakir began. Resistance started in the Aikesdan (an area of rural homes) and Kaghakamech (an urban zone) belonging to the city of Van, each independent of the other. The Armenian population was able to withstand the siege until 16 May, when the Russian army entered the city.

The ARF led the fray in urban areas, and together with other organizations had a valuable role in the Aikesdan, under the leadership of Aram Manukian and Bulgaratsi Krikor, along with the Ramgavar and Hunchakian leaders. The Venezuelan mercenary Raphael de Nogales edited his memoirs in Buenos Aires in 1924, under the title **Cuatro años bajo la Media Luna** [Four Years beneath the Crescent] where he gave his testimony of Turkish barbarianism during the attack on the Armenian city of Van.

In the Armenian Patriarchate at Constantinople the community leaders, the inter-party board and Armenian legislators got together to analyze the terrible news coming from the Armenian provinces. A proposal was put forward by representative Krikor Zohrab which suggested a memorandum should be submitted to the government requesting a change in its Armenian policy. Zohrab drew up two notes of protest, had several interviews with Talaat and all the answer he got was "deportation to Diyarbakir" to cover his murder, and that of Vartkes. On the eve of the Easter Sunday, (according to the previous calendar, 2 April), fulfilling illegal order, based on thoroughly prepared lists, the government of the Young Turks first arrested and then deported the principal religious leaders, politicians, intellectuals, and people of culture in the Armenian nation: after spending a night in the Mehderhane prison, they were sent off to different parts of the country where they were awaited with false trials followed by slaughter. The arrests took place throughout an entire month: 196 writers, 168 painters, 575 musicians, composers, players and dancers, 336 physicians, pharmacists and dentists, 176 teachers and professors, 160 lawyers, 62 architects, 64 actors, etc.

Patriarch Zaven had an interview with the Turkish Premier Said Halim and with Talaat, who confirmed the guarantees for the Armenian Nation, arguing that the measures had been adopted only against political party militants.

The Buenos Aires General Armenian Beneficence Union opened a public subscription selling cards to aid Armenian victims. A few days before a public meeting had been held to discuss the dreadful news appearing in the Argentine press. A delegation arrived in Montevideo on 28 May and distributed a manifesto which was published in **La Razón** newspaper in Uruguay.

Turkish-Macedonian immigrants settled in Zeitoun and started to carry out massive arrests of Aintab leaders.

Lord Gray, British Foreign Affairs Minister, sent a message to Enver making him personally responsible for anything that might happen to the 3,000 English and French civilians taken prisoners by Turkey. U.S. Ambassador Henry Morgenthau sent a report to his government describing the arrests and deportations as a terrible action against the minorities by the Turkish government. On 27 May 27 German marshal Otto Liman von Sanders informed Berlin that the deportations were planned by the "Djemiet", with the approval of all the ministries, and executed by the governors and the police force.

Patriarch Zaven again approached the Bulgarian Primate in connection with the Armenian tragedy, urging him to request support from the neutral powers and world mobilization, so as to at least save the remaining survivors. Boghos Nubar (founder of UGAB) informed the Bulgarian Primate that a report had been submitted to the King of Italy and the President of the United States, but pointed out that a positive response had not been elicited from Turkey. The same report was submitted to the English, French and Russian authorities. Turkey responded to all the allied demands denying the slaughter that was underway. In an interview with Ambassador Morgenthau, Talaat reprimanded him for his activity in favor of the Armenians and told him there would be further massacres.

A Regulation was drawn up ordering the appropriation of any property left behind by Armenian origin Ottoman citizens who had been threatened with death. At the Young Turks central headquarters Talaat submitted a detailed report on the progress of the genocidal process, and the plan to appropriate their property and repopulate the "de-Armenianized" towns. The following day additional funds were ordered for operating expenses.

The allied powers submitted a memorandum to the Turkish Ottoman government making them responsible for the crimes. The Sublime Porte again denied the massacres arguing it was "the product of the imagination of the Entente against the Ottoman Empire". Concurrently, Dr. Behaeddin Shaker issued a communication ordering total annihilation of the Armenians, starting by the most outstanding. Three Armenian military physicians, Drs. Haitanian, Baghdasar and Vartanian, who served in the Turkish army, were assassinated in Sivas. During the fourth day of the Lemnash massacres 25,000 Armenians fell before the Turkish 86th Cavalry Brigade and the 2nd Cavalry Reserve.

On 15 June twenty Hunchak Party leaders were hanged in the Sultan Bayezid Plaza. Their betrayers were executed years later by orders of the ARF. That same day another twelve Armenians were hanged in several locations in Cilicia and yet another twelve in Caesarea. In Merzifon 1,213 Armenians were arrested. Jalal Bey, governor general of Aleppo, resigned in protest against the deportation orders and massacres by the Young Turks. That same day Talaat issued the order to avoid the Turkish populace from appropriating Armenian belongings. Two days later he advised the governors that these belongings should be given to immigrants settling on Armenian properties.

A command issued by Dr. Reshid ordered the massacre of Armenians, Maronites, Nestorians and other Christians in the city of Mardi'n. Simultaneously, Armenian personalities from Trebizonda were taken by boat to the nearby port of Samsun and thrown into the Black Sea.

On 1st July Armenians and Assyrians in Merzifon, Telermen and Mardin were put to death. That same day a group of 2,000 Armenian soldiers used as labor were slaughtered on the outskirts of Kharput. The governor general of Sivas also urged the Armenians in the city (some 48,000) to leave on the caravans by July 5th. Two representatives, the qadi (religious judge) and the mufti (religious leader) took part in the deportation.

The governor of the concentration camp in Der el Zor informed his superiors his camp was overfull of deportees and suggested they should be sent to Kirkuk (north of what is currently Iraq), south of Aleppo and east of Syria. The sacred month of Ramadan started for the Muslims. Throughout that period murders became more frequent and bloodier and the deportations ordered by Turkish officials and the Young Turks increased. The commander of the fourth corps of the Aleppo army complained to Dr. Reshid, governor of Diyarbakir about the contamination and epidemics caused by the bodies thrown into the Euphrates. Talaat instructed Urfa, Der el Zor and Diyarbakir officials to bury the bodies instead of disposing of them in the lakes or rivers.

On 18 July Sasun started its self-defense against the attack by the Turkish army, ante. In the region of Dersim the Turks killed 3,000 Armenians. Many of the Kurds in the region refused to take part in the massacres and even sheltered the survivors. On 26 July Talaat

informed the Malatia Ittihad that half the booty plundered off the Armenians had been assigned to the Djemiet in Constantinople and the rest was to be distributed among the bandits they had recruited. The Turkish newspaper Sabah reported that each bandit Malatia received 15,000 Turkish pounds.

28 July marked the beginning of the deportation of Armenians in Aintab, Kilis and Adiaman. Professor Kakig Ozanian of the American College, together with community leader Dikran Diranian and others for Samsun were taken to prison in Sivas to be killed.

On 30 July the order for deportation was issued for six Armenian villages located close to Musa Dagħ. The population here had chosen the path of resistance in an epic struggle known as **The Forty Days of Musa Dagħ**, until they were rescued on 14 September by a French warship. The immortal work by Franz Werfel appeared in the list of books forbidden by Adolf Hitler in Germany. On the other hand, the Turkish government has systematically been devoted to taking the book out of circulation and exercised pressure on the U.S. film-making company Metro Goldwyn Mayer to avoid it being turned into a film in 1935. Censure and prohibition were achieved by putting pressure on the American Department of State. In Buenos Aires, Yemil Digdanian, and Armenian from Mardin, who spoke Arabian, started to issue a polemic journal in that language, criticizing and denouncing the crimes of the Ottoman Empire.

On 1 August the slopes of Mount Monte Ak Dagħ saw the beginning of the defense put up by the villages of Chat, Eilendje and Kum Kuyu, which continued until 1919. The deportation of 25,000 Armenians from Adabazar began. U.S. Ambassador, Henry Morgenthau (mentioned several times in this study) was informed by Talaat that the careful plan for crushing the Armenians had been officially adopted by the CUP as a matter of state policy, and the deportations. He indicated, moreover that the deportations were not the result of hasty political decisions but had been thoroughly and deliberately discussed.

150,000 deportees arrived in Aleppo from various unspecified places. Four thousand five hundred Armenians arrive from Mezre. In response to unofficial German protests about large-scale murders, rapes and tortures inflicted on the deportees, as denounced by "importunate witnesses", a telegram was sent out advising the deportation forces to keep away from roads and highways where they might come across foreigners. On 6 August a short defense began in Fendeyak, close to Marash. Eighteen Armenians were publicly hanged in Everek, close to Caesarea.

Harutian Tagtachian, who some years later contributed to the foundation of the **Diario Armenia** in Buenos Aires, Argentina, issued a communiqué and commissioned a representative to visit house by house the almost one thousand Armenian residents in Buenos Aires, with the purpose of raising help for the survivors of the genocide. Socorros para Armenia [Aid for Armenia] was created around the same time, with similar objectives. Several letters arrived in Buenos Aires from Armenians in Hadji'n, sent from the last stops of the caravans, telling their relatives in Argentina of the tragedy unleashed by Turkey.

A group of Armenian intellectuals imprisoned in a Muslim religious school in Sivas was slain on the outskirts of the city. A Court Martial sentenced Boghos Nubar Pasha, founder of the UGAB, to death in absentia. Nubar had carried out his political career in Egypt and played a decisive role in making the Armenian Cause visible.

On 19 August 250 Armenians were massacred by the Turks in Urfa with the aim of uprooting them from the city where their forefathers had lived since before Christian times. The defense organized by the ARF began, continuing until 23 October. The order was issued for the liquidation in favor of the State of the storehouses shut down, and which had once belonged to the Armenians. The War Ministry ordered the requisition of soap, timber, coal, metals and other family belongings from Armenian homes.

On 24 August Talaat ordered Armenian community schools to be transferred to the Turkish Ministry of Education. Paid Turkish bandits murdered poet Daniel Varuyan and his scholarly friend Dr. Rupen Sevag, close to the prison. On 2 September the Turkish government explained why they had chosen caravans to extermination camps and the desert of Der-EI-Zor as the final destiny for these prisoners. They created slave labor brigades for the Turkish government and the army. On 7 September the second commission for expropriation of property off the Armenians in Caesarea, from whence 14 caravans of deportees departed. On 15 September Talaat explained in a circular letter that the true intention of the Armenian deportations to the desert of Der el Zor was to annihilate them.

Pope Benedict XV received a visit from Monseigneur Kojunian, Vatican representative for Armenian Catholics, and was informed of the terrible persecution being suffered by the Armenians. The Pope sent Sultan Mohamed V a plea for generosity and mercy towards the Armenian people, invoking God on high. A similar request from the crown prince Abdul Mejid received the following answer: "What more can I do? I have spoken to Talaat but he refuses to listen to me". The reply sent by the Sultan to the Pope repeated the misrepresentations by the Turkish Chancery. The Turkish War Ministry Health Board ordered the requisition of medication and pharmaceuticals off the Armenians.

Home Minister Talaat issued a regulation containing eleven articles, later ratified by the Ottoman Senate, legalizing ex post facto the State-ordered plundering of Armenian goods. On 1 October 600 Armenian orphans were Turkeyfied in Herek. On 3 October Talaat informed the civilian authorities that assassins of Armenians would be free of any court action since "they serve government objectives and help to make them come true". On 7 October it was estimated some 360,000 Armenians had survived, while 800,000 had been murdered. The rest of the Armenian population was in the caravans. The subject of the genocide was a topic for discussion in the House of Lords in Great Britain between Lord Bryce, Lord Crece and Lord Cromer all of whom condemned the massacres in the Ottoman Empire.

The Turks published a notice in the German press in Berlin stating that the "account of the massacres" had been invented by the allies. The U.S. Department of State declared that Turkey failed to keep its promise not to deport Catholic or Protestant Armenians, which information was ratified by Ambassador Morgenthau. Catholicos Sahag Jabaian, belonging to the Great House of Cilicia, who had been deported from the Holy See in Sis to Aleppo, was once again constrained to depart into exile. The dean of the Realschule (German Technical School) in Aleppo and the German teaching staff protested against the massacres taking place in the Ottoman Empire. Talaat threatened to take the dean to court.

On 18 October a multitudinous public protest was held in New York against the slaughter of Armenians. The main speakers were B. Vochrane, D. Barton and H. Holt. Following instructions by Talaat, 80,000 deportees were taken to the Konia railway station with their "final destination" announced as Bozanti, for Armenians from neighborhoods close to Constantinople.

Dr. Schacht, German army physician in the village of Der el Zor counted over 7,000 skulls in a district close to the Euphrates. The Mosul German consul reported that the soldiers of Halil Pasha had massacred Armenian people living north of the city of Mosul and were preparing to invade and murder the Armenians among the population.

The number of deportees in Bozanti is estimated at 10,000; those in Tarsus at 20,000; those at Islahie 40,000 and those in Katma 50,000. Under a circular issued by the ministry on 5 November, Talaat ordered local authorities to murder any a Armenian children adopted by Turkish families. A Spanish version was published of the book by Arnold J. Toynbee **Armenian Atrocities, the Murder of a Nation**, which had been originally issued by the government of the United Kingdom. It was also distributed in Buenos Aires.

On 18 November Talaat ordered the Aleppo government to be careful when Armenians were taken into the desert. Recent intervention by Ambassador Morgenthau in favor of the Armenians showed – said Talaat – that U.S. consuls send realistic reports, and it was therefore recommended the massacres should be conducted in secluded locations. On 29 November the heroic defense of Urfa (Hatesia) by its inhabitants began, continuing until 23 October.

Several orders issued by Talaat: murder Armenian clergy instead of confining them to Syria or Jerusalem; keep journalists from preparing reports on the genocide and taking photos, because they then had to “be annihilated”; to the corresponding officials: gather and feed only those Armenian orphans unable to remember what happened to their parents. The rest should be included in the caravans. Only Armenians accepting Islam as their religion should be recognized as such after reaching their final destination with the deportation caravans.

Talaat signed a decree depriving the Armenians of the right to protest against the acts of violence, plundering and murder to the authorities.

1916

The first contingent of 28 volunteers traveled from Buenos Aires to Marseilles under the leadership of Josrov Reshduni, one of the founders of the South American Tashnagsutun.

Further instructions were sent to avoid foreign officers taking photographs of slain Armenians. Four days later a circular letter from the Home Ministry was sent with the similar gist. An order from the Home Ministry temporarily exempted from deportation Armenian technicians and artisan who were required for railway operation. Their families, however, were deported.

The vice governor of Aintab informed the governor of Aleppo that he was handing over the surviving Armenian women and children to the Kurds. That same day Roessler informed Wolf-Metternich that the authorities at Sivas had requested their peers in Caesarea of Cappadocia to hand over the orphans in that city to them. But the officials in Caesarea refused and proposed to the Armenian orphans they should convert to Islamism and continue in their own city of birth.

According to estimations by Lord Bryce, there were still some 100,000 Armenians between Damascus and Maan, 12,000 in Hama, 20,000 in Homs, 7,000 in Aleppo, 4,000 in Maara, 8,000 in Bab, 5,000 in Munbuj, 20,000 in Ras-ul-ain, 10,000 in Rakka and 300,000 in Der el Zor. The German representative Erzberger visited Turkey to protest against the massacres. Enver promised to adopt the measures required to suspend the Armenians’ enforced exile, relocated them in their villages and ensure religious freedom, and Talaat explained that the Turkish aim was to give them their independence (!) and once this was achieved the rights violated would be returned and they would be given the corresponding territorial compensation for the properties taken away for them.

German Ambassador Wolf-Meternich puts forward a proposal to his government on 14 February to honor Talaat with the First Degree Order of the Prussian Red Eagle, as “the most influential minister of the Sublime Porte and a convinced defender of the Turkish-German alliance”, as well as “the most active, together with Enver and Jalil, inside the Young Turks Party”.

On 16 February when the Russian army marched into Erzurum they found only a handful of Armenian women alive in that historical Armenian province. U.S. Secretary of State Robert Lansing requested German Ambassador Bernstorff to put an end to the great Armenian tragedy.

On 10 March a report sent from Aleppo to the Home Ministry in Constantinople said that 75% of Armenians had been assassinated and that the remaining 25% were still alive. Karim Reffi was designated as the new governor of Ras-ul-Ain. He accelerated the slaying of the Armenians and for five months made use of the members of an extremely savage tribe from the Caucasus region to carry out these crimes.

On 17 March enormous slaughters took place in the concentration camps in Ras-iul-ain (50,000) and Der-el-Zor (200,000), where the caravans of deportees were sent.

Three ARF leaders who by miracle managed to escape the massacres organized in the city of Konia a temporary information center, in contact with Shavarsh Misakian and others in Constantinople, and were able to send the outside world true information from Armenian sources.

At an interview with the German paper Berliner Tageblatt, Talaat declared that “the sad events taking place in Armenia keep me from sleeping at night. We are accused of not being able to distinguish between innocent and guilty Armenians. But that is impossible, for the innocent of today could well be the guilty of tomorrow”.

Due to the strong pressures from Constantinople Sheik-ul-Islam Khairi resigned and was replaced by Musa Kiazim, a war criminal who took over the handling of the traditional pious foundations of Islam. One thousand four hundred Armenian orphans were distributed by the Ittihad. Reports stated that there were still 2,500 survivors in Mosul, who had been part of a group of 19,000 deportees who were murdered on the banks of the river Khabur, northeast of Der-el-Zor.

The news reached New York that close to 80,000 Armenians starved to death in the vicinity of Damascus. Another 60,000 deportees were spread around the district of Hejaz in Central Arabia and Aleppo. Lord James Bryce submitted to Lord Gray, British Foreign Affairs Secretary, the Blue Book describing the situation of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

The Turkish army reported they had lost 60,000 men as a result of starvation, diseases and other causes. The German marshal Von Sanders attributed these losses to the collapse of the country’s agriculture due to the elimination and deportation of the Armenian peasants, who were more specialized in this area than the Turks.

Due to the bodies of 200,000 Armenians in the area of Der-el Zor the course of the river Euphrates was diverted at the point where the river Khabur flows into it, close to Sumar.

A decree by the Turkish government annulled the Jerusalem and Constantinople Patriarchates, which had already been closed, leaving only the Catholikos of Cilicia, but with a see in Jerusalem. Patriarch Zaven of Constantinople was deported to Baghdad.

The central government ordered the names of Armenian orphans should be changed to names of Turkish origin. The Turkish ambassador in Berlin, Hakken, requested that the Secret Report on the genocide published by Lepsius should be taken out of circulation in Germany. At a meeting held in Constantinople by the Young Turks Party, the policy conducted by partisan leaders was rated as "right and just". A Bank was created with the money taken from the Armenians. Marzbed and other ARF revolutionaries organized an escape route for survivors from Der-el-Zor to Aleppo, by railway.

German Ambassador Wolf-Metternich was forced to resign his charge due to the report filed by the General Staff, upon request by Enver, for having protested against the Armenian massacres. Wilhem Radewitz was appointed as acting chargé d'affaires for the German Empire until the arrival of the new ambassador, Richard Von Kuhlmann.

Interim ambassador Radowitz was alleged to have given information to Chancellor Theobald Von Bethman Hollweg about the two million Armenians who were deported, and 1,175,000 murdered, with only 325,000 having survived. The Turkish government confiscated by way of a provisional law all the real property belonging to Armenians.

In answer to a letter from senator Louis Martin, the French Premier Aristide Briand declared that "when the time for just repair comes the French government will not forget the painful situation of the Armenian people, and in agreement with its allies, will adopt the measures necessary to assure them a lifetime of peace and progress".

German general Liman von Sanders, Commander General of the V Corps of the Ottoman Army, informed the Governor of Smyrna that the mass deportations of the Armenians were jeopardizing military security for the V Corps, and that if the police attempted to deport Armenians during the time he was in command, he would have to make use of military force against them to prevent the operation. When the Governor replied that the order was signed by Talaat, von Sanders reiterated his objection and suggested the government should issue a counter-order. At a meeting between Boghós Nubar and George Picot, at the French Embassy in London, following the creation of a brigade of Armenian volunteers who would fight in the French army to free the Armenian territories occupied by Turkey, the Legion d'Orient was created, which in December 1918 was given the name Armenian Legion.

1917

President W. Wilson informed the parties to the conflict that "the allies have resolved to free the people oppressed by the bloody Turkish dictatorship and to drive the Ottoman Empire out of Europe, seeing it is clearly foreign to occidental civilization".

Writer Halide Nahum, who had become popular during the Kemalist ear, managed an orphanage that received 70 Armenian children for Turkeyfication. Exiled Armenians and prisoners of war in Baghdad were deported to the desert, by order of the local Governor.

During the 1917 budget review, the Economy Minister made a speech to the cabinet in which he estimated at 7,900,000 gold coins "the amount obtained by the army, of which only 1,900,000 was collected according to the laws, while another 6,000,000 entered the treasury by illegal means; though I am convinced this is only one quarter of the actual amount". The report provides some idea of how much was stolen off the Armenians, and how much of it went to the State and to government officials.

The U.S. Armenian Political Concordance created in 1914 by the four Armenian political parties in that country, as a single organism for Armenian defense, was broadened to include the Apostolic Church, the Evangelical Church and the UGAB, and adopted the name of National Armenia Union, creating branches in all the communities in the diaspora and in Cilicia, including Buenos Aires in 1918.

In preparation for the International Socialist consultative meeting to be held in Stockholm in July and in name of the ARF, Rostom – one of the founders of the organization – submitted a memorandum claiming autonomy for Turkish Armenia.

Armenia: A Martyr Nation [Armenia Mártir], one of the first books published in Spanish on the genocide, was issued in Buenos Aires. The book was written by Melkon H. Ebeian a young evangelical intellectual Armenian from Aintab, who also edited this book illustrated with a large number of photographs of personalities of the time, from different sectors and institutions. On 1 August, during an address to the parties in conflict calling for a restoration of peace, Pope Benedict XV declared that "the same sincere, justice-loving spirit will solve all the other territorial and political issues like the recreation of Armenia (and other nations) who, due to the sufferings undergone during this war, should, by all reason, have the solidarity of other countries."

At a hearing granted to the leaders of the German Missionary and Benefic Society, the Turkish criminal Djemal declared that "the Turkish government has acted against the Armenians not because they were Christians but because they were Armenians and because they jeopardized the existence of the Ottoman state.

The Annual Young Turks Congress was held in Constantinople, and resolved administrative changes in the regions that had been emptied of Armenians, repopulating these lands with Turkish colonizers. The report by the Congress pointed out that the plans provided for had already been completed.

The Turkish Home Ministry required the Railway Superintendence at Aleppo to provide a list of the Armenians who worked at the stations in that section, establishing, on the basis of a survey, their identities, number of relatives, etc. The Armenians had used this route to escape from the genocide. The Home Ministry requested the deportation of Armenian railway employees. United States President, Woodrow Wilson, exhorted former Ambassador H. Morgenthau to write his memoirs on his experience of the massacres. Lloyd George declared in the House of Commons that the post-war Conference should remove Mesopotamia and Armenia from Turkish dominion.

1918

On 8 January U.S. President Wilson proclaimed his famous fourteen points for establishing peace, paragraph twelve of which declared that "The Turkish portion of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development".

That same year the independence of Armenia was declared after defeating the Turks at the battles of Sardarabad, Bash-Abaran and Garakilise. The local organization of the National Armenia Union was founded in Buenos Aires at the beginning of the year, presided over by Hampartzum Ketchedjian. For a decade the organization acted as the political representation of the Armenian Nation and community, issuing certificates acknowledged by the authorities for personal documentation. Under the initiative of the French Consul an appeal was issued to the organizations that took part to overcome any differences. The following president was Yervant Khachikian, who then alternated with Israel Arslan, until 1928.

War Minister Enver ordered the annihilation of all his Armenian subjects over the age of five within the country's frontiers, as well as the shooting of Armenian soldiers and the imprisonment of any officers, until further orders. The Savage Division of the Tartar army began to act in Baku at the service of Pan-Turkism, murdering in a short time some 30,000 Armenians. Jalil, Enver's paternal uncle, occupied Kantzag from whence his army started on the slaughter of the Armenians in Karabagh. The survivors of the genocide in the Mezire-Kharpert region who had returned to their homes were shot by the Turkish army on the banks of the river Arazani.

By invitation of the Turkish-Azeri Musavat Party, Nur Pasha (a brother-in-law of Enver's) invaded and laid siege to Baku, which was under joint Russian-Armenian command. After a siege of four months the city fell in the hands of the Turks and Tartars.

The decisive battle of Arara was fought in Palestine against Turkish-German forces. On 19 September the Armenian-French contingent took 25,000 prisoners of war and 250 cannon. The acts of heroism among Armenian volunteers defending the liberation of Palestine are worthy of note.

The government of Ahmet Izzet Pasha, which replaced the Enver administration, requested an armistice with the Allied Powers, and on 24 October the Turks started to withdraw from the Caucasus, as far as the frontiers established in 1914.

Days after the fall of Talaat Pasha's cabinet, the Turkish government authorized Armenians to return home. On 26 October an agreement was signed in Constantinople between the Turkish cabinet and the Armenian Republic delegation, under which the Turks promised to return the occupied territories and withdraw from the boundaries set forth in the Brest-Litovsk Treaty.

At an urgent meeting held in the afternoon of 1 November, on the eve of his flight to Germany, Talaat again stated his false arguments concerning the genocide before the central organism of the Young Turks Party, and went on to declare the party dissolved. Two days later second line leaders re-founded it under the name of Teyediud Party. On 4 November the Ottoman Empire parliament decided to submit the responsible members of the Young Turks to a court martial for the genocide. An investigation committee was presided over by the Governor of Paghesh. On 23 and 26 November Kiazim Pasha presided over a Military Tribunal to judge Enver and Djemal.

Once the First World War was over, in an effort to continue with their sporting tradition, the Boy Scout movement and the social integration movement set up by Shavarsh Krissian, slain in the 1915 Genocide, the General Armenian Union for Physical Culture-Homenetmen was founded in Constantinople. According to the Turkish newspaper **Yenigün** dated 9 December, Germany refused to hand Talaat over to be judged by the Turkish authorities.

In a telegram sent to Constantinople on 14 December the Governor of Erzurum reported evidence of the crimes committed by Behaeddin Shakir in the region making use of the Kurds brought from Dersim.

On 16 December a decree was issued to proceed with investigations of the perpetrators of the heinous cruelties, slaughtering and deportations against the Armenians. On 25 December the government of Constantinople promulgated a law announcing the start of the court trials against those responsible for the deportations committed between the years 1915 and 1918.

By the initiative of the Turkish governor of Dort-Yol, on 29 December a special meeting was conducted with the aim of arming the irregular forces in the region, to persecute the Armenians who had returned home in the region of Cilicia.

1919

Enver and Djemal were expelled from the Ottoman army and in absentia the verdict was ratified by Premier Tevfik and War Minister Djevad.

At the great Greek church of the Holiest Trinity in the neighborhood of Pera, in the capital of the Ottoman Empire, a requiem mass was celebrated in homage to the victims of the Armenian massacres during the years 1914 - 1918.

On 2 February the government confiscated some of the Young Turks' properties, which were of little value because the actual management of the funds for the genocide was done from private accounts. One document shows that in only one month in 1921 some 115,000 marks were distributed among ten criminals in Germany. In February a Pan-Armenian Conference met in Paris, with the presence of delegates from the communities of Turkey, Persia, Syria, Egypt and United States. During the encounter a memorandum was drawn up with Armenian vindications, assessing the damages suffered, and setting up a commission to set forth a status for the new State.

As a result of an order that came from Konia, the Turks organized a great rebellion against the French. The Turkish leaders issued a statement on 21 February in which they proposed the plundering of the Armenians while they were waiting for Enver (who never arrived) "Help him and kill all the Christians, no matter if they are women or children".

On 22 February Turkish nationalists occupied the city of Marash, perpetrating further crimes. On 28 February the Kemalists conducted a slaughter of Armenians in Aleppo.

According to the Turkish daily **Yenigün**, lawsuits were filed against 93 leaders of the Young Turks, accused of being responsible for the genocide against the Armenian people.

In Ghalata (a neighborhood in Constantinople) a large Pan-Armenian meeting was held on 21 March, where speakers from the Catholic, Evangelical and Apostolic Armenian communities took the floor, stressing the need to carry out a coordinated, unified task with the purpose of seeking a solution to the consequences deriving from the genocide.

On 30 March a plea for help came from Karabagh requesting the English authorities in Constantinople to exercise their influence on the English authorities in Baku and get them to abandon their Pro-Turkish action los años 1915 and 1917 to the Tribunal judging the criminals involved in the genocide.

The French Commander of Cilicia, Colonel Bremond, announced that within a term of two months all real and movable property belonging to the Armenians appropriated by the Turks in 1915.

On 8 April the Military Tribunal at Yozgad condemned the governor of Boghazlian and his delegate to death for the crimes committed during the deportations.

On 12 April the Military Tribunal decided in Constantinople to bring to trial most of the members who made up the Young Turks cabinet. The church of the Holiest Trinity in the neighborhood of Pera, a funeral mass was held in memory of the victims of the genocide, following Father Gomidas' Mass for Four Voices. In his homily Patriarch Zaven, who had returned from exile, declared that "all the Armenian martyrs are like grains of wheat that will flourish and become thousands of ears of wheat"

On 1st May Colonel Bremont demanded the Turkish population should return the weapons they had taken, which never actually happened.

In a speech before the Peace Conference Supreme Council, Damad Ferid Pasha (Prime Minister of the Ottoman Empire) condemned the anti-Armenian policy of the Young Turks party, a declaration which he made again on 16 June before the same Conference. On 21 June the first Kemalist statement was issued to keep the territories in the Ottoman Empire under Turkish dominion, something that would only be achieved with Armenian territories.

In Constantinople the Martial Tribunal presided over by Nazem Pasha condemned the following to death in absentia: Talaat as the "moral representative for the Young Turks", former Education Minister Nazem, former War Minister Enver, who had been expelled from the Army, former Navy Minister Djemal, and several others. The nationalist Congress presided over by Kemal Ataturk gathered in Erzurum.

In a personal letter to Mustapha Kemal on 10 August, writer Halide Edibel pointed out that, whatever the conditions of the peace treaty, there would continue to be minorities in Turkey. She therefore held that a stringent government should be formed, reducing the rights of the Patriarchates and reducing the minorities to a conditions such that the large powers would be unable to threaten Turkey by supporting these subjected nationalities.

The Commander of the XII Turkish Army Corps informed Mustapha Kemal that all the Turkish political parties had resolved and communicated to the United States that they were in agreement with allotting a territory to the Armenians. In a telegram addressed to the Sultan on 10 September, Mustapha Kemal informed him that the Turkish nationalists did not want to acknowledge the rights of the Armenians over their ancestral territories. The former Young Turks in Konia adopted a similar position.

On 7 October War Minister Djemal switched over to Kemalism, adopting the position of the nationalists. On 9 October, Mustapha Kemal sent an invitation to the Arabs in Syria asking them to join in with their plan to preserve the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire. He was unsuccessful. In a speech given on 19 October Turkish premier Damad Ferid Pasha once again condemned the Young Turks government for the genocide committed against the Armenian Nation, declaring he had in his power the corresponding documents and declaring the killings were not due to inter-ethnic confrontations or to religious causes. In an encounter held on 22 de October between Saleh Pasha, Navy Minister for the government of Constantinople, and Mustapha Kemal, the decision was made to defend by common accord the current frontiers of the Empire, and to adopt measures to bring back to Turkey the criminals exiled on the Island of Malta.

On 2 November, an imperial decree appointed the new governor, Adana Djelal Bey, a Kemalist who devoted his efforts to organizing irregular Turkish groups that once again started the persecutions against the Armenians in Cilicia.

On 29 November a Turkish-Azeri treaty was signed establishing friendship, military cooperation and mutual aid. Turkey would be in charge of preparing Azeri officers, providing them with weapons, ammunition and planes.

After an interview in Caesarea with Ali Fuad Pasha, the representative for the French government Georges Picot met with Mustapha Kemal in the city of Sebastia, where they eventually signed a treaty concerning Turkish, Arab and Armenian issues, and outlining a Turkish-French agreement project against the Armenians.

1920

On 8 January the law enacted on 25 September 1915 on the expropriation by Turkey of the properties abandoned by deported Armenians was annulled.

On 18 January, Turkish officials submitted an ultimatum to the French governor, requiring him to cease to control the city of Marash. The following day, in response to this Turkish claim, the 500 Armenians volunteers were displaced by deceptive means implemented by the French command, with the apparent mission of taking food and weapons to the city of Islahie. On the way they were ambushed by Turkish irregulars and, after losing over one hundred mates during the days of combat, returned to Marash.

On 19 January 1,500 Armenians were murdered in the village of Fendeyak.

On 21 January the Marash saga against the Kemalists began, with resistance continuing until 12 February. The survivors marched through the snow to Islahie and, from there, on to other cities. The French troops had retired for the night, abandoning the Armenians to their luck. Some 2,000 Armenians, who had sought refuge in a church, followed the French. But they were all cruelly assassinated by the Turks.

On 28 January, in Constantinople, the Parliament of the Ottoman Empire decided to accept and acknowledge the Kemalist Declaration of Sebastia on 11 September and establish it as a National Government Plan.

On 9 February French-Turkish skirmishes began at Urfa, continuing until the armistice on 8 April. Depopulation of the city of Hetesia began on 10 April.

On 10 February, English authorities required by note that the leaders of the Young Turks protected in Germany should be sent to them.

On 4 March, the Turks massacred the Armenians and Greeks of Rodosto.

On 13 March the siege of Hadjin began; the town resisted heroically until 15 October. Only 450 Armenians survived.

1st April the prolonged saga of Aintab began, concluding in victory on 8 February 1921.

On 4 April, the Turkish-Azeri organized the massacre of the Armenians in Shushi (capital of Karabagh), while the Armenians were resisting the bloody invasion supported by the English which preannounced the Sovietization of Armenia.

On 23 April the Turkish National Assembly started its sessions in the future capital of Ankara, shifting the imperial government from Constantinople and taking over its legal existence.

On 25 June, Aristide Briand declared in Parliament that "France will never abandon Cilicia, because this would mean the murder of hundreds of thousands Armenians".

On 23 July, from Adana, Damadian informed the National Armenian Union that the whole of Cilicia had been occupied by the Kemalists, with

the exception of Hadjin, Zeitun, Aintab, Osmaniye, Hasan-Beli, Dort-Yol, Adana, Tarsus and Mersin. The Armenians resolved they would resist to their last breath, rejecting the Turkish government just as the Turks themselves had done, along with Arabs and Circassians, abandoned by the French.

On 10 August 1920 a peace agreement was signed at Sèvres, a city close to Paris, between the Ottoman Empire and the allies who had won the First World War (without the USA). The aim of the agreement was to restrict the sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire, which was limited to Asia Minor, which meant it lost its European dominions, gave up eastern Thrace, Imbros, Tenedos and Izmir to Greece, and was left with the region around Constantinople. The Kurdish cultural region gained autonomy, and Arabia, Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia and Egypt remained outside Ottoman rule. Armenia became independent. While Sultan Mehmet VI had accepted the Sèvres Treaty, Mustapha Kemal, who founded the Republic of Turkey in 1923, did not do so. The military victories of Kemal paved the way to the Treaty of Lausanne (1922-1923) which gave the Turks the chance to recover, among other things, most of Armenia.

On 19 August France dissolved the legion of Armenian volunteers. On 24 August the friendship and cooperation Treaty of Moscow was signed between Russia and Turkey, giving the Turks freedom of action as regards Armenia, without awaiting any Russian intervention in favor of the Armenians.

On 10 September the Kemalist Turks ordered further deportations of the Armenians who had returned to Keotahia, Tavshan, Biledjig, Denizli, Munyusun, Caesarea, Afion Karahisar and other villages. On 14 September the French authorities occupying Adana ordered the Armenians to prepare to leave for America, Marseilles, Beirut or any other place.

On 22 September, two days after the start of the Kemalist attack, the French authorities arrested the members of the Armenian National Union in Adana, and disarmed Armenian combatants who were about to leave in aid of Hadjin, as they had been authorized to do by the French themselves.

On 23 September, without any prior declaration of war, Turkey attacked the Republic of Armenia.

1921

The Independence Tribunal of Ankara took over the cases of the Military Tribunal of Yozgad and declared the innocence of the Young Turks who had been judged. Therefore, on 7 January the death sentence issued by the Higher War of Constantinople was annulled. On 9 February, not having received the outside aid they had expected, the Turkish forces raised a white flag and signed their surrender before the joint Armenian-French command in Aintab.

On 15 March in Berlin, Soghomon Tehlirian, an Armenian student, murdered Talaat, the principal organizer responsible for the genocide committed by Turkey.

In Moscow a new Russian-Kemalist treaty was signed. The English freed former Premier Said Halim when he was on his way to Rome.

On 27 June the Turks started their final attack against the Armenians in Zeitoun, an assassinated all the survivors. On 19 July in Constantinople Misak Torlakian, a young Armenian, murdered Behbud Jan Djivanshir, former Home Minister for Azerbaijan responsible for the killings in Baku.

1,600 women, children and elderly Armenians were deported from Jarpert to Bitlis. On 13 October another Russian-Kemalist friendship treaty was signed in the Armenian city of Kars requiring Armenia to accept the previous Moscow treaty which allowed for the appropriation of Armenian territories by Turkey.

On 20 October a Turkish-French treaty was signed in Ankara in which France in a "gentlemanly" way renounced to all the principles they had sworn to defend in the interests of justice.

A Turkish-English treaty was signed in Constantinople under which the following week they would exchange prisoners and free the Turkish war criminals exiled on the Island of Malta.

On 31 November the Armenians in Dort-Yol who had resolved to defend their homes and belonging from Turkish sackings were disarmed by the French army.

On 5 December Said Halim, former Prime Minister of the Young Turks was killed in Rome by Aram Yerganian and Arshavir Shiraguiyan, two Armenian youths.

The Turkish Kemalist government decided to deport Pontian Christians from the cities of Samson, Ordu, Bafra, Inebolu, etc. Towards the end of 1921 the withdrawal of the French forces from Cilicia was completed.

1922

On 17 April in the city of Berlin two young Armenians Aram Yerganian and Arshavir Shiraguiyan murdered Djemal Nazem and the person responsible for the Special Organizations in the city of Erzurum, Behaeddin Shakir.

On 2 May the representatives of the Compatriot Unions in Aintab, Marash and Kilis met in se Aleppo and decided to rescue any orphans with the help of the Armenian National Union Nacional and take them to hospitable Syria.

On 5 June, Mustapha Kemal ordered the mandatory conscription of all Christians in the region of Cilicia, to make up the slave labor battalions sent to dig trenches on the battle fronts and other tasks of a similar nature.

On 21 July three young Armenians Dzaghiguiyan, Der Boghossian and Kevorkian killed Djemal, Naval Minister in the Young Turks cabinet, in the city of Tiflis.

On 4 August, in a village close to Bukhara, while heading an anti-Soviet Basmachi revolt "in search of the English", former War Minister and former General Commander of the Ottoman Forces, Enver, who had been appointed by the Kremlin as the special envoy of Lenin for Central Asia, died at the hands of a Russian patrol commanded by an Armenian military, subsequently banished by order of Stalin.

On 9 September the Kemalists invaded the city of Smyrna, and began plundering Armenian homes and murdering the Armenian population and finally set fire to the Armenian neighborhood (Hainotz).

On 16 October the governor of Zonguldak ordered the deportation of some 850 Armenians who had remained in the city, and sent them to the interior of Anatolia.

On 30 November, following the authorization given to Christians to abandon the Pontus, close to 50,000 departed from the port of Samson and another 30,000 from the region of Gallipoli.

Under Turkish Republic Law 319 dated 31 March all the Turks condemned as war criminals by any Military Tribunal or any other court venue were declared innocent.

An international treaty was signed in the city of Lausanne (Switzerland) under which Turkey, defeated in the First World War, obtained more than it expected, while Armenia, which had trusted the allies, lost more than it deserved.

In September a law forbade forever the return of the Armenians to Turkish territories. Plundering of Armenian cultural heritage continued.

MEMORY EROSION when a genocide is forgotten

In **The Armenian Genocide, Memory, Politics and Future**, Historian Roger Smith speaks of memory erosion to describe the way the Armenian genocide, despite being widely acknowledged at the time it occurred due to the abundance of news in papers, books, articles, official research, eye witness accounts, the trial of those responsible in Constantinople in 1919, was silenced after only a few years by parties outside the Armenian environment.

What are the causes leading up to this memory "erosion"? An initial response would be that countries, groups or individuals have a short memory in connection with events that do not directly concern them. A further explanation can be found upon consideration of the stages this oblivion went through. With the Treaty of Lausanne (1923) and the creation of the Republic of Turkey, Armenia ceased to exist as an independent state and the Armenians ceased to be news. A small part of Armenia, which was set up as an independent country between 28 May 1918 and 2 December 1920, was Sovietized, which meant there was no state to claim its victims.

The Second World War and the Holocaust drew the world's attention away from the Armenian plight, while Turkey simultaneously implemented a policy of concealment, misrepresentation of history, and negation.

THE JEWISH HOLOCAUST AND ARMENIAN EXTERMINATION

Common Signs

The UN Convention agreed with Judeo-Polish jurist Raphael Lemkin in referring to the Jewish holocaust perpetrated by Nazism as "genocide" (a word created by Lemkin). The United Nations Convention on Genocide provided the international legal framework to ensure the crimes against vulnerable groups did not go unpunished. Nobody could consider that the punishment for a genocide state should involve intervening in their internal affairs.

Prior to the arrival of Nazism, Lemkin had expressed his concern about the victimization of the Armenians who could not resort to justice for reparation and pointed out that without an internationally applied legal regulation, if the Turkish genocide Talaat had not been assassinated by a member of the Armenian resistance, he would have been able to evade punishment for his crimes by appealing to the respect for Turkish sovereignty.

The Armenian genocide and the Jewish holocaust are to some extent interconnected. The Armenian tragedy presaged the Jewish tragedy, and was the antecedent and precursor of the Holocaust. "The Armenian genocide was the dress rehearsal for the Holocaust."

(Leo Kuper and Israel W. Chasny)

"Nothing emboldens a criminal so much as the fact of knowing he can commit a crime with impunity. This was the message passed on to the Nazis because of not having brought the massacre of the Armenians to court."

(David Matas, Canadian, expert in international law)

A German writer who supported the cause of the Young Turks (Ernst Jackh) wrote: "The Ottoman dynasty began in an age when the hordes of Genghis Khan - the pro-Asian Mongol - swept westwards bearing the swastika into Asia Minor. It ended when the modern Genghis Khan, the pan-European Hitler, thought up the plan to lead his swastika-bearing armies to the ends of the Earth."

The German plenipotentiary in occupied Denmark declared that "Experience of history has shown that extermination or expulsion of a foreign people does not run counter to the fundamental principles of human existence, provided the exterminations and expulsions are complete."

These are the same arguments and actions used by the Young Turks in the Union and Progress Committee (CUP), Turkish fascism, when deciding to murder the very last Armenian or deport them from Turkish territory, in what turned into a ferocious caravan of death into the deserts of Syria. Anti-Semitism and persecutions and segregation against the Jews are historically founded on the false accusation of the deicide of Christ. Muslim persecutions against the Armenians used their Christianity as an excuse, despite the fact that Armenians exiled in Islamic countries were not disturbed.

Hitler held that the destruction of a certain group or nation, no matter how criminal the act, is very likely to be accepted in one manner or another, provided it is crowned by a certain degree of success, for "the world only believes in success".

(Documents on British Foreign Policy)

Already in 1924 Hitler had declared that "the solution to the Jewish issue required a bloody struggle. Otherwise the German people will end up exactly the same as the Armenians"

(Henry Picker, Hitler's Table Talk)

Save for rare exceptions, other countries did not adopt a harsh critical attitude during the Armenian extermination. The United States took 37 years to ratify the 1948 Convention against Genocide.

Max Edwin Von Scheubner-Richter (who was the German consul in Erzurum) wrote in a report to the German Chancery that "the Armenians in Turkey have, for all practical purposes, been exterminated. Scheubner himself (about whom Hitler said "everybody is replaceable with the exception of one person: Scheubner") described the Armenians as the Jews of the east. To the Nazis they were one and the same thing.

A dual interconnection exists between the Armenian and Jewish cases. There is a convergence of objectives (brutal means to ensure the success of the genocide plan). Expansionist Turkish nationalism vindicates the sanguinary prowess of Genghis Khan. Hitler does likewise when he declares that none will remember his cruelties because all that matters is his name as a great founder of nations.

Hitler was not alone in downplaying the significance of the Armenian extermination. This was the opinion he had received from the Nazi Franz Von Papen assigned to the IV Ottoman Army as military Chief of Staff. Several years later he used his knowledge of the Armenian extermination to unleash the Holocaust against the "inferior peoples" (Jews, gypsies and Slavs). It was a necessary precedent.

Before the First World War, Talaat, the Ottoman Home Minister, led the destruction against the Armenians. Hitler said that with cruelty forgotten, the world believes only in success. Talaat held that "as long as a nation does the best in its own interests and is successful the world will admire it and consider it ethical".

The very vulnerability of the Armenians and the Jews throughout history enabled their persecution. Apart from the cultural, political or geographical differences between Jews and Armenians, the Jews were persecuted because for being deicides while the Armenians supposedly for being Christians. The Armenians were an autochthonous population while the Jews were immigrants in the countries where they settled. This difference is only a half-truth, for the "assimilationism" of German Jews made them believe they were part of the autochthonous population.

The financial success of Armenian sectors in the Empire led to the envy and resentment of Ottoman leaders and paved the way to one of the many excuses leading up to the extermination. The Jews were accused of financing Germany's adversaries in the First World War and that was one of the reasons given for their subsequent persecution.

In times of war genocides accused the Jews of internationalism (during communist or intellectual liberalism rule). The Armenians were attacked for their nationalism. Both Armenians and Jews were accused of jeopardizing the national and racial integrity of the victimizers.

Ethnic-racial homogeneity was one of the objectives of both the Nazis and the Young Turks. Turkish expansionism based its project on Pan-Turanism by uniting Turkish nations as far as the boundaries of Central Asia. Germany sought to build the European New Order on the idea of Aryan-Nordic domination.

Stringent discipline, missionary fervor, obedience to Party guidelines, accumulation of power in leaders, reinforcement of the military apparatus, purges in the Wehrmacht and reorganization of the Ottoman army after 1913, creation of a secret inquisitorial corps to persecute and torture opponents, were all common guidelines both for the Union and Progress Committee (CUP), the Young Turks party, and for the SS services of the National Socialist Party.

The Nazis accused the Jews of being actors in the international money plutocracy. The Turks accused the Armenians of being the Russian fifth column.

The vulnerability factor in the Armenian and Jewish genocides

"Any form of genocide is, primarily, an exercise of power specifically involving the use of force. Therefore, this presupposes considerable disparity in the power relationships between a potential perpetrator and a potential group of victims. To be able to assess the structural dimensions of the problem it is thus necessary to direct the investigation towards the prevailing social systems.

Among all the features that underline aspects common to both cases, (Dadrian refers to the genocide of Jews and Armenians) the fundamental and most frequently repeated aspect is a particular type of vulnerability. However, the circumstances around this common factor are as diverse as the social systems in which the unequal power relationships emerged and crystallized. Common aspects refer to more or less fixed attributes related to the minority condition of both groups; the divergence between the social systems, on the other hand, considers the problem of the different dominant groups emerging from these systems. In other words, the victimization act of genocide is basically viewed as dependent on the relationship between the dominant group and the minority group."

Historical Targets

Armenians and Jews have been the targets of persecution throughout history, in particular due to their vulnerabilities resulting from their condition as minorities. Despite some significant geographical, cultural and political differences differentiating Jews from Armenians, and their respective victimizers, the patterns turning them into victims are relatively constant. Some outstanding points of this divergence-convergence syndrome are important to note. As regards popular attitudes, the Jews were blamed for dissociating from Christ, while the Armenians were blamed for associating with him. Both genocides were the culmination of the historical cycles of these pressures, and their perpetrators, in other words, the leading social strata, were not only unreligious but in most cases were adverse, even hostile, to religion, but took advantages of the residual religious prejudices of the respective masses. This was more evident in the case of the Armenians regarding the ramifications of the Holy War proclaimed after Turkey joined the war.

Autochthonous and immigrants

The Armenians were an autochthonous people living in a land of their own while the Jews were immigrants living in a variety of host countries. However, a large number of Jews, particularly in Germany, had become "assimilationists" encouraging maximum integration and considering Germany their "motherland" and themselves essentially German. Similarly, the great majority of Ottoman Armenians considered themselves a significant part of the Ottoman state system, and subjects of whatever sultan was in power. But their religion was anathema to the Muslims who exercised power. The National Armenian Constitution introduced between 1861 and 1863 by the Sultan was used as a tool to prevent assimilation with the institutionalized practice of social distance. The so-called "privileges" for organizing the community and internal administration were instruments for segregation, made up of closely related practices of prejudice and discrimination, and the annulment of civic and political rights. The powerlessness the Armenians were reduced to turned their relative economic predominance - often obtained by suspension of payments - into a palpably negative burden, arousing the envy and resentment of the supreme Ottoman chiefs, and increasing the overall vulnerability of the Armenians.

The Jews, instead, lost their condition as citizens after Rome embraced Christianity as the state religion in the 6th century. The ghetto as an institution imposed on the Jews is related to the formulation of canonical law (the Roman ghetto was maintained by the Papal State until

1870); for over ten centuries the will of the Church was equivalent to the will of the State. These byproducts of different social systems, which reflect the ups and downs of theocratic practices, once again point to the relevance of the divergence-convergence syndrome. Ottoman theocracy predicated over Sharia, the sacred law of Islam, which like other regulatory theological systems contains its quota of ambiguities and contradictions.

But its central doctrine involves a perspective in which the world is divided into two opposing conditions, "peace" and "war", which emphasizes the permanent state of tension between "believers" and "non-believers" – the unavoidable nature of making war – which leads to the need to organize the universe around the categories of "victor" and "conquered". The Quran, the centerpiece of Islamic Sacred Law, contains more than two hundred mandates summoning the faithful to conduct bloody incursions, which include Holy War. The conquered, known as *zimmis*, can be left alone and granted clemency and even protection, provided they are willing to pay tribute "despite being humbled" (Sura IX, verse 29). This was the theocratic subjugation and tolerance mandate within the framework of an Islamic Legal Covenant. It will be noted there is nothing anti-Armenian in this arrangement; it is, instead, the expression of a general dogmatic principle comprising all non-Muslims.

However, this was not what happened to the Jews of old, with the birth of Christianity, or in medieval and modern Europe. Anti-Semitism was by definition specifically and solely anti-Jewish. There is nothing in Christian theology as such exhorting Christians to make war against the Jews, or to subjugate them simply because they are infidels. It might be tempting to suggest that one of reasons for this lack of anti-Semitism in the Gospels is due to the sequence of events: the teachings and sermons of Christ came before, and not after, the crucifixion. Such a suggestion would, however, reveal a large amount of ignorance about Christianity, for its basis contradicts long-standing dogmas of Christian faith. The misfortunes of the Jews does not stem from the teachings of Christ but from a succession of theologians bent on creating dominions and ecclesiastical hegemonies. The differential treatment they used, which little by little was transformed into persecution, is in line with the efforts made in Europe to organize Christianity by setting up a group of churches around the Reformation movement, and an institution representing all the national churches. The incidence of the diatribes and incitements aimed against the Jews by the Church Fathers from the start of Christianity is worthy of note. From St. John Chrysostom and St. Augustin in the 4th and 5th century and St. Thomas of Aquinas in the 8th century up to Martin Luther in the 16th century, pronouncements against the Jews were practically a summons to persecution. Echoing the sentiments of St. Augustin, St. Thomas of Aquinas declared: "it will be licit (...) to subject Jews (...) to perpetual servitude", and to Luther the Jews were a "plague, pestilence and sheer misadventure (...) making us work to exhaustion (...) while they live placidly off our fortunes."

Critical times for Armenians and Jews

The first centuries of the second millennium, which were marked by the Crusades (the first beginning in 1096 and the eighth ending in 1271), were a crucial time for both Jews and Armenians, for they inaugurated a new of dispersals, diasporas and persecutions. As pointed out by an American historian, the advent of the Seljuks, cousins and precursors of the Ottoman Turks, to the Near and Middle East, gave new life to Islam for "the dynamic power of Arabian Islam had run out". It is estimated that during the 9th and 10th century the Turkish component of the vast family of Turanian tribes and races was converted to Islam, and following the victory over Byzantines in 1071, "the Turks forced their way across Asia Minor (...) entirely upsetting all walks of civilized life..." The historian concludes that: "This led to the Western lightning flashes", clearly referring to the Crusades. At the same time "the Armenian nation was displaced by the Seleucid Turks in the 11th century", in the words of a British scholar. Jerusalem fell temporarily to the power of the Ortugid dynasty, under a Seleucid army captain named Atabeg. Although he had an alliance with the Seleucid Arch-Sultan, and the dominant Muslims were divided into the Sunnite and Shiite factions, among Christian native inhabitants and pilgrims a sense of "outrage" took hold, precipitating the first Crusade. Among the byproducts of this incursion were the violent Anti-Semitic outbreaks. According to the definition in the Judaic Encyclopedia, the crusades marked "the beginning and the explanation of Jewish misfortunes (...) sparking a period of recurrent massacres and persecutions that distorted the Jewish experience in Europe in the following centuries." The parallels that can be drawn with the Armenians are surprising.

These events were the starting point for a model under which Jews and Armenians suffered an increasing process of victimization. However different the circumstances of these processes, the force that drove them was the same: the overwhelming appearance of Turkish tribes in Near and Middle Eastern areas imbuing Islam with a violent new coercive expansion plan. On the other hand, neither Jews nor Armenians were the main targets of the military operations unleashed at that time. It is best here to briefly review the events of the time. The Seleucid hordes under Thughril, and later under his nephew Alp Arslan, fought against the Byzantine hegemony in the area where they settled after the victory of Malazkerd in 1071, when the Roman forces of emperor Diogenes were overpowered and Byzantine power destroyed. The after-effects of that battle are still felt today, for it spelt "the ruin of Armenia", despite certain genuine qualities attributed to Alp Arslan, "the noble savage". Towards the end of the 13th century the Seleucids were replaced by the Mongols "...who razed Armenian territory like locusts." It was the worst disaster ever to fall on that ill-fated nation, for so terrible was the slaughter it was never again able to recover its numerical strength." Once again, though not the main contenders in an armed encounter, the Armenians were the unintended victims for reasons of geography.

The second wave of Mongol invasions is related to Tamerlan, a convert to Islam who conquered and devastated Asia Minor in the early 15th century. The native population in Van was massacred and 4,000 Armenians defenders from Sivas were buried alive after having been given promises of immunity if they surrendered. After overwhelming Ottoman warring power, Tamerlane advanced as far as Smyrna and invaded the city, ruthlessly massacring people of any age and sex, after which he set up a pyramid of human heads at the entrance to the city.

Selim the Cruel set a new path for religious persecution, massacring 40,000 'heretic' Shiites and exiling another 100,000 to Macedonia.

The author of the texts mentioned above, Vahakn Dadrian had a sociology degree from the University of Chicago, a history degree from the University of Vienna and an International Law degree from the University of Zurich. He was a researcher at the MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) and, like Raphael Lemkin, also spent a time at Duke University. He led the Genocide Study Project sponsored by the Guggenheim Foundation.

The clear-thinking actions of Simon Wiesenthal

"When the Turks murdered 1,500,000 Armenians almost 100 years ago, the act included the six components required for a genocide, as would the burning of twenty persons at the stake during the Spanish Inquisition, and I can assure you that Hitler studied both holocausts thoroughly", declared renowned Nazi hunter Simon Wiesenthal. Along with Franz Wefel and Raphael Lemkin (see Appendix), Wiesenthal is one of the Jews who has done most for spreading the Armenian cause at international level. He not only devoted himself to hunting war criminals, but also systematically took a stand against racism, pointing to the Jewish holocaust as a lesson humanity should never forget.

The Turks fail to tell the truth when they say they protected the Jews during World War II. Not only did they not protect them, but many Jews were stripped of their belongings. MV Struma, a ship full of Jews, was denied access to a Turkish port and was bombed by mistake by an allied vessel, leading to the loss of most of those on board. The Yad Vashem museum shows evidence that many Armenians risked their life to save Jews in Nazi-occupied territories. Jorge Vartparonian adds that no Turk ever exposed his life to save Jews during the Second World War. Instead 300,000 Armenians soldiers in the Soviet army lost their lives in the fight against Fascism to defeat the enemy and rescue survivors from the concentration camps. The Turkish government remained neutral, supposedly because it was supplying the Axis with strategic minerals.

VOICES SHOWING SOLIDARITY towards the Armenian cause

"...Here in just a few words is an account of how events developed. It was decided that it was preferable to massacre, if possible, all the Armenians, from first to last. As previously mentioned, after the mobilization (and transfer of mobilized Armenians to the more dangerous areas on the front) the towns were left with a weak population unable to put up the least resistance. One winter night in February 1915, officers and NCOs spread throughout the Armenian neighborhoods, waking those who slept by knocking noisily on windows and demanding they should immediately hand over the weapons they had at their domiciles. However, with the exception of the villages in the area of Van, where even in this initial stage the men who handed over their weapons were immediately killed along with women and children, in other areas, the killings had not yet started.

But on April 20, 1915 without the least provocation (not even the Turks denied that the extermination plans had been thoroughly drawn up in Constantinople) Governor Djevdet gave the signal for the massacres in the cities of Van and Zeitun. The partial Russian offensive in the Van district as far as the city helped to save some of the survivors. But this offensive was interrupted and the massacres entered the acute phase."

Tarle wrote that a crier would appear in the town with a drum ordering the men to proceed to a certain location under pain of death. But those who complied with the order were arrested, tied up together, taken out of the city, to forests or quarries, and slain. He adds that the extermination was led by Talaat. Those who survived or were from other regions encountered death from the start or faced it during the deportations.

E.V.Tarle (historian)

In writing this book (Hussein makes mention of the Massacres in Armenia) the aim is to deny the accusations aimed at Islam and the Islamic religion and prove that responsibility for the act against the Armenians falls entirely on the leaders of the Union and Progress party, who were in charge of the Turkish state, and who committed the massacres solely out of racial fanaticism and, to a certain extent, out of envy. "Islam is innocent of this act... The Armenians had done nothing to deserve such a terrible fate at the hands of the Turks, a fate such as no nation had been made to suffer since the Dark Ages".

"...The men of Islam must curse a government that so tramples on the surahs of the Quran, the sayings of the Prophet decreeing the murder of innocent women, children and aged. Instead, they too will be considered accomplices to this butchery with no precedent in history."

Faiz-El-Hussein (Muslim publicist)

"...If during these massacres and the forced deportation of Armenians from some locations – as happened in Adana in 1909 – they defended their homes and families with the weapons they had at hand, this happened solely when the Ottoman government failed in its duty, and when the Armenians were convinced that their annihilation had been decreed. Even in these circumstances, as happened in Adana, the Armenians once again trusted in the promise of the government of Constantinople to protect them against the fanaticism of the Muslims in the area. I feel it is important to remind my readers that everything I am writing is based on the testimony of eye witnesses. Thus, the Turks over and over again betrayed the good faith of the Armenians. Ottoman government officials, violating the promises so solemnly made, massacred the Armenians when they had handed already handed over their weapons."

Herbert Gibbon (American publicist)

"...These are the figures, the eloquence of which requires no further comments: out of the 18,000 Armenian inhabitants in Erzurum before the war, when the Russians entered the city no more than 120 people were alive, for the most part women and children, and only two boys."

"During the journeys," says Barby, "the weak, the exhausted, the starving gradually fell away." Along those roads the massacre had already begun. Other Turks appeared, falling like wolves upon the unarmed prisoners. They carried off women and young girls with clear bronze skin and large sad eyes... All the rest of the exhausted train, who had neither beauty nor youth, were slain."

Henry Barby (French journalist)

"...We often read that the Armenian slaughters were the result of the Armenian merchant class having exploited the Turks and that the Turkish population automatically lined up against the Armenians. It has been proved that neither the killings in 1895/6 nor those that took place more recently stemmed from popular disturbances. Both then and now, the administrative orders of the Turkish state establishment prevailed. More specifically, both then and now, it was the commercial class in Constantinople, Smyrna and Aleppo that escaped, partly because they were in a condition to escape. Instead, all the peasant population in Anatolia, representing 80% of the Armenian population, and the artisans, for the most part Armenians, were sent to the desert and annihilated. The rest of the Armenian population, some 250,000 people from the oriental provinces, escaped deportation because of the Russian occupation of border areas, taking refuge in the Caucasus."

A Russian general, a commander in the Caucasus, announced that Russian Cossacks would occupy former Armenian territories. However, this announcement received severe criticism from Parliament, denouncing that the Russians could not repeat what the Turks had done, in other words "Armenia without Armenians"

Johannes Lepsius (evangelical pastor)

"...The Armenians who survived had to opt between Islam and death. All those who served in the army had to accept circumcision, otherwise they were forbidden to adopt a Turkish name. Many consented to becoming Muslims and being circumcised; the authorities extended to as many young boys as possible. The Turkish program was to remove any trace of Christianity in Asia Minor, from the Black Sea to Syria, and to replace Christian names with Muslim names." The poor resistance put up by the Armenians with their old rifles was soon put down. The appropriation of Armenian belongings in Anatolia added up to many millions. But Nansen put forward a grave accusation: "the peoples of Europe, the men of State are weary of this eternal issue. So far it has meant nothing but unpleasantness, the very word Armenia awakens in their sleeping awareness a series of promises never kept, with no serious effort ever having been made to satisfy them. It was a small industrious people soaked in blood, but which had neither oilfields nor gold mines."

Fridtjof Nansen (Evangelical Scandinavian humanist)

"Only one third of the two million Armenians in Turkey survived, at the cost of apostasy in favor of Islam or leaving behind everything they owned and fleeing across the border. The refugees saw their wives and children dying along the way, and for women apostasy meant a living death married to a Turk and making up his harem. The other two thirds were deported, forced to abandon their homes in groups, without food or clothes for the trip, subject to fiery heat and rigorous cold, and travel hundreds of miles along rough mountain roads. They were plundered and tortured by the guards and their bands of criminal accomplices, who swooped on them in the desert, stripping them of their few belongings and socializing with the guards."

"...This mass destruction has included Armenian and Arabian peoples in Turkey and affects 60% of the population who do not speak Turkish; it is the direct work of the Turkish government. "

"...No State can be as entirely responsible for any act committed inside its frontiers as the Turkish State, which is fully accountable for the heinous crimes perpetrated against the peoples subject to them during the war."

Arnold Toynbee (historian)

TURKISH NEGATIONISM was never alone

The Republic of Turkey, the successor of the Ottoman Empire, does not deny that the massacres of Armenian civilians actually happened, but argues it was not genocide because the deaths were not the result of a mass extermination plan ordered by the Ottoman state, but of inter-ethnic struggles, diseases and hunger during the upheaval of the First World War. Nonetheless, scholars, some Turks among them, consider the events fit the current definition of genocide. What happened with the Armenians is generally considered the first systematic modern genocide. In fact, it is one of the best studied cases of genocide, second only to the Holocaust against the Jews, among other victims of the Nazis.

In 1914, prior to the outbreak of the First World War, there was a large Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire, though there is some disagreement as to the actual figures. According to the report provided by the Armenian commission to the Berlin congress, in 1878 the figure was 3,000,000. Similarly, in 1867 Ottoman authorities mentioned the existence of a population of 2,400,000 Armenians inside the country's frontiers, though after the Treaty of St. Stefan, when the Armenian Question began to be considered a problem for the Empire, the Turks reduced this number to between 1,160,000 and 1,300,000. Other estimations account for between 1,325,000 (the lowest figure) and 2,100,000 (the highest). Though concentrated mainly in the east of Anatolia, there was also a sizeable Armenian community in the west, particularly in the capital, Istanbul, where there is even today an important Armenian minority.

Huberta von Voss: On Turkish Negationism

In her investigation *The Armenians – Portraits of hope*, Huberta von Voss holds that negationism is the term used internationally to describe the position of the Turkish state and society towards the Armenian genocide. She marks a difference, however, in the appropriate use of the term, arguing that it is used correctly in connection with the Turkish state, but interpreting its lack of repercussion among Turkish society as the result of ignorance, apathy and silence. Von Voss accuses Turkey of suffering from a lack of historical awareness, a country experiencing social amnesia, incapable of remembering its past. The Turkish state has implemented a nationalist version of history in its educational system, resulting in a striking lack of awareness as regards the change from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic of Turkey. The official version, says Huberta von Voss, has not only disregarded or distorted the Armenian genocide but also the history of other ethnic and religious minorities. Is the result premeditated collective amnesia instilled by the Turkish government? It could be. The reformation of the alphabet in 1928 substituting Arabic script for Latin script enabled the state to "purify" history and prevent society from accessing their own past, for only the texts that suited the government were transcribed. Turkish society has no real access to their past. In situations of this nature, the powers that be often resort to concealing tactics arguing they "didn't know". This is what some German sectors did after the Second World War, and it was also a recourse used by those who tried to cloak the multitude of deaths that occurred during the military dictatorship in Argentina in '76.

What is said in public is "the Armenians got what they deserved for allying with the Russians against the Turks", but in private many sectors of Turkish society do not actively share the negationist policy. And it is precisely for this reason, because the past has been kept concealed, Turkish society has made no contribution to help to clarify the conflict. This is what has to change, says von Voss. The Turkish state can no longer continue to forbid the discussion of its past because, like it or not, that past exists, as did social and economic classes, Kurds in the mountains, and different ethnic, religious and cultural groups.

On the basis of sustained Turkish negationism, Huberta von Voss interprets why Armenians attach so much importance to Turkish recognition of the genocide. They have several reasons. It is known that the victims of this type of human catastrophe suffer a 'second traumatization' when their original pain is not acknowledged. This also poses a threat to Armenian identity in the diaspora. In this connection, says von Voss, the genocide is a unifying element among Armenians spread around the world. Thus, the genocide has become

an integral component of Armenian identity. One of their essential objectives over the last decades has been to gain support from other countries in their effort to obtain Turkish recognition.

The Negationist argumentation of an American scientist

Guenter Lewy (Emeritus professor of Political Sciences at the University of Massachusetts) argues that the case of Armenia continues creating controversy in a manner that the Jewish Holocaust, beyond the agitated frontiers of the Arab world (probably referring to Iran), no longer does.

Present-day Turkey (which he refers to as 'modern') rejects the pressures to recognize the events suffered by the Armenians during the First World War as genocide and flatly denies it reached a level similar to Hitler's Final Solution. Turkey refuses to admit it was an Armenian holocaust. Lewy attaches excessive significance to the Armenian political party Dashnaks, to the extent of holding it has a 25,000-strong guerrilla group. It is likely this overestimation can help to attribute greater responsibility at the genesis of the Armenian guerrilla uprising and along the way underscore the acts of vandalism that might have occurred. Lewy recognizes that these politicians kept silent during what was known as the Young Turks progressive stage, but holds that subsequently the Dashnaks party resumed armed resistance following the entry of Turkey on the side of Germany against Russia. In Lewy's interpretation the Armenians confronted Turkey because of their tacit or explicit alliance with the Russians, but the confrontation was not a consequence of the Armenian extermination set in motion by the Committee of Union and Progress, also driven by the Young Turks in the second stage, in other words, in their participation in the genocide. It is Lewy's opinion that Armenian resistance in Van aroused fear among Turkish leaders because they were concerned it could lead to a general revolt against the government of Turkey. What Lewy did not consider was that there was no revolt in Van, but rather a reaction of self-defense against the progressive advance of Turkish attacks. It could be interpreted that Lewy made the mistake of judging that the Van uprising was caused to contribute to the advance of the Russians, when it was in fact a defensive or preventive action against the deportations. He based his argument on the alliance or sympathy of the Armenians towards the Allied cause at war against the Germans and Turks. But admitting such a historical interpretation supported the Turks' argument which considered the Armenians as a fifth column allied against Turkey and therefore leading to the extermination. Lewy had to acknowledge that the ruthless Turkish reaction was not justified, but he warned that the reaction had to be placed in a certain historical context. He thus holds that though the ruthless acts existed, when considered against a certain historical backdrop they became less significant. Yet there was no supposed historical backdrop to justify the extermination of 1,500,000 Armenians and the public declarations of Turkish leaders not to leave a single Armenian alive.

The resistance of the Armenians in Van stemmed from the Turks having begun the genocide in Zeitun. Their resistance bought time for the Armenians in Van to be evacuated by the Tsarist army.

Let us also mention in passing that, contrary to what Lewy supposes, the Armenian sympathy for the Allied Powers was not corresponded. A natural historian in Tiflis held in 1926 that the protests and statements of the Entente were only used as a means of propaganda against Germany and Turkey. "The rivers of blood and lamentations over the Armenian misfortunes raised to the stars were leveraged in the fight against Germany. As Germany was still strong and victorious, the Armenian massacres were useful for their enemies, to discredit this people, to morally underestimate them, to prove that they were involved with and protected the barbarous, and to present themselves as defenders and liberators of martyr nations. But no sooner was Germany defeated and ceased to inspire fear in anyone, Armenia too was forgotten, along with its tormented history and all the blood spilt." The United States of America did not make use of their financial or military potential to pressurize Turkey and only put forth ethical issues.

Was it all the same to Lewy?

Lewy was not blind to the Armenian vicissitudes during the death marches, but he compared them to the suffering of Turkish soldiers who were also dying of malnutrition, exposed to weather inclemency, clothed in rags. He reasoned that if the rations were insufficient for the Turkish soldiers, it was not surprising that no food should reach the captive Armenians. He pointed out that "one of the problems affecting the Armenians in this discussion is the lack of authentic documented evidence to prove the guilt of the central Turkish government in connection with the massacre that took place in 1915-16". This statement is not in line with reality, for the genocidal manifestations of the main Turkish authorities and CUP leaders were sufficiently clear.

It makes no sense to question the genocide arguing that the Armenians have no authentic proof linking the central Turkish government with the 1915 massacres, because, according to Lewy, no record was found, either, of the order given by Hitler for the final solution to the Jewish question. This fails to acknowledge historical truth. Prof. Lewy evidently felt there was insufficient evidence in the statements and concrete actions of the Young Turks, the Triumvirate, and the Committee of Union and Progress during the time they were in government in the most critical phase of the extermination.

Lewy minimized the deportations saying the deported Armenians were allowed to purchase their ticket in which case they were exempted of some of the stages in the deportation process. This could be interpreted as: there were "VIP" deportees and "economy" deportees, these latter being the ones who were hacked to death in the caravans, or whose young girls and boys were violated, and young women enslaved in harems.

"Documentary evidence suggests that the Ottoman government sought to carry out an orderly and even relatively humanitarian deportation process, to judge by the number of decrees requiring protection and compassionate treatment for the deportees", held Lewy. What is most important then? Is it to be some benevolent wording in a few decrees or the celerity with which the deportations of women and children were executed simultaneously with the slaying of their men?

When referring to the deportations, Lewy proposed there should be no questioning as to whether the order for expelling the Armenians was fair or not, because it was necessary to place it against a certain historical backdrop. If that reasoning were applied to Nazism should it be left unquestioned whether death in the gas chambers was fair or not?

It makes no sense to exonerate Turkish bureaucracy because the extremely primitive transport system inevitably had to be replaced by the deportations on foot. It would be politically naïve to believe that "the fundamental intention behind the order for deportation was not to eradicate an entire people, but rather to deny support to Armenian guerrilla warfare and remove the Armenians from the war zones and other strategic locations" when a government official orders the slaying of every last Armenian.

The Turkish government continues to deny that almost a century ago their predecessors exterminated 1,500,000 Armenians. Moreover, as can be seen elsewhere in this study, Section 301 of the Criminal Code is still applied to anyone mentioning in public or writing about the extermination. The permanent claim for countries to pronounce themselves against the extermination led the Turks to cancel in 2001 the purchase of a spy satellite because the French National Assembly declared the Armenian killing was genocide. Lewy acknowledges that "the Ottoman regime certainly bears some degree of responsibility for the humanitarian disaster suffered by its Armenian population." To speak of "some degree" of responsibility means they are not solely or entirely responsible. No doubt he feels that the Armenians themselves were the architects of their own extermination.

An Israeli professor questions the negationism of Shimon Peres

In 1982 a Congress was scheduled in Tel Aviv on the Holocaust, the Shoah. The Turkish government had objected to any material being included on the killing of the Armenians in Turkey. The petition was accepted by Shimon Peres, then Foreign Affairs Minister for Israel, who held that inclusion of the Armenian question could be damaging to Turco-Israeli relations. Peres' reaction led to Elie Wiesel - a survivor of Auschwitz - withdrawing from the Congress. Years later, when Shimon Peres visited Turkey, he made a statement to the Anatolia News Agency saying "we rejected any attempt to establish similarity between the Holocaust and Armenian accusations. There has been nothing similar to the Holocaust. What the Armenians underwent was a tragedy, but not genocide. He added that "if it were necessary to take up a position regarding these accusations, it should be done with extreme care so as not to distort historic realities."

Shocked at this statement, the renowned Israeli university professor E. Charney (the author of two volumes of a **Genocide Encyclopedia**, which includes 45 pages of objective testimonies on the Armenian massacre) wrote a letter to Shimon Peres saying: "You have overstepped a moral boundary that no Jew should allow himself to go beyond... it is possible your broad perspectives of the needs of the State of Israel lead you to evade and refuse to mention the subject with Turkey, but as a Jew and an Israeli I am ashamed of the extent of your negation of the Armenian genocide, which is comparable to the negations of the Holocaust."

Charney reminded Simon Peres that at a Congress on the Holocaust held in Philadelphia in the year 2000, researchers from all over the world, including Israeli historians, signed a public statement declaring the reality of the Armenian genocide and that in 1997 a meeting of the International Association of Genocide Scholars voted in favor of a resolution admitting that the Armenians were the victims of a large-scale genocide.

The pressure of Turkish lobbying in the United States

In the year 2000 the US Congress drafted a bill on the Armenian genocide requesting that in his annual speech commemorating Armenia President Clinton should refer to the murders as genocide.

Turkey threatened to close down the American air bases in their country and to cancel their purchase orders for weapons off the United States. President Clinton did not, of course, use the word genocide.

"The Armenians were the target of a genocidal campaign, a heinous crime in a century of sanguinary crimes against humanity. If I am elected president I shall ensure our country adequately recognizes the tragic suffering of the Armenian people", was the response of G. W. Bush during his presidential campaign in answer to a question by the Armenian community as to his policy in connection with the genocide if elected. Once he became the US president in 2001, Bush did not use the word genocide but rather "infamous murders" and a "tragedy that has marked the history of the Armenian people and their bitter destiny at the close of the Ottoman Empire."

The Turkish government perspective regarding the genocide

Turkey denies that the deaths that took place in 1915 were the result of a state-organized plan to eliminate the Armenian population under their rule, which is a requirement for a crime of this nature to be deemed genocide, and defends a position based on the premise that the Ottoman Empire fought against the uprising of the Armenian militia in Turkish sovereign territory, with the support of the Russian government. There is also some disagreement as to the number of deaths involved. Several scholars such as Justin A. McCarthy, professor at Louisville University or Turkish historian Omer Turan offer an alternative perspective based on demographic studies of the time, which holds there were less than 1.5 million Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire, suggesting that published figures speaking of the death of one and a half million Armenians could have been overly exaggerated, and likewise point out that during that time 3 million Turks died.

If saying that both parties were killing each other makes me a negationist of the genocide, then that is what I am.

Justin McCarthy, United States historian.

Official Turkish media believe the number of victims could range between 200,000 and 600,000. More recent figures concerning the death of Armenian victims were submitted by Professor Yusuf Halacoglu, director of the Turkish History Academy holding that a total of 56,000 Armenians died during that period as a result of the terrible conditions prevailing because of the First World War, and that less than 10,000 were actually murdered. Another of his studies points out that close to 500,000 Turks were killed by the Armenians, but this was not supported by any facts, nor was the source of this information revealed, although the Turkish government has officially published figures in recent times concerning the number of Turks supposedly killed by the de los Armenians. Another report by Halacoglu, which holds that less than 10,000 Armenians were killed, has not as yet been included in official Turkish publications abroad.

Turkey also criticizes the similarities with the Holocaust described by some sectors, based on the reasoning that, unlike the Armenians, the Jewish population in Germany and Europe did not campaign for separation or rebel against the government by making an alliance with foreign powers. The mere mention of Armenian genocide anywhere in the world are likely to come up against a formal complaint by the Turkish ambassadors, while this same mention in Turkey could involve a trial and prison sentence, as happened to Turkish Nobel prize winning writer, Orhan Pamuk. The Ankara Executive also criticized the demand by the European Parliament for Turkey to acknowledge the existence of the Armenian genocide. In a communiqué by the Turkish Foreign Ministry Ankara denied the existence of the la genocide and declared that "historical controversies must be assessed by historians ".

A recent offer by Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan in March 2005 to Turkish and Armenian historians as well as historians round the world suggested the creation of a commission to establish the truth behind the events that took place in 1915. The offer was accepted by the Armenian State but on the condition good relations were established previously with the Turkish state. Turkish and Armenian relations are still at a stalemate and Turkey has closed its frontiers with Armenia.

As a response to the constant denial of the Armenian genocide by the Turkish genocide, many activists in Armenian diaspora communities have exercised pressure to get official recognition of the Armenian genocide from various governments around the world. Twenty-one countries and forty-two U.S. states have approved (as at November 2008) a formal resolution recognizing the Armenian genocide as a historical event.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Criticism to Turkish criminal legislation penal – Demand for the derogation of Section 301

In 2005, when Pamuk valiantly stood by his convictions, Amnesty International (AI) declared they were extremely concerned about the frequent use of section 301 of the Turkish Criminal Code to process human right defenders, journalists and other members of civilian society peacefully expressing their discrepant opinions. Section 301, which deals with offenses to Turkish national identity, the republic and State foundations and institutions, was included in the Code along with the legislative reforms introduced on June 1 2005, replacing section 159 of the previous Criminal Code. Amnesty International repeatedly took a stand against the use of section 159 with the purpose of processing people who peacefully expressed their critically opinions and urged the Turkish authorities to derogate this section. The organization finds reason for concern in the broad, imprecise wording of section 301 which they feel could likewise be arbitrarily applied to judge a large range of critical opinions as crimes.

Section 301 establishes that:

1. Any public offense against Turkish national identity, the Republic, or the Great National Assembly of Turkey will be punished with a six-month to three-year prison sentence.
2. Any public offense against the government of the Republic of Turkey, the State's judicial institutions, the armed forces or security enforcement structures will be punished with a six-month to two-year prison sentence.
3. In those cases in which the offense is committed by a Turkish citizen in a foreign country, the penalty will be increased by one third.
4. Expressions having the sole purpose of voicing criticism will not be considered a crime. This final proviso as expressed in subsection 4 suggests that expressions defined as "criticism" rather than "public offense" are not punishable.

Amnesty International considers that trying to establish the difference between criticism and offense is an extremely difficult task. The lack of legal certainty as to how to typify this crime will mean prosecutors and judges will arbitrarily interpret this section. Turkish Minister of Justice, Cemil Cicek, is reported to have said that "the crux of the matter lies in the manner in which the laws are interpreted".

Amnesty International strongly holds that section 301 is a direct threat to freedom of expression as set forth in article 19 of the International Civil and Political Rights Covenant and in article 10 of the European Convention of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. Turkey is a Party State in both these treaties and therefore its government is legally bound to defend that freedom. Despite this, Amnesty International constantly receives reports on proceedings filed against persons under article 301 for expressing a broad diversity of opinions. The organization hopes international attention, which has focused on the case of novelist O. Pamuk will likewise consider the cases of other lesser known persons, who have been processed under the same piece of legislation. In connection with the reasons that led to their statement in connection with Section 301, Amnesty International quotes jurisprudence which establishes that the limits of acceptable criticism are broader in the case of politicians than of private parties (Lingens v. Austria, 1986); that they are more long drawn out as regards the government (Castells v. Spain, 1992); and that the authorities of a democratic country must accept criticism even though it is provocative or insulting (Ozgur Gundem v. Turkey, 2000). Additionally, the law must be accessible and be drawn up with sufficient accuracy to enable any citizen to align their behavior to it (The Sunday Times v. the United Kingdom, 1998).

Amnesty International took note of Recommendation 1589 (2003) by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe which urges States, among other things, to "abolish any legislation that could mean journalistic freedom of speech is subject to criminal procedures", "immediately put an end to any form of legal or economic harassment against opposing media" and "include European Court of Human Rights jurisprudential law in the sphere of freedom of expression to their own legislation and guarantee judges are given adequate training in this subject"

Cases opened by enforcement of Section 301

Orhan Pamuk, winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature, is an internationally renowned Turkish writer whose novels, such as Snow and My Name is Red, have been translated into many languages and been acclaimed by critics the world over. Pamuk faced charges under section 301 because of statements he made to the Swiss newspaper Tages Anzeiger February 5, 2005. During the interview, Orhan Pamuk stated that "30,000 Kurds and a million Armenians were murdered. Hardly anybody dares to mention it, so I do - which is why they hate me." His case was first heard in First Instance Court No. 2, in the metropolitan district of Sisli, in Istanbul, on December 16, 2005. In 2006 the inordinate amount of international support for Pamuk led a Turkish Criminal Court to dismiss the case.

Hrant Dink was a journalist and editor of the Armenian language weekly Agos, published in Istanbul. On October 7, 2005 First Instance Court No. 2 in Sisli issued a conditional six-month sentence against him for "offending Turkish national identity" in an article he wrote on the Armenian identity. According to the prosecutor in charge, Hrant Dink had written the article with the intention of discrediting Turkish national identity. Because the journalist had no prior criminal background the court suspended the sentence on the condition there was no recurrence of the offense. Hrant Dink appealed the decision. However, he is also being tried under section 301 for another crime. If

imprisoned Amnesty International would consider him a prisoner of conscience.

Hrant Dink was shot and mortally wounded in Istanbul outside the premises of the bilingual Turkish-Armenian newspaper he managed. Systematically threatened by Turkish nationalists, he refused to go into exile: "I shall not leave this country. If I left I would feel I was abandoning the people who fight for democracy in this country. It would be a betrayal for them. I could never do that."

Sehmus Ulek is vice president of Mazlum Der, a Turkish NGO for the defense of human rights. On April 28, 2005 First Instance Court No. 3 in Sanliurfa began the hearings of the case brought against him and Hrant Dink, under section 159 (now section 301) of the former Turkish Criminal Code, in connection with speeches they had made during a conference organized by the Urfa section of Mazlum Der on December 14 2002 around the topic "Global security, terror and human rights, cultural plurality, minorities and human rights". In his presentation, Sehmus Ulek referred to the national consolidation project undertaken by the Turkish Republic and the way this had affected the southeastern region of the country in particular. Hrant Dink, on the other hand, examined his own relationship with the official conceptions of Turkish identity. The next hearing was scheduled for February 9, 2006.

Ragip Zarakolu. In May 2005 First Instance Court No. 2 in Beyoglu, Istanbul, started the hearings of the proceedings against editor Zarakolu for having published a Turkish translation of a book by Dora Sakayan, **Smyrna 1922: Between Fire, Sabre and Water**. The newspaper belonging to Dr. Hatcherian (Bir Ermeni Doktorun Yasadiklari: Garabet Haceryan'in Izmir Guncesi, Istanbul: Belge, 2005) [la frase parece estar incompleta...]. Ragip Zarakolu had been accused under section 159 of the Turkish Criminal Code for "offending the Turkish national identity and the security enforcement forces" and, subsequently, under section 301 once the new Criminal Code came into effect. In March another case had been filed against Ragip Zarakolu charged with "offending the State and the republic" under section 159 (charges which continued to exist under section 301 of the new Code) and with "insulting the memory of " under Law 5816, for publishing a Turkish translation of a book by George Jerjian by the title **The truth shall make us free: Armenians and Turks reconciled**. (Istanbul: Belge, 2004)

Fatih Tas was at the time a youth of 26 studying Communication Sciences and Journalism at the University of Istanbul and was also the owner of the publishing company, Aram. He had been brought to trial under section 301 for publishing a Turkish translation of a book by US specialist John Tirman, under the title **War booty: the human cost of US weapon trading** (Savas Ganimetleri: Amerikan Silah Ticaretinin Insan Bedeli, Istanbul: Aram, 2005), which, according to available reports, included a map showing a large area of Turkey as being traditionally Kurdish, and stating that the Turkish armed forces perpetrated a variety of violations to human rights in the southeast of the country during the 1980's and 1990's. Fatih Tas argued that the book contained nothing not previously discussed in Parliament or in Turkish media, and that it was not published with the intention of offending Turkey and Turkish national identity. It is reported that the prosecutor demanded that each "insult" supposedly proffered in the book should be processed as a separate charge, and asked that Fatih Tas be condemned to a ten and a half year prison sentence. The next hearing was scheduled for December 2, 2005 before First Instance Court No. 2 in Istanbul. In connection with other statements made in the book, Fatih Tas was also facing charges under sections 1/1 and 2 of Law 5816, which forbids public insults against the memory of Ataturk.

Murat Pabuc, a lieutenant in the Turkish army, retired because of a disability. While he was still in active service he witnessed the terrible earthquake that devastated Turkey in August 1999, and the institutional corruption that Pabuc alleged prevailed in the aftermath of the earthquake. He was disillusioned in his military duties when he saw the soldiers acting as though they were unhinged, alienated from ordinary people, and began to disobey the orders he was given. He eventually started a psychiatric treatment. In June 2005 he published his book **Duty abandoned by the Painted Bench**. The title refers to a Turkish anecdote describing an archetypal soldier blindly obeying orders. Pabuc believed that writing that book was the only path available for describing his experiences in the army. Following its publication he was brought to trial for "publicly offending the armed forces ", under section 301 of the Criminal Code.

Birol Duru is a journalist. On November 17, 2005 he was accused of an "affront to the security forces" under section 301 for publishing, via the Dicle news agency, a press communiqué in the Bingol section of the Human Rights Association, in which he stated security forces were burning forests in Bingol and Tunceli.

The president of the Bingol section of the Association, **Ridvan Kizgin**, was also accused under other legislation because of the contents of the press communiqué. Since 2001 more than 47 cases have been filed against Ridvan Kizgin, and Amnesty International has launched a Web action in his favor within the framework of his campaign work with human rights defenders in Turkey and Eurasia. It was expected that a ruling would be given on December 8 2005 in connection with the Birol Duru case.

Amnesty International positively welcomes many of the changes introduced by legislative reforms that came into effect on June 1, 2005. However, the organization believed that the scope and frequency of the cases cited above illustrated the threat involved in section 301 against freedom of expression, and issued a call for its derogation. Human rights activists, writers, editors – in fact, practically anybody – expressing opinions contrary to the "official story" or the prevailing ideology could be brought to trial. The fact that these trials rarely end in a prison sentence and that they are more frequently resolved with fines, absolution or removal of charges is hardly a comfort. The start of the judicial processes is a manner of trying to silence the voices of the opposition and it is an issue that must be dealt with immediately.

Amnesty International considers that section 301 is contrary to Turkey's legal obligations at international level and therefore is urging Turkish authorities to promptly bring to an end any proceedings brought against anyone under said section, and to entirely derogate this section.

A GIANT STEP BACKWARDS

Switzerland 2009, A protocol to silence the extermination?

Despite the denials of the Armenian government as to the existence of prior conditions in the process known as "Road Map", the Protocols negotiated by the chancellors of the two countries in Switzerland contained proposals that were unacceptable to the Armenians. There are testimonials in this connection in information broadcast by the international news agencies EFE and France Press, among others.

In a joint press release issued on Monday August 1, 2009 in the evening, the Foreign Ministers for Armenia (Eduard Nalbandián), Turkey (Ahmet Devutoglu) and Switzerland said that Ankara and Yerevan had agreed to start "internal political consultations" in bilateral Protocols referring to establishing diplomatic relations and reopening common borders. "Political consultations will begin in six weeks after which time the two Protocols will be signed and submitted to the respective Parliaments for ratification by each of the parties," read the press release. "Both parties will make their best efforts to ensure the timely advance of the ratification according to their constitutional and legal procedures."

According to the copy of the project agreements launched by the Armenian Foreign Relations Ministry, the Turkish-Armenian border would reopen within a term of two months following the effective date of the agreement.

Turkish chancellor Ahmet Davutoglu gave an interview to Turkish television channel NTV on Tuesday October 31, 2009 where he stated that "if everything goes as expected, if the relevant measures are taken the frontiers can open around New Year." But in a television interview conducted on the previous Monday evening, Davutoglu himself said that "the time for opening the frontier has not yet been decided and is not a priority." He also made it clear that the Turkish government will not take any measure that could "harm the interests of Azerbaijan" "Opening the frontier without a solution of the Nagorno Karabagh conflict in a manner that does not go against the interests of Azerbaijan will not be possible," were the words spoken to AFP by Elkham Plukhof, spokesman for the Azerbaijan Foreign Ministry in answer to the Turkish-Armenian announcements. Plukhof said that Baku hoped Ankara would not raise the 16-year economic blockade against Armenia, imposed as of the start of the war between Armenia and Azerbaijan by the Nagorno-Karabagh region. And he added that "Azerbaijan's position is based on the numerous statements by high-ranking officials in Turkey concerning the issue of opening the Armenian-Turkish frontier".

Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan and other Turkish leaders declared on several occasions that Turkish-Armenian relations would not go back to normal as long as the Karabakh conflict continued unsolved. However, the draft Protocols published by Yerevan made no reference to Karabakh, a fact that was stressed by President Serge Sarkissian. "As I have stated on several occasions, the negotiations underway and the agreements reached with Turkey do not contain any condition relating to a peaceful solution for the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict or any other related issue."

Vartan Oskanian, former Chancellor of Armenia, acknowledged the need to establish relations with their neighbor Turkey, but when referring to the meetings in Switzerland he conceded that although it is a good idea to take steps towards a Turkish-Armenian approximation this "has been negotiated poorly and put together dangerously. Forcing our people to make such elections about our past and our future is irresponsible of our government. The history of our relations (and the absence of such relations) with Turkey has a prior history and dates back to before Turkey closed its frontiers with Armenia in 1993. After acknowledging Armenia as an independent republic in 1991, Turkey imposed two clear conditions to establishing diplomatic relations: Armenia had to renounce its territorial claims against Turkey and forget about the genocide recognition process."

The former Armenian Foreign Minister held that with the frontier closed in support of their sister Azerbaijan, "Turkey added a further condition to the two existing ones: that Armenia should renounce its struggle for security and self-determination over Nagorno-Karabakh to achieve a favorable solution to Azerbaijan." Even once signed, says Vartan Oskanian, these Protocols "only speak of Turkey's wish to establish diplomatic relations and open the frontiers. This will only come true when ratified by the Parliament. But ratified or not, Turkey will have got what it wanted. Once signed the Protocol will give Turkey the opportunity to show the world that Armenians have, in fact, renounced to their territorial claims and that they are also will to offer a bilateral study of genocide." In connection with Azerbaijan, Oskanian pointed out that "high officials in Turkey and Azerbaijan constantly repeat that Turkey continues to defend the interests of Azerbaijan and nothing will be done, the frontier will not be opened, until the process for solving Nagorno-Karabakh starts to move in a direction that suits Azerbaijan."

Background to the Protocol Turkey sought to institutionalize

Turkey's objectives are apparently clear: to get rid of the burden of the Extermination. The creation of a joint sub-committee of experts was to transform the political debate on the Armenian genocide into a historical debate with Turkey questioning its veracity. It was not a novel idea for the Protocol for the proposal of a study of this nature had previously been put forward by Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan in a letter sent in 2005 to then Armenian President Kocharyan. If Turkey managed to convince the historians' committee to change "extermination" for "tragedy", this would mean the end of any Turkish human, historical and legal responsibility for the events that took place between 1915/1923 against the Armenians, and would avoid any more countries adding their recognition of the existence of genocide. It is obvious that some events of Nature can be considered tragedies: tsunamis, earthquakes, floods, droughts, volcano eruptions, hurricanes. The hand of man is not behind them, as it is in the case of genocides, and at the most what can be held is lack of foresight or a cruel delay in mitigating their consequences.

The extermination of human peoples (for political, ethnic or religious reasons) involves certain characteristics and sanctions typified by agreement of nations because of their criminal nature, and acknowledges the right to demand compensation for the victims, whether persons, communities or nations. The change in the name used to describe the events is not semantic, for there is a great difference between a tragedy and genocide caused by nations and their governments. Eluding the accusation of "extermination" would make their relationship acceptable in particular to Western Europe and their future entry to the European Union.

Turkey's access to the European Union

The EU established a set of requirements for Turkey to be able to become a full member. Some of these have been complied with, such as the abolishment of the death sentence. Yet there are other requirements still outstanding. Human Rights Watch has denounced that adversaries are still being tortured at police stations. There is no freedom of expression. Turkey cannot equate with western democracies because the Turks continue to violate human rights and the Turkish political system continues to apply its discriminatory policy by leaving

Kurds and progressive streams out of Parliament. The European Parliament permanently demanded the Turkish authorities should formally acknowledge the historical reality of the 1915 Armenian extermination. Another of the demands from EU members is that Turkey should withdraw its forces from the north of Cyprus where they have been stationed since 1974 and acknowledge the Greek-Cypriot republic.

A jurist's view

Alfred de Zayas is an international jurist, emeritus professor at various universities and a UN expert in human rights. His book, **El Genocidio contra los Armenios 1915-1923 y la relevancia de la Convención de 1948 para la prevención y sanción del genocidio** [Genocide against the Armenians 1915-1923 and the relevance of the 1948 Convention in preventing and sanctioning genocide], with a prologue by the International Commission of Jurists (Geneva) has recently been translated and published in Argentina (2009). The 1948 Convention is analyzed in several chapters of this book. What is interesting to consider in this case are the legal arguments wielded by Alfred de Zayas to demonstrate that Turkey cannot resort to any legal loophole to elude the entirety of its responsibility for the extermination of Armenians in the 20th century.

In the trial against Nazi war criminal Eichmann, the Israeli court resorted to Article 6 of the Convention against Genocide to demonstrate that their purpose was not to restrict criminal action solely to the States where the crime had been committed. This legal precedent made it possible for Israel to judge Eichmann, and for the genocidal Argentine military dictators to be tried not only by the country's national courts but also by other countries (Italy and France). Had he been a contemporaneous figure, instead of having a monument built in honor as Kemal did, Talaat could have been accused before the International Criminal Court or have been judged by a third-party country, such as Spain.

"Similarly, a State that did not exist at the time genocide was committed against the Armenians (i.e. the Armenian Republic) could represent the rights of the Armenian genocide victims and its survivors. Furthermore, on the basis of the theory of legitimate fundamental bonds of the victims, other states such as France, Canada and the United States could represent the interests of Armenian genocide survivor descendants who residing in or are citizens of France, Canada or the United States."

Doctrine of State responsibility for illegitimate acts

Continuing along the lines of the legal foundations established by Alfred de Zayas, "a general principle of International Law dictates that a State is responsible for any type of injury or damage caused by its illegitimate acts and has the obligation of repairing any such injury or damage. The Permanent Court of International Justice stated this principle in the case of the Chorzow factory as follows: "It is a principle of International Law and even a general concept of Law that any violation of commitment involves the duty of reparation." Undoubtedly, Turkey does not feel such a commitment. The killings or enforced exiled of Armenians occurred between 1915 and 1923, but the genocide was prolonged with the destruction of personal or community property (burning down churches, monasteries, schools) and the erasing of their historical memory, for instance by suppressing the name of Armenia from official maps or the alteration of the names of towns and villages. De Zayas resorts to a valid hypothesis on which he founds his argumentation: "what would be the reaction of the international community if the German post-war government had converted Jewish synagogues into Christian churches and kept for itself the lands and homes of the victims of the Holocaust?"

To deny a historical reality involving the extermination of 1,500,000 Armenians means gainsaying the right to individual identity and the right to individual history. The Turkish Republic of today cannot refuse its obligation to make up for the consequences of the extermination committed by a previous Turkish government. Our author cites as an example: "The fact that the Federal Republic of Germany should have taken full responsibility for the crimes committed by the Third Reich was an act in line with International Law, as was the responsibility undertaken by France to remedy the illegal acts committed by the Vichy government during German occupation, and by Norway in conceding restitution of confiscated property and making reparation for other damages perpetrated against the Jews during the Quisling regime."

Restitution does not lapse with the passing of time. The survivors, individually or collectively, have valid and sufficient grounds for seeking reparation. This was something Jewish survivors of the Holocaust were able to achieve. It is a right explicitly acknowledged by UN documents.

The valiant reports prepared by the Turkish US ambassador during the times of the Extermination contain a macabre quote: Talaat demanded the United States should transfer to Turkey any sums for life insurance policies hired by the Armenians "for now they are practically all dead and have left no heirs to collect the insurance."

Morgenthau refused to communicate this request by Talaat. There is no doubt international peace requires the reestablishment of diplomatic relations between Turkey and Armenia. But is this to be at the price of the Republic of Armenia, its citizens and the Armenian diaspora giving up their fair historical claims?

CRITICISMS OF THE PROTOCOLS Statement by the Armenian Revolutionary Federation

Threat to silence the extermination*

"For the first time since Armenia proclaimed its independence, the Armenian people in the country and in the diaspora are confronting the threat of having the 1915-1923 Genocide and its claims for vindication silenced. The governments of Armenia and Turkey are preparing to sign an agreement to reestablish relations between the two countries based on provisions agreed on in the protocols dated August 31 2009. Among other things, in these protocols both countries acknowledge and ratify the current frontiers, undertaking to respect the principle of "territorial integrity" and agreeing to discuss any pending "historical" issues through inter-governmental commissions comprised of specialists. As established in the August 31 2009 documents, once the term fixed for discussion concluded, the date for entering the agreement reestablishing relations between the two countries was made to "coincide" with October 13, the date on which the Treaty of Kars was signed back in 1921 setting current Armenian borders. These borders were closed in 1993, after the Armenian declaration of independence, by the unilateral decision of Turkey. As of that time Armenia adopted the principle of reestablishing relations without any prior conditioning. However, the Turks established three conditions: that Armenia should cease in its efforts for international recognition of the Genocide, that current borders should be ratified and that the Karabakh issue should be resolved in favor of Azerbaijan. The Tashnagtsutun Armenian Revolutionary Federation has always supported good neighborly relations, and the opening of the frontiers

between the two countries without any prior conditions, but it opposes any conditions to reestablishing relations. It therefore notes that the current process for reestablishing relations does not obey the principle of relations without prior conditions because the protocols signed:

- 1 Officially ratify the current frontiers between the two countries imposed by the Treaty of Kars, which means legally giving up the claim for the restoration of the territories which historically belonged to the Armenian people.
- 2 Agreeing to discuss the historical issues pending between the two countries means accepting the 2005 proposal by the Turkish state requesting the historical truth of the Armenian genocide should be established by a commission of "specialists". Acceptance of a proposal of this nature indirectly means casting doubt on the historical existence of the Genocide and, hence, corresponds to the negationist policy of the Turkish state.
- 3 Accepting the principle of territorial integrity without mentioning the right to self-determination jeopardizes any possibility of fair solution to the Karabakh issue. The protocols are, therefore, palpable proof that reestablishing relations under this process involves accepting the conditions set forth by Turkey. Furthermore, this process will allow Turkey to increase pressure on Armenia and multiply its efforts to neutralize the diaspora as an influential political factor.

Aware of the fact that reestablishing relations between Armenia and Turkey could be a terrible blow to the achievements of generations in their struggle for the Armenian Cause and neutralize the political potential of the successes attained, and loyal to the vindication and recognition of the Armenian genocide, as well as its programmatic principles for territorial claims; saluting the attitude of traditional partisan central leadership and the unanimous mobilization of social organizations and outstanding personalities both in the Motherland and in the diaspora, the Central South American Committee for the Tashnagsutiun Armenian Revolutionary Federation, in name of its militants in Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil, its collateral organizations Civilian Beneficence Association - HOM, Hamazkain General Armenian Union for Physical Culture, and Cultural and Education Union, and the Armenian Youth Union) - and their large mass of supporters, refuses to accept the reestablishment of relations between Armenia and Turkey based on the conditioning of current protocols, and urges the Armenian government not to sign the agreement without its first being subject to amendments to restore the principle of reestablishing relations without any prior conditions. Likewise, the Central South American Committee for the Tashnagsutiun Armenian Revolutionary Federation offers full cooperation to the political parties acting in the sphere of Armenian communities in Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil, and to social organizations, compatriot unions, personalities and any citizen feeling bound by their identity and with the just claims of the Armenian people, to make up a united front against this further pressure by the Turkish genocidal state, and let us continue in our struggle for the acknowledgement of the Armenian Genocide and its vindication, and for the restoration of territories historically belonging to the Armenian people"

* Central South American Committee for the Tashnagsutiun Armenian Revolutionary Federation, Buenos Aires, September 30, 2009

Why silence genocide?*

"It is difficult to understand under what circumstances a group of individuals decides to forget the greatest tragedy in the community it is a part of. It is not usual for this to occur. This is why the decision by the Armenian government to ignore the genocide suffered by the Armenians at the hands of the Turks in 1915-23 is something that merits a special analysis. Negative reasons, such as the intellectual reasoning of a historical people, the situational logic of the realpolitik or the potential proximity of a new traumatic experience; or positive reasons such as healthily overcoming a tragedy or achieving the genuine reconciliation of two peoples can make this "lack of memory" understandable. Which of these reasons can explain the attitude of the current Armenian government? This is an unusual situation which can provide significant learnings. After two years of discreet negotiations, with the participation of Switzerland, the government of Armenia and Turkey agreed on two Protocols ratified on October 10, one of which considers the restoration of diplomatic relations while the other seeks to encourage the development of bilateral relations. The first involves several drawbacks, but could be improved and perhaps implemented. There is no doubt that sooner or later Armenia and Turkey will regularize their formal bonds. However, a gradual approach aimed at creating mutual trust and reciprocity undertakings could have led to a framework free of suspicions and fears and aimed at a sounder aperture of binational bonds.

The second Protocol is incomprehensible and inadmissible for it proposes the creation of a commission to examine the "historical dimension" of the bonds between Turks and Armenians. The only "historical dimension" to be examined is an irrefutable series of events known as genocide. This protocol, therefore, seeks to "examine" the occurrence of the genocide. This proposal - which today would be the equivalent of bringing Nazi Germany and State of Israel descendants together to confirm the authenticity of the Holocaust - means the greatest historical setback to the just Armenian cause. This is not progress but rather a giant step backwards; it will not heal wounds, it will simply make them worse. Nor is it of any use to new generations of Turks who could, like the Germans, build their present on the strength of their history.

Given the number and eloquence of testimonies gathered from many non-Armenians (diplomats, physicians, clergy, observers) and the images (photos and films) that went the rounds of the world to provide evidence of the size of the monstrosity committed in camps, villages, towns and cities without any reaction from the Western world, is the Armenian genocide something that still needs proving? As though this were not enough, in 1973 and 1975 the report by Rwandan Nicodeme Ruhashyankiko, sent to the UN Human Rights Subcommittee, pointed to the existence of a large amount of impartial documentation concerning the massacre of the Armenians, considered the first genocide of the 20th century. When the report reached the Human Rights Committee in 1979 that paragraph no longer appeared. However, in the mid-1980's another report by British politician Benjamin Whitaker returned to explicit acknowledgement of the genocide suffered by the Armenians. In a series of historical debates - which included outstanding work by then Argentine representative, Leandro Despouy - the missing paragraph was reintroduced, with a large amount of support documentation and positive consent by the United Nations Organization. Later, in the nineties, a significant number of nations acknowledged the Armenian genocide by legislative or executive action. The nascent Republic of Armenia, which achieved independence in 1991, had little to do with this: it was those in the diaspora who, after decades-long efforts, managed to reaffirm the genocide cause. The diaspora has always been ahead of the State in this connection. The genocide cause for the Armenians has been a social issue rather than a state issue over time. However, it has always been clear to them all that its defense was a guarantee to the survival of the State of Armenia. Furthermore, the advance of the Armenian cause was not an isolated affair. At the time transcendental achievements were attained for the community of nations. The International Criminal Court for Rwanda, created in 1994, achieved the first international condemnation for genocide. The establishment of the International Criminal Court in 1998 marked another milestone. Against this background, during the first part of the 21st century, there were several pronouncements acknowledging the Armenian genocide, which were made even more significant by the growing repudiation against Turkish negationism.

The idea shared by a large number of countries, international entities and non-governmental organizations was that acknowledgement was the indispensable preamble to understanding and reconciliation. However, new geopolitical dictates tend to obscure any gradual advances against barbaric practices and attempts in favor of mass violence. The human tragedy in Iraq, where hundreds of thousands died without there being any evidence of the existence of mass destruction weapons; the resignation of Europe and the United States in the face of the social Calvary suffered in Darfur, Sudan, a country where China was investing in hydrocarbons; the pathetic trivialization or negation of the Jewish Holocaust by the president of Iran, Mahmud Ahmadinejad; the nameless suffering the people of Palestine are subject to; the unattended crisis in Colombia, where more than three million people were made to leave their homes; the gradual fall into oblivion of the Ukrainian Holodomor and the recent Chechen killings are only a few examples illustrating the paralysis and regression in human rights affairs. Against this backdrop, the second Armenian-Turkish Protocol is opprobrious in its purpose. Without Turkey having taken any steps to admit the genocide, the Armenian government itself is calling it into question. Is this a government minority whose mind has been anesthetized? Is there any evidence of the Armenians being in danger of becoming victims to another atrocity, and the Executive is therefore conceding with the aim of avoiding something worse? Are the citizens of Armenia and the diaspora satisfied as to the genocide issue and the leaders in Yerevan thus deem it is time to heal any wounds? Has Turkey shown even minimal signs of contrition? Has the moralpolitik of the fight against genocide been abandoned for the realpolitik of letting the genocide fall into oblivion?

Is the internal situation of Armenia of such concern, in its role as one of the countries most severely affected by the current world crisis? Perhaps the conjunction of these two last motives can explain the position of the Armenian government. It would be a concession linked to some material and situational benefit in certain internal sectors at times where there is an exaggerated perception of weakness. If this were the case, the diaspora, internal sectors of Armenia and world actors defending the unarmed fight against genocide should create a broad coalition against the Turkish-Armenian protocols. Only an alliance of the vulnerable can confront the pragmatic silencing of horror. The Armenian genocide was one of the first and cruelest in the 20th century. Letting it fall into oblivion could be the antechamber to extended impunity. The loneliness of the victims of yesteryear and our victims today is the prologue to further barbarism."

*Note by Juan Gabriel Tokatlian published in La Nación newspaper (Buenos Aires, Friday October 9, 2009)

ANATOLE FRANCE AND THE EXTERMINATION

"Armenia is dying, but it will survive. The little blood that is left is precious blood that will give birth to a heroic generation. A nation that does not want to die does not die. Following the victory of our armies, fighting for freedom, the Allies have major duties to fulfill. And most sacred among these duties is to return martyr peoples to life, Belgium, Serbia. We will then guarantee the safety and independence of Armenia. Leaning over her they will say to her "Sister, arise! Suffer no more. You are free to live according to your genius and your faith."

*Speech by Anatole France at the homage to Armenia on April 9, 1916 at the public session summoned by the deanery of The Sorbonne.

Anatole François Thibault, who adopted the nickname of Anatole France, was a French writer born on April 16, 1844 in Paris. He died on October 12, 1924 in Saint-Cyr-sur-Loire. In 1921 he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature for his entire work. He supported Émile Zola in the Dreyfus case, and the day after the publication of *I accuse*, he signed the petition requesting a review of the process. He returned his Legion of Honor when it was taken away from Zola. He took part in the foundation of the League for the Rights of Man. His ashes rest in Yerevan.

Anatole France and Jean Jaures described the Armenian drama at the Second International Socialist Congress

Jean Jaures was a strong critic of the killing of Armenians by the Ottoman Empire and repeatedly denounced French silence and indifference: "What absolute silence in newspapers and among renowned politicians! Directly or indirectly this silence is paid by investors in the Ottoman Empire. Not a cry escapes their lips nor is a word said about this bloodbath, destruction and barbarity. Your silent testimony condemns you!" With the same vehemence Jean Jaures denounced the killings in Adana. For many years he directed the Pro Armenia publication.

GREEKS TOO WERE EXTERMINATED

Greek Genocide (also known as Pontic Genocide) is the term used to describe the events suffered by the Greeks prior to and during the First World War.

The terms are used to refer to the persecutions, massacres, expulsions, and death marches the Greek populations were subjected to in the historical Greek Pontus region, the provinces southeast of the Black Sea in what was already the controversial Ottoman Empire, at the dawn of the 20th century under the Young Turks administration.

It has been argued that the killings continued during the Turkish National Movement led by Mustapha Kemal Atatürk who had organized the killing of Greek inhabitants in western Anatolia. The atrocities were both spontaneous and organized on both sides from the time of the Greek occupation of Smyrna and after 1919, in the national movements in Greece to expel the Turks, and the movements in Turkey where the Turks massacred and/or expelled other ethnic groups under their control (Greeks, Armenians, Kurds, Circassians, Nestorians, Assyrians, Tartars, Lazi, etc.).

According to a variety of sources the official number of Greeks killed between Anatolia and Pontus was 500,000 to 560,000 men, women and children. Official recognition of such events is limited, and whether these incidents are to be considered as genocide has been a matter of some debate between Greece and Turkey. The Turkish government maintains that using the name of "genocide" in connection with these acts distorts history; however, Turkey has systematically denied the historical truth of the Armenian and Assyrian genocides.

As happened with the Armenians, the Greeks also suffered the consequences of the "Turkey for the Turks" policy

Within a term of only four months 400,000 Greeks were banished from the Mediterranean littoral area and tossed onto the Aegean islands. Before the war an attack was organized against the Greeks on the Asia Minor sea coast; then it was the turn of the Thracian Greeks who were displaced towards the interior of Anatolia.

The methods used against the Armenians were once again applied: first they were recruited for the army; once this stage was completed they were stripped of their military status. Some were tortured to death. Others were expelled and many forced to do forced labor building roads, where they suffered the same privations as the Armenians and starved to death.

Those who managed to survive were offered only the alternative of converting to Islam. Children were handed over to Turkish families as slaves while young girls ended up in the harems of rich Turks and adult women were raped and murdered.

According to US Ambassador Morgenthau between 200,000 and 1,000,000 Greeks were victimized.

The reasons for the anti-Hellenic policy were diverse. One of them was that of achieving national purity: Turkey only for the Turks and without allowing other nationalities to defend their own identity. Another was taking over the economic activity dominated by non-Turkish minorities, like the Greeks. A third reason was to convince the Greeks to give way in the matter of the Greek Aegean islands. The excuse was ever the same: like the Armenians, the Greeks were accused of being a hazard to state security. When the exodus of Turkish populations from Thrace and Macedonia began, they were sent to mainly Greek towns so they would numerically become Muslims in their majority.

None of these measures was peaceful. The forced emigration of the Greeks was conducted violently and bloodthirstily by armed Turkish groups. Official measures obliged the Greeks to abandon their homes and country.

A psychological war was loosed to create the ill will of the Turkish population against the Greeks with groundless arguments. Anonymous graphic material was circulated accusing Greece of being a false, miserable, vile, minuscule country. Greek tradesmen were denounced for taking advantage of the poverty of their Turkish clients to accumulate money which would return from Greece in the form of weapons to fight against Turkey.

The areas of the Aegean sea inhabited by the Greeks were transformed into deserted wildernesses, without housing or crops and, also, without Greeks. Talaat declared there was no forced exile but an emigration, a voluntary exodus ordered and decided on by the Greeks themselves.

DOCUMENTS

ACADEMIC PANEL

Genocide of the Armenian people

FACULTAD DE FILOSOFIA Y LETRAS (UBA) [School of Philosophy and Letters – University of Buenos Aires]

Human Rights Department

Series: Genocidal social practices (19 May 2006)

Panelist Juan Pablo Artinian

I would like to thank you all for your presence here and for being able to share this table with people of extremely significant intellectual and academic weight, like Juan Gabriel Tokatlian and Khatchik Der-Ghougassian; for me, as a young person taking my first steps, it is an honor to share this table also with notary Gregorio Hairabedian, who will be talking to you about a paper he is preparing in connection with genocide. I am going to give the historical development and contextualization of the Armenian genocide based on oral sources. Many in the Armenian community are most probably aware of this account but those who don't belong to the community should find it interesting. I belong to the Oral History Department of this School of Philosophy and Letters, which is preparing a file with testimonies of genocide survivors. This is a joint research with doctor Alejandro Schneider on the Armenian genocide based on interviews with the last survivors in Argentina. I would like to start by mentioning what Hitler said before invading Poland. In August 1939, at a meeting with his generals, Adolf Hitler uttered the following words:

"Our strength consists in our speed and our brutality. Genghis Khan led millions of women and children to slaughter with premeditation and a happy heart. History sees in him solely the founder of nations" and he urged the military to "send to death mercilessly and without compassion men, women and children of Polish derivation and language for who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

It is almost a century since the first genocide in the 20th century, when a million and a half people were murdered by the Turkish state. This crime still goes unrecognized by diverse countries and intellectuals, and has practically not been addressed by academic historiography. We believe it is enormously significant, both at human level and at legal and political level to consider this topic, particularly since even today the Turkish State Estado refuses to acknowledge the existence of this genocide. When asked for recognition and justice, Turkey responds with lies, and all kinds of theories have been drawn up in an effort to relativize and revise the idea of genocide.

What is understood by genocide?

By genocide we mean an organized manner of exterminating a group of persons with the aim of bringing to an end their collective existence. In fact, this crime is centrally planned and makes use of the entire State machinery for executing it. Thus, it is States that can commit this crime. We therefore speak of genocide as a form of State terrorism. The killing of three quarters of the population between 1915 and 1923, out of a total of two million Armenians, justifies this concept of genocide. The methodology we apply in our research involves verbatim transcription of interviews of witnesses to the tragedy, people over 93 or 94 years of age. The research process was traumatic, but these memories not only help to reconstruct the crimes committed but also to some extent help to sustain collective memory and identity.

This genocide took place in the Ottoman Empire, a multi-ethnic society where Armenians were a minority. In 1913 a triumvirate came into government, made up of Talaat, Enver and Djemal, which sought to create an ethnically homogenous nation, rejecting the previous system where a variety of minorities could coexist, albeit subordinated because of their non-Muslim condition. The aim of Pan-Turkism was to create a vast empire extending from Anatolia to Central Asia. The new ideology sustaining these ideas was to replace devotion to the Sultan with devotion to a new, higher entity, a collective identity which was the Turkish nation.

The decision to carry out the extermination was prior to the First World War, and emerged from the Congress of Salonika in 1910. The First World War was the opportunity to set the genocide in motion. The first targets for extermination were Armenian soldiers who fought as Ottoman soldiers and were loyal to the Ottoman Empire against the Russian Army. These soldiers were disarmed and shot at the battle front by their Turkish comrades at arms. Some were relegated to very heavy labor during which many lost their lives. It is important to note that this required a very efficient execution plan: the major leaders, clergy and tradesmen in the community were simultaneously arrested and killed on a date known to everyone: 24 April. Once the able-bodied male population had been eliminated along with the main referents in the community, the extermination of a large part of the civilian Armenian population was implemented following a systematic methodology of deportation.

The Armenian community was spread around different parts of the Ottoman Empire. The aim was to gather the community members together and carry them off to the deserts of Syria. A deportation order dragged them out of their homes and onto the long caravans whose destination they were unaware of.

I am going to read out a testimony to you, one of the many accounts we have compiled on the deportation:

"Can you remember anything about that time?" the survivor is asked. "I can remember it perfectly. I was 13 years old at the time of the tragedy, when the order came for Armenians to evacuate their homes and gather at certain muster points. I, my father, my mother, my sisters, my younger brother all proceeded to the place where we had been ordered to gather. There they first separated the adults from the rest of the group, among them my father. They formed them into groups and marched them off, wantonly killing them right there."

Another testimony:

"One morning, our village, our neighborhood was surrounded by the Turkish gendarmerie who burst into our homes and started destroying everything they could lay their hands on. They threw photos on the ground and trod on them. They burnt some books. They insulted us. And we were 'gabur', which means, godless."

These testimonies speak not only of the brutal manner in which the Turkish army conducted the deportation but also of the ideology underlying the genocide: hatred and xenophobia against an Armenian minority identified as godless, in other words they were denied any kind of cultural existence, justifying their physical and material extermination. What we are shown is a first symbolic extermination.

Another interview with a person living at the Armenian home for the elderly in Palermo Viejo:

"One day my father came into the house and said to my mother: 'Sabel, they're doing genocide', he said. I remember this, I was 4.

"And what did your people do when they heard that there were killings?"

"Do? We were afraid. Full of fear. There was nothing we could do. Who would defend us? Nobody. We were at their mercy; there was no nation to protect us. They did whatever they wanted. I was 4 years old, I remember. All of them. They dragged us out of the house. They killed. Hours, days, years, walking, walking. There were women who couldn't carry their babies and had to leave them behind. They couldn't take any more."

All the interviews we held stress the planned nature of the genocide and its different phases: grouping, transport, extermination. Witness accounts come from different villages and show the general nature of the deportations and the extent of their vulnerability and defenselessness in the face of an arbitrary central government. We thus find an unequal relationship inside the Empire which enabled the genocides to act with total impunity towards a community that lacked a State of its own. Added to this was the failure of the central powers to put a stop to these crimes. Between 1916 and 1918 two million Armenians were transported in caravans. A large number were murdered by what was known as the Special Organization, an armed band of convict and irregular Kurdish regiments. These killings were added to the effects of famine, thirst, disease. And the worst of this genocidal scenario: the concentration camps in the Syrian deserts, in Der Zoor.

After the First World War the nationalist movement led by Mustapha Kemal, known as Kemal "Ataturk", the father of modern Turkey continued with the genocidal policies and ethnic homogeneity ideology that existed previously, with the government of the Young Turks. Where can we see that genocidal continuity reflected? In the destruction of the Armenian neighborhood of Smyrna.

"My personal involvement"

My grandmother was a survivor of the Smyrna destruction. We can give this testimony even though my grandmother died because my mother was able to interview her in 1984, and has told us in detail of this process. I think it is important to point out, therefore, that it is not only the Young Turks who conduct the genocide. The genocidal practice has continued as has negationism into current times. In 1923, in the newly formed republic of Turkey, all the war criminals were declared innocent, and in the international field the Treaty of Lausanne failed to mention the Armenian question. I would like to finish this short presentation reading the testimony of a survivor, which may perhaps summarize hopes for confronting any future genocides:

"Do you think the genocide, or genocides, were successful in what they aimed to achieve?"

"Genocide will never be successful, anywhere in the world. Hitler asked 'Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?' and yet I say 'there will never again be a genocide'."

Panelist Khatchik Der-Ghougassian

It is a pleasure to share this table with my colleague Juan Gabriel, with notary Hairabedian who, as Armenians, we all owe a great debt to, and with Juan Pablo. It is a pleasure to see a new generation of young Armenians devoted to looking more deeply into the genocide, and making a commitment to life. This gives us great hope in a future without genocides. I plan to speak a little of genocide on the Armenian political agenda, going back to 1965, the year in which the fiftieth anniversary of the genocide was commemorated when for the first time Armenians, both in the diaspora and in what was at the time Soviet Armenia, made public their demand for acknowledgement and reparation of the genocide by mass organized or spontaneous demonstrations, as happened in Yerevan, in the streets. It was the first time the Armenians went out into the streets seeking justice for their genocide. The fiftieth anniversary of this event in 1965 started to give visibility to the Armenian genocide. From the time of the execution of the extermination plan between 1915 and 1923 – and I include 1923 because as Juan Pablo pointed out, the genocide did not finish with the Young Turks. Kemalist Turkey, with the extermination in Smyrna, carried on the genocidal policy, and today's negationism is the continuation of the genocide by other means; the years until 1965 were a time of great silence. This is the title of a famous play by an Armenian writer. The Armenian genocide took on the nature of a forgotten event, a characteristic that sadly marks the disaster played out against the Armenian people, given that any tragedy, from the Holocaust, Cambodia, Darfur, Rwanda, is unique and particular. Which does not mean it is not a cause to be taken up by the whole of humanity. But again, any genocide, any extermination, is unique and particular. And ours, the Armenian genocide, took on this characteristic: that of the forgotten genocide. No one spoke of the subject. Why? I will quickly go through the factors that led up to this, because it is important to keep them in mind to know why what happened in 1965 actually happened and how the question of the genocide evolved on the Armenian political agenda.

The first factor is the official policy of negation adopted by Kemalist Turkey. Secondly, the interests of the great Middle Eastern powers, particularly as a result of Iraqi oil. And here the words of Churchill are very apt when he said that oil weighed much more than Armenian blood. In other words: it is untrue that the world did not know what had happened, but it preferred to forget about the genocide. The third factor, the inability of the government of the Socialist Soviet Republic of Armenia to file an international claim concerning the genocide, because it did not have the sovereignty of the international scene, and, of course, because of the circumstances that followed on its heels in October 1917; on the part of Moscow this topic was not on the foreign policy agenda of the newly born USSR.

Armenian communities spread around the world were preoccupied about their own survival, about gathering the survivors of the genocide, getting organized and ensuring a future for their children, a future where they would be able to preserve their identity, culture, memory... but they were as yet unable to take over the responsibility of the political task of having the genocide recognized. And finally, it is also important to consider a topic that turns up in all the debates, particularly when the Turks wish to deny the genocide, the non-existence of a legal concept to adequately characterize massacres. As you know, it was Raphael Lemkin in 1944 who coined the word genocide, thinking, among others, of the Armenian genocide.

It is because of all of these factors that during the first 50 years the Armenian genocide was not on the political agenda or talked of in the diaspora, even less so on the international political agenda. The fiftieth anniversary made the genocide visible, including it on the Armenian political agenda which had so far been restricted to the community environment, and had no transcendence either at national or international level. National is in the sense of transcendence in countries located in Armenian communities. But putting the genocide on the political front and including it on the political agenda provided the Armenian political agenda with a new dimension, a new manner of making politics, and new national and international projections.

Since 1965 this agenda, the Armenian political agenda concerning the genocide, has progressed significantly towards achieving its main aim, that is, international recognition of the genocide and reparation for material and moral damages. But it has likewise progressed in

terms substantially transforming a strictly national cause into a commitment to the future of humanity. This evolution has had an inevitable impact on the definition of Armenian identity against a changing international backdrop. It is my opinion that there are four main stages defining the evolution of the Armenian political agenda as regards the central issue of the genocide.

The first stage was obviously the first decade following the fiftieth anniversary, i.e. 1965-1975, with the precedent of recognition by Uruguay. A period of political activism began based on petitions to international governments and institutions. Expectations were great, but there was a belief, an almost naïve faith in the diaspora, among Armenian communities, that justice would be done, for who could refuse justice, who could deny what happened to the Armenians? These expectations were to receive a very harsh setback when the UN Human Rights Subcommittee report, upon request by Turkey, removed the paragraph referring to the Armenian genocide. Despite this first setback, this decade is also characterized by the politicization of a new generation in the diaspora. They were third generation Armenians who undertake the first serious research in the field of history and international law which would later in the 90's and still today continue to reveal crucial truths for future political activism. The second stage is the decade known as that of armed struggle, or vindication of recognition by force. The main protagonists in this stage are secret Armenian organizations who choose mainly diplomatic Turkish interests as the targets for their attacks. They seek above all else to "break down the wall of silence" erected round the Armenian genocide. Despite their mistakes, or perhaps their point of view, which some were unable to share, it was this armed struggle that got the international press talking of the genocide. In other words, thanks to this decade the genocide became one of the topics on the international agenda. It caused ripples across the world, and for the first time politicians started to wonder what could be done. And because of the reaction by the politicians, because of the politicization via armed struggle, the first results began to show in 1985. This is the third stage of evolution for the genocide on the Armenian political agenda. Between 1985 and 1987 armed struggle fizzled out, for it no longer made sense or led to further results. And it is during these two years that the first significant political results begin to show. I refer, mainly, to four results. The first is obviously reinsertion in the UN report of the paragraph referring to the. The second is the precedent established by then president of France, François Mitterrand, in 1986. He was the first president in the world to publicly acknowledge the Armenian genocide.

And in 1987, perhaps the most significant political achievement up to that time was the decision by the European Parliament to condition Turkey's entry to the Union to its recognition of the genocide. Finally came acknowledgement by Argentine President Raúl Alfonsín, in 1987, of the Armenian genocide. In this third stage, during the 80s, and particularly as of 1985, when political achievements over more than twenty years of struggle started to be seen, political activism became even more professional. Two Armenian lobby groups emerged in Washington (though "lobby" may not be viewed as the most positive of words). It was then that demands for recognition began to be systematized, with the US Congress as their main target following the 1987 boom in the United States as the superpower it was to become following the end of the Cold War. And there is a type of demand and political activity that becomes international, in the sense that practically all mobilized organized Armenian communities adopt the same procedure to carry out political activities and achieve recognition. Basically this involved recognition in the legislative and executive environment. But also at this time the lack of a State began to be felt in order to achieve progress, to make that extra step forward. Many of the efforts ended for all practical purposes in a statement, a resolution, and went no further. It was as of 1987/88 that the genocide finally started to appear on the public stage, though it had never disappeared in Armenia. In 87/88 the Karabakh liberation mobilization and subsequent struggle began, with the genocide inevitably being discussed on the streets of Yerevan throughout this movement leading up to the independence of Armenia and the liberation of Karabakh. But to be able to fully understand this latter stage, which is still ongoing, it is necessary to break it down into several shorter stages. For it was a particularly harsh process to have recognition of the genocide included in the Armenian political agenda. I would say the first stage was between 1987 and 1991, where the priority was inevitably the Karabakh issue. This does not mean the genocide was left aside, particularly when events such as Sumgait or the extermination of the Armenians in Baku and other cities in Azerbaijan once again brought back the threat, the phantom of genocide. But because of the circumstances in these three or four crucial years Karabakh holds priority among the Armenians.

Between 1991 and 1998, the first administration of President Levon Ter Petrossian, the independence of Armenia, half of the second election of Levon Ter Petrossian, is the most painful time for the Armenians. Because there is a refusal, though I would never say official negation by the first Armenian government, to include the genocide on the political agenda, simply because they think the priority is to normalize relations with Turkey. I say this time is quite painful for the Armenians, because it led to internal confrontations, in-country fractures both inside Armenia and in the diaspora. And Armenia received practically nothing from Turkey in exchange. In other words, Turkish intransigence was basically expressed during this time. In France there is a law recognizing the genocide. In Argentina likewise a law was voted in 1995, but was vetoed by then President Menem under direct pressure from Ankara, who sent their representatives to make public statements: "We have come to tell Argentina that there is no need for it to have a law recognizing the Armenian genocide". It was during this time that this novel idea emerged, that of adopting a mechanism to consolidate recognition by means of a law. This became public.

In France it had results. In 2000 the topic was almost discussed in the United States Congress, and if it had been included on the agenda of discussions, it is quite likely the law would have been passed. Once again there was direct intervention from the President – Clinton at this time – to remove the topic from the agenda. Political activism became even more professional. Armenians in Europe adopted a new regional organization, speaking in name of Europe and taking it as their field of activity. They were not locals, this was not France or Germany. They thought in terms of European citizens, which is very important as evidence of progress. Significant figures appeared in the arts, vindicating the genocide. I am thinking of Peter Balakian and other great writers, well-recognized figures who were committed to the struggle for recognition. The first steps towards compensation of the genocide began. Trials began in the United States, including the one filed here by notary Hairabedian.

The topic of the genocide began to take on preeminence; for the first time a university department was opened on the subject of Genocide and the Holocaust, at University Clat, in 2003, an extremely important precedent. There were a few preliminary attempts at dialogue between Armenians and Turks. What was known as the Commission for Reconciliation between Armenians and Turks failed, and came to nothing. Success came when a significant sector of Turkish intellectuals publicly recognized the genocide, despite persecution from their own government.

The importance the Armenian community begins to acquire in Istanbul

The entry in Turkey brought this advantage to the Armenian community in Istanbul, who no longer fear persecutions, or who are at least sure that it will not be so easy for the government in Ankara to exercise repression as they had once done. And international media are no longer afraid of characterizing the deeds as genocide. Whenever the genocide was spoken of the expression used to be "the so-called genocide". Or expressions like "according to the Armenians and according to the Turks" were used. The latest editorial in The New York Times spoke of Armenia, Turkey and negationism, and ended saying that Turkey could not get away from its past. Turkey still does not recognize the genocide. And this is the most important aim in our struggle for recognition. But the next 10, 15 years, I would say until the centenary, will be very important. Because they will involve the negotiations for Turkey to enter the European Union, and this issue will no doubt appear on the agenda. There is already a resolution, dated September 2005, by the European Parliament, which again conditions Turkey's entry to its recognition of the genocide.

I believe that in this sense the genocide is no longer the forgotten genocide. It is genocide with recognition, though that of Turkey has as yet to be obtained. There is, therefore, a challenge in the diplomatic formulation of recognition by Turkey, which will be fundamentally a task for Armenian diplomacy. In other words: to find the way in which this can become a reality. A way for Turkey to be able to say "we recognize it was genocide, we are responsible". Meanwhile, I believe it is time for the Armenians to start the debate around two post-recognition topics. The first involves material and moral reparation for the genocide. The second is the ethical and moral legacy of a commitment to a global "never again", as a result of our terrible experience.

Panelist Juan Gabriel Tokatlian

The first presentation contained a great deal of interpretative rigor and even greater hope. I think this last one, by Khatchik, painted a future horizon of positive expectations, both for the Armenian cause and for its struggle for recognition of the genocide by Turkey. My interpretation will most likely be different. And my purpose is simply to present another perspective. And I get ahead of myself, to some extent, in connection with my conclusions by pointing out that I perceive a coming horizon not of hope but rather of extreme alert – both for Armenians from Armenia and for a significant part of the international community.

Recently the Norwegian Academy of Sciences and the World Organization of Human Protection submitted a short report showing that in approximately 5,600 years of written history of humanity there have been 14,531 wars, and about 3.4 billion people have died as a result of them. And in those approximately 5,600 years it is only possible to identify 292 years in which there were no wars in the whole of the planet. And out of that total 3.4 billion dead, which today would be equivalent to the disappearance of the entire population of China three times, 150 million of these victims occurred in the 20th century – a century which was an assassin by definition. 5% of all the deaths occurring in 5,600 years took place in one hundred years. And it is against this backdrop I feel we should place the Armenian genocide. I don't really like the debate of which is the first, the second, the tenth, or what came before, what postponed it, what altered it. What happened to the Armenians was genocide. The systematic massacre of a million and a half people is genocide. There is no other word or definition for it. What I feel is essential in this context is to try to identify what elements, what events, contributed to the genocide. And I believe there is a series of components that we can say today with some degree of certainty that triggered what then became the systematic killing of Armenians by the Turks. And that has to do with the conditions that contribute to violence within a society, or among societies.

There are three components of a geopolitical nature establishing a framework that allows us to locate the potentiality of genocide. Conditions of imperial collapse, which was the situation in the early 20th century with the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Ottoman Empire in the heart of Europe, contribute to an environment that to some extent helps certain players to more vehemently assert their claims, their rejections, their repudiation towards other human beings. The practice of what is diplomatically referred to as real politik, a practice by means of which States think in terms of their own reason of State and not in terms of citizens or individuals, and seek to maximize their relative position on the international scene so as to increase their own power, leads to a context in which as a minimum individual rights become less important because the most important thing is to protect the State tooth and nail. The existence of a key strategic resource – oil – in the heart of Central Asia and the Middle East led to confrontation where the sharing of this increasingly developed market by the start of the 20th century and an ever greater appetite, particularly in the Western world, likewise contributed to the framework where interests started to be settled with longer term ambitions, where the confrontation became increasingly violent as a result of the control over this strategic resource. Behind this map of conditions which could be referred to as geopolitical, there is another parallel or superimposed map which we could refer to as symbolic and sociological. When we find nations or human groups, or countries where standardizing utopias prevail, Pan-Turkism, the manner of aggregating a diverse community, the expectation of creating the most powerful man in the world, the new man, gives rise to a relationship vis a vis those who are not a part of this, a situation of differentiation which can potentially lead to situations of violence. But if this is added to the exaltation of social, ethnic and religious differences, we are faced with a hotbed that is much more dangerous in terms of the likelihood of resorting to strength to confront the other. If we add to this the fact that X human group describes itself as exceptional, either culturally, morally or nationally, then we come upon an additional symbolic element that to some extent stimulates the likelihood, not only of identifying the other party as an adversary, but of seeing in the other an enemy that is to be exterminated. We will probably never know exactly what the causes of the Armenian genocide at the hands of the Turks were. But I feel that this context, these two maps, the geopolitical and the symbolic-sociological, were clearly present, most particularly in the case of the Armenians. This obliges us to consider in detail the origins, development and evolution of the Armenian genocide, which, to my way of seeing, despite the very good research done so far, still deserve more attention in this connection. There are other spheres in which genocides occur, with Rwanda and Cambodia as eloquent examples. And here, as noted by Khatchik, it is necessary to understand the particular historical context of these genocides. But I would say that for the purposes of the comparison I am attempting to draw, today we have a context which is very similar to that prevailing historically at the time of the Armenian genocide. Today we have the dismemberment, the disarticulation, the implosion of what was once the USSR, and not only that, but we also have a country like the United States ever more prone to considering an imperial project in which force becomes a central element in its foreign policy. Today we are again experiencing typical elements of the real politik, and the balance of power and State policy and the search for specific short term profits. We can see it in the Middle East. We saw it in the war in Iraq, in the coalition that went to Iraq. Remember all that was discussed even in countries close to ours, like Spain, where it was said that fortunately Aznar had formed part of the coalition of volunteers going to Iraq because thus Repsol could have a share in the Iraqi oil market.

I am pointing this out because once again oil is at the heart of international debate. Oil prices are reaching a historical high, at 75 dollars a barrel. And there is a ferocious confrontation in connection with control over oil in the Middle East and Central Asia, with players who are no longer the players of old, i.e. Russia, Europe and the United States, but mainly India and China. And we know from what we are living on a daily basis, from the details we have, from the proof available, from the irrefutable evidence, plus all the elements at our disposal that genocide is occurring in Sudan. And yet, there is this mixture of collapse, real politik and oil: Sudan is the third supplier of oil for China, and the largest oil investments in Sudan are of Chinese origin, and China has systematically promised to make use of its power of veto if the case of Sudan comes before the Security Council. Therefore, this is where the people in Darfur subject to massacres will go, in the rather derogatory light of the Western world in connection with this case. And in this context, on the other hand, it is not only the geopolitical elements that have returned but also the sociological and symbolical elements. I believe the current standardizing utopia of imposing democracy in the Middle East, of establishing there is a superior culture which is occidental culture, fighting an all-out war against Islam, reinforcing ethnic and religious differences by many players, the reappearance of a strongly conflictive religious agenda, all lead to an environment where resorting to force would seem to be only natural. And this time it would be devastating.

I would like to finish by outlining four general issues. Firstly, I feel that the situation of countries like Armenia today, or that of Armenians in Armenia and those of us who are still in the diaspora, is enormously weak and fragile. And what is convulsing Central Asia could have uncontrollable consequences, leading once again to terrible actions against Armenians. Therefore, I feel that continuing to insist on the danger of other violent acts and massacres should have a more central focus on our political and intellectual agenda. And I do not believe this topic involves only the Armenians. The cause of the Armenians will never be given the significance it deserves it is not universally recognized. For the Armenian cause at this stage is not the only cause for defense of human rights, of international humanitarian rights and protection of the citizenry. It is a global cause of universal interest. And in this connection I feel that Armenians who have lived through the genocide, Argentinians who have lived through State terrorism and other communities and human groups that have undergone massacres, vituperation, wars, extermination, should set up a coalition of vulnerable parties. We who are vulnerable must become ever more united. For if we allow everything to be resolved by the coalition of volunteers, as happened in Afghanistan and Iraq, we are lost. I insist, there is a key issue which is the persistent theme behind the delicate situation of Armenia, the need to universalize the cause for human rights, and make up some sort of coalition of the vulnerable to confront an extremely complex, delicate and negative international scenario.

The second element I would like to insist on is that we must make a significant conceptual and political step forward to confront what today is referred to as preventive war. What is happening in Iraq is terrible, horrifying. It is a dark era in the history of humanity. For there has been no formal attack on the part of Saddam Hussein's opprobrious regime, yet, according to a study undertaken by the British, Swiss and Iraqis and published by The Lancet, a British medical magazine, over 100,000 people have already been put to death in Iraq, most of them civilians. To which it should be added that on 18 April this year, President Bush made a pronouncement in a press conference leaving open the possibility of using nuclear weapons in a potential attack against Iran. This would mean crossing an unheard of psychological, political and military threshold for the western world. I feel it is necessary to have a preventive view different from the one the United Nations has so far tried to follow and develop, which does, no doubt, involve the area of human rights, insisting on the importance of preventive diplomacy with the purpose of anticipating potential situations involving genocide and crimes against humanity, but which is occurring in a context where, on the one hand, the United Nations is extremely debilitated and, on the other hand, a very restricted vision is given to what prevention implies. Prevention in this more civilian, less military, more diplomatic, less war-like, more human, less militarized sense seems simply to mean avoiding people killing each other. And what we need as a more substantive view of prevention. We need, for instance, prevention by ensuring a better income distribution in the international system; by requiring countries to apply more inclusive social systems; by ensuring countries have a better State. Prevention cannot be understood simply as a sort of band-aid to stop the killing. This is the reason I feel that citizens who are committed to causes linked to human rights have a great contribution to make to this topic of prevention, a different kind of contribution, from a different perspective, not restricted solely to watching the way events play out and then starting to count the dead, and at some point saying "this can't go on, something must be done, like sending a humanitarian mission or something", but rather how to bring about a substantive vision of prevention.

As regards the specific topic of Turkish negationism, I believe this will continue. I don't think this will change in any way, at least as regards Turkish authorities. And I would like to endorse what Khatchik pointed out so clearly at the end of his talk, the need for a more active policy, not only towards denouncing this negationism but also to making it clear that this is not only an issue involving Europe. It is not simply a question of Europe asking Turkey to accept the genocide to be able to enter the EU. This should be a requirement the rest of the world establishes for Europe, to make Europe more precise in the specific limitations imposed on Turkey. This is not something related to a Muslim country being included in the European Union. It is a universal topic, not simply European. And therefore, it is extremely important for the civilian society and the individual States to deploy very active diplomacy towards Europe. And in this case, Argentina could give a good demonstration if our legislators were to pronounce themselves more emphatically not only in favor of the "never again" but also against all those who continue to deny the "never again" of the Armenians.

Panelist Gregorio Hairabedian

I intended to explain briefly what it meant to file legal proceedings in a country like Argentina for a crime committed in western Armenia 90 years ago. I may yet do it, only briefly. But firstly I would like to point out that different views have emerged on this panel in this connection and this is what is interesting - because in my view what is still missing is the social ingredient. Yet perhaps what we have in common is that we are all fighting against impunity, each with our own ideology, even though we may not say it clearly. Is it possible to find a solution to the scourge of genocide suffered by the Armenian people, and many others, in a human society based on the principles and reality we are living in? Is it possible to find a solution to problems as grievous as the genocide of a people, when man continues to be the wolf of mankind, when the immense majority of world population has no access to the most elemental basics, such as housing, education, health, culture? Or is it possible to tear away certain things in these partial struggles, which necessary seek a different world, a new social order? As Tokatlian said, to a certain extent it is a universal battling. But we do not point out precisely whom we are battling against. And this is the basic issue. I do not approach lightly the topic of the impunity of the genocide of the Armenians, a community I descend from, first

generation born in this country, and in my family, as happens with any Armenian family, we have had 40, 50 dead and disappeared; all the horrors that can be involved in a genocide were suffered by the Armenians. Horrors of all classes and types: Disappearances, violations, rapes, tortures. All those descriptions so aptly and precisely set forth in the first part of this seminar by doctor Ferreira. Yet, as I do not approach this lightly, I feel it requires an analysis of a different nature.

What I basically want to stress is that it gives me great pleasure to see that from a variety of perspectives we all basically agree as to the fight against impunity. I do not wish to go into the issue of Armenia's internal policy, because, unlike Khatchik, I do not consider myself Armenian. I consider myself – I am – an Argentine of Armenian descent. An Argentine, more specifically from the province of Cordoba, and Latin American, culturally bound to my forebears. And to me the issue around the vindication of the Armenians, fundamentally the vindication of the life of the Armenians, is something that concerns us all, Armenians or otherwise, but most specifically it concerns the Armenians. And I accept this as something singular. The Armenian genocide is something singular. And it is that singularity that should be added to what Tokatlian pointed out as universal struggle: The singularity of the Armenian people. There is a stage in the Armenian people –Der-Ghougassian, I suppose we will not agree on this – which it is of basic importance to point out as one of the moments when the Armenians achieve physical preservation after six centuries of wandering the earth. And this is in no way ideological or propagandistic in nature; it is a specific fact of reality. Armenia lived for 70 years in what was known as Soviet Armenia, as a consequence of the expansive force of the great Russian Revolution in 1917, when the Armenians were allowed to gather in their tiny territory 3,600,000 people, something which has no precedent in modern Armenian history, at least in the last six centuries. And this is what has to be highlighted basically, because it is linked to the struggle we are carrying on with today.

What is the reason for those 70 years of peace the Armenians enjoyed? Why were Armenians able to satisfy their basic needs during those 70 years? Should we not explain this? Why don't we do it now? Why is it that since what is known as the Armenian independence the country has continued at war, permanently at war? Should we not ask ourselves about this? But to avoid a polemic discussion, which is not what we wish to do today, I would like to give you my point of view in connection with what has been talked about, which will possibly not coincide with the viewpoint of all those here. What is interesting is that we are going to continue fighting together against impunity. What is interesting, too, is to identify who we are fighting against. To believe that this world situation dominated by the most powerful imperialist power in the history of mankind, the United States, can be solved without that imperial power ceasing to have the hegemony it wields today, is no more than a dream, but that dream can come true to the extent the subjugated, dominated peoples seek common denominators to fight against that common enemy. Perhaps the Foundation itself does not agree with what I am saying. This is just a digression to point out that our Foundation is the continuator of a legal action. Genocide is a crime, and crimes must be brought before the courts of law. The task conducted by parliaments in different parts of the world is therefore extremely important. I am not going to give greater transcendence to a statement by a President than a statement by anyone else, whether Mitterrand or Alfonsín. They are statements, as are those made by Congresses, but not binding on anybody. Undoubtedly they are steps ahead. In many cases they are the result of lobbying, in others of opportunism or convenience. But the situation does not end there. I don't think the struggle will end, this struggle of mankind, because we are inserted in it, we are a part of this struggle of mankind. I don't believe this struggle will end with international diagrams that can be drawn between different countries in the world – because this is not a struggle between countries. The struggle is between dominant and dominated classes. The dominant classes in a certain country stretch their arms out across the world, to the extent they can, as happens with the United States, to continue oppressing peoples producing material and spiritual wealth. That material and spiritual wealth they produce is enjoyed by the small social classes that wield political, economic and cultural power, the way North American imperialism does today. Of course I did not say all this to the judge hearing the proceedings – because I do not think a decision is a panacea. A court decision is a step, a tiny step, as are the statements made by France, but in the meantime Turkey is wriggling its way in. Paradoxically, the European rightwing movements are opposed to Turkey entering the European Union, while the socialists and social democrats are supporting this move. This is the reality; we should not forget it. I am not saying this to undermine anyone; I know they are respected scholars. I simply have a different perception.

This different perception has been the basis on which I initially set in motion proceedings requesting the right to the truth of the Armenian genocide, because of by paternal and maternal family who completely disappeared. On 9 December 2005 the entire Armenian community joined forces behind me, not because they agreed with my way of thinking but because they agreed with the need for the Armenian genocide to be subjected to justice, to be subject to a legal decision. And the right to truth is the path that can lead to justice. This is what our Argentine compatriots attempted when, as a result of the laws known as Punto Final [Full Stop] and Obediencia Debida [Due Obedience] and the pardons, they were forced to resort to this right to the truth, which is also the right to dignity, and to the mourning every person is entitled to according to their beliefs. This was basically what led me to file these proceedings, with a degree of temerity, which at the time seemed tinged with madness. For I was filing my motion on the basis of a crime committed 80 years before (I submitted my petition on the last day of the 20th century). I remembered my father, who had given up his life, not simply submitting a piece of writing. He went as a volunteer from his quiet home back in New Jersey, United States, to the Adana front to fight against the Turks, naively believing he would save the memory of his family. The least we can do, whether or not we have problems of identity, whether we consider ourselves Armenians, not Armenians, internationalists, non-internationalists, communists, conservatives, religious, non-religious, as human beings is to seek the common denominator(s) to ensure this scourge does not continue; for it does continue, as though it were 1915, or even earlier.

What did Europe do? What did the political movements in Europe do? European social democracy? What did the United States do at that time when they received reports from their consuls, their ambassadors, of what was happening? Not one of them moved a finger, despite the fact that this was the first Christian people in the world. No one remembered. Perhaps they prayed in their intimate circles, but no one thought of taking a concrete step. Why would they do so now? Are they not the same, or are they different? There are different currents. There are currents in the world that are different, which are not precisely the ruling ones, with the exception of certain countries. It is them we should aim at, for they represent the immense majority of humankind. That is where our faith and hope lie, contributing our own singularity. Our singularity is that a people that were entirely decimated, as happened in western Armenia, should have been able to rebuild itself with great heroism in a small territory, no more than 10,000 square kilometers in size, and manage to become an organized State. Now those of us who are in agreement with that, or even in disagreement with that, have come together to try and prevent that crime from going unpunished. That, from my point of view, is the great, singular contribution the Armenians could make. What did we do? We took the conditions into account. Why did we not file legal action 40 years earlier? Because the conditions were not ripe. The Armenian community that had taken refuge outside Armenia sought solution to the basic problems of any human being: a job, housing, a temple, a school. Later

came the ideological division, the Cold War that split us all apart. It split us as enemies without our realizing it. Fortunately now we have come to realize it, but not until certain social, political, cultural conditions of existence had been achieved, to enable us to file legal action. And this is related to the relevance human rights organizations have taken on in the world, and most particularly in Argentina, and very specifically in this Human Rights Department which has taught us so much, and which rallied many, many more people than there are today. We have learnt so much from this department, in this educational task. We also learnt a great deal from the legal proceedings filed by victims' family members, and the lawsuit against Pinochet in Spain. We began to wonder how it was that this Chilean genocide should have been arrested in England by a Spanish judge. This spurred us to further action. The unwavering resistance of the Mothers of Plaza de Mayo, and their willingness to continue fighting for the same ideals their children had held, in different conditions, in a different national and international scenario, and using other methods, no doubt. And the condemnatory sentence issued by the Permanent People's Tribunal Permanente, the most significant moral act performed in connection with the Armenian Question, whose founder was senator Lelio Basso, and whose members included Pérez Esquivel, personalities from Belgium, South Africa, Japan, Chile, United States, Italy. The Tribunal condemned and bore in mind both the Turkish argument, which denied the existence of the crime of genocide, and the Armenian argument, which supported it. I did something very similar to the procedure used in this Tribunal. In other words, I requested a judge in my country (despite my lack of confidence in what judicial independence might mean) to make a pronouncement in connection with a crime my family had been the victim of, based on the provisions of article 118 of our National Constitution, and the obligation of the State that represents me, the Argentine State, to investigate those events. We likewise established principles. We were not motivated by religious or racial issues; there was no hatred or revenge. Not at all. What we demanded was justice, based of course on the description referred to previously.

Nor did we demand anything off the Turkish people. I did not file a complaint against the Turkish people. I filed it against the dominant classes in Turkey, who are the same. They differ in age, but they are the same in their purposes and procedures as those who led the country in 1915 or earlier, in 1890. And they are legally, politically, socially and culturally responsible for what happened to the Armenian people. Despite everything Law technicians, criminalists might say to the contrary, I hold they are responsible because now that all the perpetrators of the genocide are dead, it is still these dominant classes who hold the State in their hands, as an instrument of domination, it is they who refuse to recognize the Armenian genocide, and refuse to conduct the investigations international law requires. In other words, they are accomplices or accessories after the fact. I believe it is necessary to go deeper into the legal aspect, bearing in mind criminalist doctrine which holds that upon disappearance of the perpetrators, criminal action likewise disappears - but those who continue to hinder clarification or regarded as accomplices or accessories after the fact. I am going to make a brief reference to what happened last week when Professor Daniel Feierstein gave a talk. In answer to a question he was asked concerning Turkey's denial in connection with having committed the crime of genocide, he said something that may not have been understood, but when I asked him about it outside the classroom he ratified what he had said. Feierstein said that those who consider that the Armenian genocide was the first in the twentieth century it is because they are unaware of the Jewish Holocaust. It is because they are unaware of the second. This is one of the great impediments we have in developing the subject of recognition of the Armenian genocide, both in the field of politics and in the field of law. This is not simply a randomly used expression but something closely linked to certain Jewish groups with whom I have no enmity of any nature. We have common causes with the Jews, we were victims of the same extermination and annihilation process, under Kemal Atatürk, under the Sultan, and under Hitler. Now I ask: Why would a professor of the stature of Feierstein refer to this? I think it is really absurd. And this is often precisely what feeds rightwing Jewish factions. Rightwing Jewish factions continually insist that the Holocaust is the "Jewish Holocaust". It was held by the Jewish leftwing factions through Pavlovsky, who said the Holocaust had changed the subjectivity of the human beings. This was said in the best Central European style, with little attention to what actually happened. The Armenians do not exist. Then came armed fighting, which was the propaganda for the fact, because the fact finds no echo. We are voicing our claims to the four winds and yet we find no echo. And there is a sectarian, racist Jewish rightwing stream that also performs acts of genocide, who wants to corner us and make us appear anti-Semitic. I think has to be made very clear. We have never heard that anyone has a theory in this connection. There is not a single Armenian writer or historian who speaks of the Armenian genocide as the first genocide, who does not recognize the Holocaust. All our writers address the Armenian genocide by comparing it to the Holocaust, and making reference to an adventurous theory that holds that if the Armenian genocide had been condemned, the Holocaust of the Jews with Hitler would not have taken place.

THE TREATY OF SÈVRES and the Armenian Question

In 1970 the Consejo Central Pro Causa Armenia para la América Latina [Latin American Central Council for the Armenian Cause] issued a document on the Treaty of Sèvres (10 August 1920) pointing out that Armenians have a political problem still pending solution, basically the recovery of the territory seized off them by Turkey. The Treaty recognized the legal equality of the Armenians as citizens of an independent country able to govern itself without exclusions founded on ethnic or religious features, with the freedom to associate, lead their institutions, receive education and enjoy their culture according to their national characteristics. It likewise exacted from Armenia the commitment to preserve the rights of inhabitants in its territories differing for reasons of religion, race or language. Sèvres declared the independence of Armenia and marked off its territorial boundaries for the country to be able to recover its condition as a sovereign state, acknowledged as such by world agreement. One year after the Congress of Versailles the Treaty was signed by Armenia on the one hand (with Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Japan, Poland, Portugal and Rumania) and Turkey on the other. The USA did not sign the Treaty because it was not in a state of belligerency with Turkey, but President Wilson was charged with marking off the frontiers of Armenia and on 22 November 1920 signed the arbitration sentence that was accepted by the states involved. The Treaty not only resolved the frontier litigation with Turkey, but also with Azerbaijan. Turkey renounced to any kind of claim over the territories assigned to a Armenia and acknowledged the right of the allied powers to judge and condemn war criminals in courts martial. The Turks are required to hand over to the allies the parties guilty for the massacres committed in the territories of the Ottoman Empire. The undertaking by the Turks extends to the obligation of returning prisoners of war and those who had been forced to adopt Islam as their religion, guaranteeing their return home and the recovery of their personal or community property without having to indemnify illegitimate occupants.

First infringement

Before a very short time had elapsed on 13 September Kemal's army started its attacks against Armenia. The Armenian claim received no attention from the League of Nations which argued that it could not enforce the Treaty of Sèvres because it had not yet come into effect,

channeling responsibility towards the powers that had signed it on the allied field. They all agreed that it was necessary to avoid a further tragedy for Armenia and help it to prepare its defense against Kemalist attacks, but in practice they confined their intervention to inviting the Council to take measures to put an end to the enmity between Armenia and Turkey. It was not a problem of enmity – which did obviously exist between the attacker and the attacked – but what should have been done was obligate Turkey to cease any type of war-faring activity against Armenian territory.

The League of Nations was dissuaded from forming an expedition force to reestablish peace in Armenia on the pretext that it was a peace enforcement agency that could not get involved in actions that could cause further bloodshed. Any solidarity and help provided was limited to moral support. In addition to the attacks from the Kemalists, the nascent Bolshevik movement red army invaded Armenia from the north after purging from its numbers any trace of Armenian origin. In 1921 Turks and Soviets signed the Treaty of Moscow renouncing to the Treaty of Sèvres with the purpose of assigning Armenian territories to Azerbaijan. A fragile Armenian Socialist Republic had set up in Soviet territory and was unable to demand the return of what the First Republic of Armenia had achieved. A morass of contradictory treaties was sufficient to block the effectiveness of the Sèvres agreement. What Armenia had obtained and achieved with the Treaty of Sèvres continues to be a vindication of the Armenian Republic and the diaspora.

LEGAL INTERRELATION BETWEEN SÈVRES AND LAUSANNE an international compromise still in effect *

"The Treaty of Lausanne was signed on 24 July 1923. Essentially, on the basis of this Treaty Mustapha Kemal did what Adolf Hitler was to do several years later after reviewing some of the consequences of the First World War. However, the significance of Lausanne has been overvalued, for the treaty did not alter the transformations caused by the war. It only affected some aspects of the Treaty of Sèvres. Although the Republic of Armenia was not a party to the Treaty of Lausanne, this agreement is closely linked to the Armenian people. It is therefore necessary to analyze the legal interrelationship between the treaties of Lausanne and Sèvres, according to international law concepts.

One and the other

From a legal viewpoint the Treaties of Sèvres and Lausanne are two different documents, not only because of the sphere of the participants. What is most important to point out is that the sense and objective between one and the other are different. The Treaty of Sèvres refers to the First World War while the Treaty of Lausanne refers to the warfare actions that took place between 1919/1922. Sèvres involves the main powers and their allies on the one hand and Turkey on the other, seeking to put an end to the First World War and replace it by fair and lasting peace. Lausanne sought to suspend a state of war between the Turkish Great National Assembly (and not the government of Turkey) and the High Contracting Parties. From this it is understood that the wording of the Treaty of Lausanne does not refer to officially declared war, as was the case, for instance, of the First World War, to be replaced by a state of peace. Simply put Lausanne sought the cease of a belligerent state. Lausanne referred to the suspension of armed actions by the Kemalists that breached the Armistice of Mudros (30 October 1918). This is documented in the first article of the Treaty of Lausanne where it speaks of restoration and not of establishing peace.

It is worth pointing out here that international law clearly differentiates the concepts of war and a bellicose situation. In the Treaty of Lausanne the High Contracting Parties clearly declared their political will in connection with the Kemalists. They were not acknowledged as legitimate representatives of the State, but solely as belligerent parties. Another point is that the Treaty of Lausanne reviewed the situations of some countries that directly or indirectly took part in military operations between 1919 and 1922. This was also included in the Treaty of Sèvres. International law does not forbid the establishment of a new treaty changing the terms of a previous one or the transformation of a multilateral treaty on behalf of two or more parties. Likewise the new Treaty, like any other treaty, must refer solely to the parties involved in it and any changes in the treaty can affect the parties thereto and cannot have any influence on the rights and obligations of the countries.

Because the Republic of Armenia was occupied at the time, it did not take part in the Lausanne conference or sign the treaty which neither created nor creates any legal obligation of any nature for Armenia. Another issue we wish to mention is the confusion that assumes that the Treaty of Lausanne made the Treaty of Sèvres lapse. This viewpoint lacks any kind of ground and cannot withstand any kind of analysis. There is a principle in international law which reads "if you are not a party you are not bound by it."

The Vienna Convention treaty, which establishes the procedural code in effect over the last centuries in international law, is very clear as to the suspension of treaties. Note 2 of Article 59 provides: "Application of the previous treaty will be considered suspended solely if this is clear from the subsequent treaty or it is otherwise noted that this is the intention of the parties" "Termination of a Treaty or suspension of the application thereof implicit as a result of the signing of a subsequent treaty".

From the wording of the Treaty of Lausanne it is clear that the parties did not wish to declare the Treaty of Sèvres had lapsed. In addition to this, Lausanne makes no mention of Sèvres. To make it simpler: a treaty cannot be declared void in any manner other than by a statement in this connection by all (and I repeat all) the signee parties.

One of the essential principles of international law is that no state can be freed of the obligations of a treaty nor can it transform its articles until it has the clear conformity of all the contracting parties. We have a clear example: Under the Munich Agreement (1938), the Sudetes territories had been assigned to Germany. At the end of the Second World War they were returned to Czechoslovakia. However, despite the diverse and varied agreements signed by the defeated Germany, this treaty had not been annulled and was legally in effect. It was not until December 1973, the Federal Republic of Germany, as the legal successor of the Third Reich, signed a treaty with Czechoslovakia under which the 1938 agreement was declared void. While we cannot hold that the Treaty of Sèvres still remains in effect, given there are faults in its ratification which meant it did not immediately go into effect, it is also a mistake to assume that Lausanne declared Sèvres null. The Treaty of Lausanne could not have that effect given that its very nature and the parties that signed it were significantly different from the Treaty of Sèvres. In other words, the Treaty of Sèvres today is an actual document of international law. Its provisions and signature were conducted following due legal procedures, despite the fact they were never applied. If we were to aim at something impossible, for instance that all the signee countries should ratify it, it would then come into effect. It is here we find this treaty is imperfect, the term used in

international law for unratified treaties. This does not, however, impinge on the rights of the Armenian Republic given the obligations of Turkey towards Armenia do not emerge from the Treaty of Sèvres but from the arbitration sentence arising from the Treaty of Sèvres and formulated by US President Woodrow Wilson on 22 November 1920. The Treaty of Lausanne does not mention Armenia or the Armenians, but it does affect us. The third section of the Treaty of Lausanne (Articles 37-45) refers to non-Muslim minorities in Turkey. Under Lausanne such articles, which have the force of a fundamental law, cannot be derogated or altered. This is a particular topic we will deal with at a later stage.

The second way in which the Treaty of Lausanne relates to Armenia involves the legal conformation of the territory of the republic being created in Turkey. The first paragraph of Article 16 provides: "Turkey hereby renounces all rights and title whatsoever over or respecting the territories situated outside the frontiers laid down in the present Treaty and the islands other than those over which her sovereignty is recognized by the said Treaty, the future of these territories and islands being settled or to be settled by the parties concerned." The Treaty of Lausanne establishes the frontiers of Turkey with Bulgaria (Article 2.1), with Greece (2.2), with Syria (3.1) and with Iraq (3.2). Therefore it should be understood that the rights and titles of Turkey are acknowledged solely in the territories included inside their frontiers. In addition to the Turkish-Iranian frontier, the only limit not mentioned is the Armenian-Turkish frontier. The reason for this is that this had already been defined in a final binding decision by U.S. President Wilson in his role as arbiter on 22 November 1920. The territories recognized as belonging to the Armenians were not included in the later Treaty of Lausanne on 29 October 1923, within the boundaries established as the Republic of Turkey. The Turkish delegation at Lausanne has renounced to its rights and titles for possession. The second paragraph of Article 16 ratifies this:

"The provisions of the present Article do not prejudice any special arrangements arising from neighborly relations which have been or may be concluded between Turkey and any limitrophe countries."

It is important to note that the second paragraph refers to clarifications concerning the frontier and not concerning the treaty or the agreement, given that special covenants include the arbiter status. Thus Article 16 of the Treaty of Lausanne ratified what was established in Article 90 of the Treaty of Sèvres under which Turkey renounced to all the territories which the W. Wilson arbitral decision recognized as belonging to the Republic of Armenia. The following conclusions therefore summarize the above:

- 1 The treaties of Sèvres and Lausanne and two different documents.
- 2 The Treaty of Lausanne could not and did not declare the Treaty of Sèvres void.
- 3 The Treaty of Lausanne, having the status of a fundamental law, consolidated the rights of non-Muslim minorities.
- 4 The Treaty of Lausanne ratified the renouncement of Turkey to any rights and titles over the territories allocated to the Republic of Armenia under the Arbitration

*Aram Papanián
Former Armenian Ambassador to Canada

DOCTRINE ON GENOCIDE by Raphael Lemkin

I. A crime without a name

The last war has focused our attention on the phenomenon of the destruction of whole populations -of national, racial and religious groups - both biologically and culturally. The German practices, especially in the course of occupation, are too well known. Their general plan was to win the peace though the war be lost, and that goal could have been achieved through successfully changing the political and demographic interrelationships in Europe in favor of Germany. The population not destroyed was to be integrated in the German cultural, political and economic pattern. In this way a mass obliteration of nationhoods had been planned throughout occupied Europe. The Nazi leaders had stated very bluntly their intent to wipe out the Poles, the Russians; to destroy demographically and culturally the French element in Alsace-Lorraine, the Slavonians in Carniola and Carinthia. They almost achieved their goal in exterminating the Jews and Gypsies in Europe. Obviously, the German experience is the most striking and the most deliberate and thorough, but history has provided us with other examples of the destruction of entire nations, and ethnic and religious groups. There are, for example, the destruction of Carthage; that of religious groups in the wars of Islam and the Crusades; the massacres of the Albigenses and the Waldenses; and more recently, the massacre of the Armenians. While society sought protection against individual crimes, or rather crimes directed against individuals, there has been no serious endeavor hitherto to prevent and punish the murder and destruction of millions. Apparently, there was not even an adequate name for such a phenomenon. Referring to the Nazi butchery in the present war, Winston Churchill said in his broadcast of August, 1941, "We are in the presence of a crime without a name."

II: The word "genocide"

Would mass murder be an adequate name for such a phenomenon? We think not, since it does not connote the motivation of the crime, especially when the motivation is based upon racial, national or religious considerations. An attempt to destroy a nation and obliterate its cultural personality was hitherto called denationalization. This term seems to be inadequate, since it does not connote biological destruction. On the other hand, this term is mostly used for conveying or for defining an act of deprivation of citizenship. Many authors, instead of using a generic term, use terms connoting only some functional aspect of the main generic notion of the destruction of nations and races. Thus, the terms "Germanization," "Italianization," "Magyarization" are used often to connote the imposition by a stronger nation (Germany, Italy, Hungary) of its national pattern upon a group controlled by it. These terms are inadequate since they do not convey biological destruction, and they cannot be used as a generic term. In the case of Germany, it would be ridiculous to speak about the Germanization of the Jews or Poles in western Poland, since the Germans wanted these groups eradicated entirely. Hitler stated many times that Germanization [p. 228] could only be carried out with the soil, never with men. These considerations led the author of this article to the necessity of coining a new term for this particular concept: genocide. This word is made from the ancient Greek word *genos* (race, clan) and the Latin suffix *cide* (killing). Thus, genocide in its formation would correspond to such words as tyrannicide, homicide, patricide.

III: An international crime

Genocide is the crime of destroying national, racial or religious groups. The problem now arises as to whether it is a crime of only national importance, or a crime in which international society as such should be vitally interested. Many reasons speak for the second alternative.

It would be impractical to treat genocide as a national crime, since by its very nature it is committed by the state or by powerful groups which have the backing of the state. A state would never prosecute a crime instigated or backed by itself. By its very legal, moral and humanitarian nature, it must be considered an international crime. The conscience of mankind has been shocked by this type of mass barbarity. There have been many instances of states expressing their concern about another state's treatment of its citizens. The United States rebuked the government of Czarist Russia as well as that of Rumania for the ghastly pogroms they instigated or tolerated. There was also diplomatic action in behalf of the Greeks and Armenians when they were being massacred by the Turks. States have even entered into international treaties by which they assumed specific obligations in the treatment of their own nationals. We may, in this respect, refer to the treaty entered into between the United States and Spain in 1898, in which the free exercise of religion was assured by the United States to the inhabitants of the territories which were ceded to her. Another classical example of international concern in the treatment of citizens of other states by their governments is provided by the minority treaties under the auspices of the League of Nations which were signed by a number of European countries after the first World War. Again, the declaration of the Eighth International Conference of American States provides that any persecution on account of racial or religious motives which makes it impossible for a group of human beings to live decently is contrary to the political and judicial systems of America. The Charter of the United Nations Organization also provides for the international protection of human rights, indicating that the denial of such rights by any state is a matter of concern to all mankind. Cultural considerations speak for international protection of national, religious and cultural groups. Our whole heritage is a product of the contributions of all nations. We can best understand this when we realize how impoverished our culture would be if the peoples doomed by Germany, such as the Jews, had not been permitted to create the Bible, or to give birth to an Einstein, a Spinoza; if the Poles had not had the opportunity to give to the world a Copernicus, a Chopin, a Curie; the Czechs, a Huss, a Dvorak; the Greeks, a Plato and a Socrates; the Russians, a Tolstoy and a Shostakovich. There are also practical considerations. Expulsions of law-abiding residents from Germany before this war created frictions with the neighboring countries to which these peoples were expelled. Mass persecutions forced mass flight. Thus, the normal migration between countries assumes pathological dimensions. Again, international trade depends upon confidence in the ability of the individuals participating in the interchange of goods to fulfill their obligations. The arbitrary and wholesale confiscations of the properties of whole groups of citizens of one state for racial or other reasons deprives them of their capacity to discharge their obligations to citizens of other states. Many American citizens were deprived of the possibility of claiming debts incurred by German importers after these importers were destroyed by the Hitler regime. Finally, genocide in time of peace creates international tensions and leads to war. It was used by the Nazi regime to strengthen the alleged unity and totalitarian control of the German people as a preparation for war.

IV: Creating a legal framework

Once we have recognized the international implications of genocidal practices, we must create the legal framework for the recognition of genocide as an international crime. The significant feature of international crime is a recognition that because of its international importance it must be punished and punishable through international cooperation. The establishment of international machinery for such punishment is essential. Thus, it has been recognized by the law of nations and by the criminal codes of many nations that crimes which affect the common good of mankind - as, for example, piracy, unlawful production and trade in narcotics, forgery of money, trade in women and children, trade in slaves - all these are international crimes (*delicta juris gentium*). For such crimes, the principle of universal repression has been adopted, namely the culprit can be punished not only before the courts of the country where the crime has been perpetrated, but also by courts of the country where the culprit can be apprehended if he escaped justice in his own country. For example, a currency forger who committed his crime in Paris and escaped to Prague can be punished validly in the latter city. In 1933, at the Fifth International Conference for the Unification of Criminal Law (under the auspices of the Fifth Committee of the League of Nations) the author of the present article introduced a proposal providing for this type of jurisdiction for acts of persecution amounting to what is now called genocide. Unfortunately, at that time, his proposal was not adopted. Had this principle been adopted at that time by international treaty, we would not now have all the discussions about *ex post facto* law, in relation to crimes committed by the German government against its own citizens prior to this war.

V: Genocide in time of war

A ruthless regime finds it easiest to commit genocide in time of war. It then becomes a problem of the treatment, or, rather, mistreatment, of a civilian population by an occupant. The Fourth Hague Convention establishes a rule of law in the protection of civilian populations which an occupant must respect. Within the purview of this law comes the protection of the honor, liberty, life, family rights and property rights of the population in the occupied country. Genocide can be carried out through acts against individuals, when the ultimate intent is to annihilate the entire group composed of these individuals; every specific act of genocide as directed against individuals as members of a national or racial group is illegal under the Hague Convention. If the killing of one Jew or one Pole is a crime, the killing of all the Jews and all the Poles is not a lesser crime. Moreover, the criminal intent to kill or destroy all the members of such a group shows premeditation and deliberation and a state of systematic criminality which is only an aggravated circumstance for the punishment. Genocide has been included in the indictment of the major war criminals for the use of the Nuremberg trials. It reads as follows: ***They (the defendants) conducted deliberate and systematic genocide - viz., the extermination of racial and national groups - against the civilian populations of certain occupied territories in order to destroy particular races and classes of people, and national, racial or religious groups, particularly Jews, Poles, Gypsies and others.***

By including genocide in the indictment, the enormity of the Nazi crimes has been more accurately described. Moreover, as in the case of homicide, the natural right of existence for individuals is implied: by the formulation of genocide as a crime, the principle that every national, racial and religious group has a natural right of existence is claimed. Attacks upon such groups are in violation of that right to exist and to develop within an international community as free members of international society. Thus, genocide is not only a crime against the rules of war, but also a crime against humanity. Only after the cessation of hostilities could the whole gruesome picture of genocide committed in the occupied countries be reviewed. During the military occupation unconfirmed rumors about genocide leaked out from behind the *iron curtain* covering enslaved Europe. The International Red Cross was precluded from visiting occupied countries and gathering information about the mistreatment of the civilian populations. It so happened because the Geneva Convention gave to the International Red Cross the right to supervise and control only the treatment of prisoners of war. A paradoxical situation was created: men who went into the battlefield with a considerable expectancy of death survived, while their families, left behind in supposed security, were annihilated.

The author of the present article has proposed in his book ***Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*** that international law be changed so that in time of war the treatment of civilian populations will also be under supervisory control of an international body like the International Red Cross. The Swedish newspaper, *Dagens Nyheter*, of November 2, 1945, announced that the chairman of the Swedish Red Cross, Count Bernadotte referred to the author's proposal as acceptable for consideration at a future conference of the International Red Cross, and declared that the Swedish Red Cross would support it. While the writer is gratified by this development, he hopes that other governments will support the proposal to change international law.

VI: Proposals

On the basis of the foregoing considerations, the author proposes that the United Nations as they are now organized, together with other invited nations, enter into an international treaty which would formulate genocide as an international crime, providing for its prevention and punishment in time of peace and war. This treaty, basically, should include, among other things, the following principles:

1. The crime of genocide should be recognized therein as a conspiracy to exterminate national, religious or racial groups. The overt acts of such a conspiracy may consist of attacks against life, liberty or property of members of such groups merely because of their affiliation with such groups. The formulation of the crime may be as follows: "***Whoever, while participating in a conspiracy to destroy a national, racial or religious group, undertakes an attack against life, liberty or property of members of such groups is guilty of the crime of genocide.***"
2. The crime so formulated should be incorporated in every national criminal code of the signatories. The defendants should be liable not only before the courts of the country where the crime, was committed, but in case of escape shall be liable as well, before the courts of the country where they are apprehended.
3. Persons accused of genocide should not be treated as political criminals for purposes of extradition. Extradition should not be granted except in cases where sufficient evidence exists to indicate that the requesting country will earnestly prosecute the culprits.
4. The liability for genocide should rest on those who gave and executed the orders, as well as on those who incited to the commission of the crime by whatever means, including formulation and teaching of the criminal philosophy of genocide. Members of government and political bodies which organized or tolerated genocide will be equally responsible.
5. Independently of the responsibility of individuals for genocide, states in which such a policy obtains should be held accountable before the Security Council of the United Nations Organization. The Council may request the International Court of Justice to deliver an advisory opinion to determine whether a state of genocide exists within a given country before invoking, among other things, sanctions to be leveled against the offending country. The Security Council may act either on its own initiative or on the basis of petitions submitted by members of interested national, religious or racial groups residing either within or without the accused country.
6. The Hague Convention and other pertinent treaties should be changed to the effect that in case of war, an international body (such as the International Red Cross) should have the right to supervise the treatment of civilian populations by occupants in time of war in order to ascertain whether genocide is being practiced by such occupant. A multilateral treaty for the prevention and punishment of genocide should not preclude two or more countries from entering into bilateral or regional treaties for more extensive protection against genocide. In this connection it is well to note that the Allied Governments in accordance with the Moscow agreements of December, 1945, have decided to enter into formal treaties of peace with the Axis satellite countries Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania, which practiced genocide in this war according to the German pattern. It is of impelling importance that anti-genocide clauses be included in these treaties.

CONVENTION ON THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE

Approved on 9th December 1948 by the III General Assembly of the United Nations, 179th plenary session. The General Assembly approves the text of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide which is attached to this resolution and submits it for signing and accession under article 11 thereof.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Text of the Convention

The contracting parties, having considered the declaration made by the general assembly of the united nations in its resolution 96 (I) dated 11 December 1946 that genocide is a crime under international law, contrary to the spirit and aims of the united nations and condemned by the civilized world ; recognizing that at all periods of history genocide has inflicted great losses on humanity; and being convinced that, in order to liberate mankind from such an odious scourge, international co-operation is required, hereby agree as hereinafter provided:

Article I

The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

Article II

In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Article III

The following acts shall be punishable:

- (a) Genocide;
- (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;
- (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;
- (d) Attempt to commit genocide;
- (e) Complicity in genocide.

Article IV

Persons committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals.

Article V

The Contracting Parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective Constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide or of any of the other acts enumerated in article III.

Article VI

Persons charged with genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the State in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those Contracting Parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction.

Article VII

Genocide and the other acts enumerated in article III shall not be considered as political crimes for the purpose of extradition. The Contracting Parties pledge themselves in such cases to grant extradition in accordance with their laws and treaties in force.

Article VIII

Any Contracting Party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the Charter of the United Nations as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III.

Article IX

Disputes between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the present Convention, including those relating to the responsibility of a State for genocide or for any of the other acts enumerated in article III, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.

Article X

The present Convention, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall bear the date of 9 December 1948.

Article XI

The present Convention shall be open until 31 December 1949 for signature on behalf of any Member of the United Nations and of any non-member State to which an invitation to sign has been addressed by the General Assembly. The present Convention shall be ratified, and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. After 1 January 1950 the present Convention may be acceded to on behalf of any Member of the United Nations and of any non-member State which has received an invitation as aforesaid.

Article XII

Any Contracting Party may at any time, by notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, extend the application of the present Convention to all or any of the territories for the conduct of whose foreign relations that Contracting Party is responsible.

Article XIII

On the day when the first twenty instruments of ratification or accession have been deposited, the Secretary-General shall draw up a procès-verbal and transmit a copy thereof to each Member of the United Nations and to each of the non-member States contemplated in article XI. The present Convention shall come into force on the ninetieth day following the date of deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification or accession. Any ratification or accession effected subsequent to the latter date shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the deposit of the instrument of ratification or accession.

Article XIV

The present Convention shall remain in effect for a period of ten years as from the date of its coming into force. It shall thereafter remain in force for successive periods of five years for such Contracting Parties as have not denounced it at least six months before the expiration of the current period. Denunciation shall be effected by a written notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article XV

If, as a result of denunciations, the number of Parties to the present Convention should become less than sixteen, the Convention shall cease to be in force as from the date on which the last of these denunciations shall become effective.

Article XVI

A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any Contracting Party by means of a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General. The General Assembly shall decide upon the steps, if any, to be taken in respect of such request.

Article XVII

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall notify all Members of the United Nations and the non-member States contemplated in article XI of the following:

- a) Signatures, ratifications and accessions received in accordance with article XI;
- b) Notifications received in accordance with article XII;
- c) The date upon which the present Convention comes into force in accordance with article XIII;
- d) Denunciations received in accordance with article XIV;
- e) The abrogation of the Convention in accordance with article XV;
- f) Notifications received in accordance with article XVI.

Article XVIII

The original of the present Convention shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations. A certified copy of the Convention shall be transmitted to each Member of the United Nations and to each of the non-member States contemplated in article XI.

Article XIX

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the date of its coming into force.

B. Study by the International Law Commission of the Question of International Criminal Jurisdiction

The General Assembly, considering that the discussion of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide has raised the question of the desirability of having persons charged with genocide tried by a competent international tribunal.

Considering that, in the course of development of the international community, there will be an increasing need of an international judicial organ for the trial of persons charged with genocide or other crimes over which jurisdiction will be conferred upon that organ by international conventions;

Invites the International Law Commission, in carrying out this task, to pay attention to the possibility of establishing an International Court of Justice.

ARGENTINA establishes 24 April as the "Day of action for tolerance and respect among peoples"

On Wednesday 13 December 2006 the final steps were completed for the law establishing 24 April as the "Day of Action for tolerance and respect among peoples", submitted by the majority 'Frente para la Victoria' [Front for Victory] block as a procedural request, thus abbreviating legislative formalities before diverse commissions, in a clear reaffirmation of the will of the legislators in both chambers of the National Congress to approve this project.

"The 24th April every year is hereby declared as the Day of action for tolerance and respect among peoples in commemoration of the genocide the Armenian people were the victims of. President Néstor Kirchner enacted the law that considers the torture and death of over a million and a half Armenians by the Turkish state as crimes against humanity. The law had previously been approved by the National Chamber of Representatives and the National Senate. "With this law", declared the National Armenian Council, Argentina "takes her place at international level as an example of solidarity and respect for diversity, and as a society in search of the truth against any type of violations of human rights"

National Law 26199. TO THE HONORABLE CONGRESS OF THE NATION Message and draft bill

I have the pleasure of addressing Your Honor with the purpose of submitting to your consideration this Draft Bill aimed at forbidding the spread by any means of ideas or doctrines flagrantly denying, justifying or trivializing the historical existence of behaviors that could be framed within the crime of genocide – in particular the Shoah (Holocaust), the Armenian genocide and the State terrorism that took place during the last military dictatorship in Argentina, because of the manner in which they affect the dignity or the right to non-discrimination of persons or groups of persons on any pretext, either directly or indirectly.

Every human being is a person (American Convention on Human Rights article 1.2) and as such possesses dignity (Universal Declaration of Human Rights article 1). This intrinsic attribute of any person deserves respect independently of other characteristics of the individual.

The recognition of human dignity is the framework within which fundamental rights are exercised and developed and by virtue of **this is not restricted to an ethnicity (to any people or ethnicity) coverage o a una etnia (a cualquier pueblo o a cualquier etnia) [frase incompleta en castellano]... are incompatible with the** respect for human dignity, which is only fulfilled if it is attributed alike to all men [and women], to all ethnicities, to all peoples".¹

In this connection the Inter-American Court of Human Rights has said that "The notion of equality springs directly from the oneness of the human family and is linked to the essential dignity of the individual. That principle cannot be reconciled with the notion that a given group has the right to privileged treatment because of its perceived superiority. It is equally irreconcilable with that notion to characterize a group as inferior and treat it with hostility or otherwise subject it to discrimination in the enjoyment of rights which are accorded to others not so classified. It is impermissible to subject human beings to differences in treatment that are inconsistent with their unique and congenious character".²

It is important to bear in mind that the principle of equality and non-discrimination has long been included in our legal regulations, for in 1853 the Argentine State recognized this principle in article 16 of its National Constitution. At a later date, article 1 of National Law 23.592³ established that "Whoever arbitrarily hinders, obstructs, restricts or in any manner undermines full and equal exercise of the fundamental rights and guarantees recognized in the National Constitution shall be required, upon request by the damaged party, to leave such discriminatory action without effect or to cease to carry out any such action and provide reparation for the moral and material damages caused. For the purposes of this article particular consideration is given to discriminatory acts or omissions determined for reasons such as race, religion, nationality, ideology, political or union opinion, gender, financial position, social condition or physical features".

1. The abovementioned article merely provides recognition of article 16 of the National Constitution.

2. It should likewise be considered that the 1994 National Constituent Assembly considerably increased the range of basic rights included in the Constitution. Eleven international documents were expressly considered for this purpose and given constitutional hierarchy. Since then the principle of equality and the right to non-discrimination have been included both in our National Constitution (arts. 16 and 75, paragraphs 22 and 23) and in numerous international documents on Human Rights at similar level: American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man (art. II); American Convention on Human Rights (art. 24); International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (art. 2, inc. 2); International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (arts. 2 y 4); and, in particular, article 7 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes the equality and the right to "equal protection against any discrimination infringing this Declaration in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination".

¹ Cfr. Spanish Constitutional Tribunal, sentence # 214/1991 dated 11 November 1991.

² Inter-American Court of Human Rights, "Consultative Opinion 4/84", 19 January 1984

³ Enacted on 3 August 1988. Issued on 23 August 1988. Published in the Official Bulletin on 5 September 1988. Amended by National Law 24.782.

We consider that, the activities mentioned in article 1 of the draft bill accompanying this message, "...the spread by any means of ideas or doctrines flagrantly denying, justifying or trivializing the historical existence of behaviors that could be framed within the crime of genocide – in particular the Shoah (Holocaust), the Armenian genocide and the State terrorism that took place during the last military dictatorship in Argentina, because of the manner in which they affect the dignity or the right to non-discrimination of persons or groups of persons on any pretext, either directly or indirectly" involve behaviors that flagrantly oppose full recognition of human rights and should therefore be expressly forbidden by our legal regulations.

The experience of Nazism led to the need to legally typify a practice that had become common in modernity, from colonial times to the Armenian genocide. In the light of this, during the Second World War, Polish jurist Raphael Lemkin coined for the first time the term genocide,⁴ defining it as systematic annihilation with the aim of "destroying national identity through terror", and typifying it following the principles of equality, as regards the "attempt to destroy, in whole or in part, a group as such". He sought to extend protection to all groups, including physical, biological, political, social, cultural, economic and religious issues. He likewise framed the destruction of a culture as a second type of genocide, which later came to be known as ethnocide.⁵ Genocide has placed mankind in a position of negation of their own condition.

En 1948, these principles were acknowledged internationally and described in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, in the preparation of which Lemkin took an active part. Article 2 of this Convention defines genocide as: "...any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:⁶

3.

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group."

The crime of Genocide is addressed in the same terms in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Art. 6)⁷. The description of the crime of genocide is very similar to that considered in the Nuremberg trials. The crimes tried at Nuremberg, defined as crimes against humanity, include murder, cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment, and the persecution of a group by virtue of its belonging to a race or ethnicity, with the purpose of destroying it.

⁴ 1944.

⁵ KOK-THAY ENG, *Redefining Genocide*, Available at: <http://www.genocidewatch.org/redefininggenocide.html>.

⁶ Adopted by the General Assembly under resolution 260 A (III), dated 9 December 1948. Effective as of 12 January 1951. Accession of Argentina 5 June 1956. Given constitutional standing with the 1994 reform.

⁷ Law 25.390, enacted on 30 November 2000 and issued on 8 January 2001.

The Holocaust was the persecution and systematic murder of approximately six million de Jews by the Nazi government and its collaborators. The Nazis, who reached power in Germany in January 1933, believed the Germans were a "superior race" and the Jews were considered "inferior". During the Holocaust, the Nazis also had their eye on other groups due to what they perceived as their "racial inferiority" such as the Roma (gypsies) and handicapped people. Other groups were persecuted for reasons of political, religious or sexual inclination: communists, socialists, Jehovah's witnesses and homosexuals.

Years ago there was a dichotomy between the particular view of the Shoah from the Jewish perspective – with the Jews arguing that the specific nature of the Jewish tragedy made it impossible to compare it with other genocides, a view accentuated by the main Israeli historians – and the universal view that sought to learn moral and political lessons from the Holocaust to combat racism, neo-Nazism or xenophobia in general and to encourage respect for human rights. These two approaches have drawn closer in recent years, summarized in the analysis by Yehuda Bauer, who, though stressing the specific nature of the Jewish tragedy likewise establishes the legitimacy of a comparison with other genocides and acknowledges the Jews do not have the monopoly or exclusivity in human suffering throughout history or in Nazi persecution. Bauer does point out, however, that the Shoah is the most extreme paradigm of genocide and that no other similar event comes close to it in significance and dimensions.⁸

The crimes perpetrated against the Jewish people in the context of the Holocaust are crimes that refuse to acknowledge the basic principles and values of humanity, and affect not only the Jewish people but society as a whole.

4.

It is extremely important that we should accept the history of oppression, not because anything can be done to revert it but because oppression can be transformed into active awareness, for greater morality and greater responsibility towards others. The greatest precedent for the creation of the term genocide, by Polish jurist Raphael Lemkin, were the killings of Armenians during the First World War (1915-1923), when the Turkish Ottoman government methodically perpetrated genocide against more than 1,500,000 innocent men, women, and children (including unborn infants) simply because they were Armenians. The mass murders were legalized in orders signed by those who officially represented the State according to its Constitution. "The Turkish state uprooted the Armenians, banished them from their land, condemned them to lethal deportation, usurped their national territory."⁹

"The Turkish nationalist government refused to acknowledge the existence of language, historical heritage, traditions and Armenian cultures, or their customs and worship. It did not want an Armenian nationality, because nationality would imply entitlement to right common to a group; it did not want a nationality with specific rights of its own, different to those of Turkish nationality." The Armenians did not accept it, and it was their refusal to renounce their ethnic values that led to their genocide by decision of the Turkish government.¹⁰

⁸ GOLDSTEIN, Y., *Metodologías, el Holocausto como paradigma del genocidio, como fenómeno histórico, sus proyecciones actuales y su significado teológico*. [Methodologies, the Holocaust as a paradigm of genocide, as a historical phenomenon, its current projections and theological significance]. Educator; organizer responsible for educational projects in Israel.

⁹ ¹⁰ OHANIAN, Pascual, *Introducción histórica de la ley 26.199, 24 de April, día de acción por la tolerancia y el respeto de los pueblos*. [Historical introduction to law 26199, 24 April, Day of action for tolerance and respect of the peoples].

The Turkish government's intent to silence the slaughter and the horror was to become, over time, an active policy of pressures and extortions aimed at organisms and sovereign states to ensure they did not officially acknowledge the genocide the Armenian people were victims of. It was thus not until 1985 that the U.N. Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities agreed to qualify the Armenian case as genocide.¹¹

In recognition of these aberrations, in Argentina National Law 26.199¹² declared 24 April each year the "Day of action for tolerance and respect among peoples", in commemoration of the genocide the Armenian people were the victims of. The foundations of the law underscore the fact that "being aware of and divulging these events is the fundamental right of the victims, as well as a duty of contemporaneous generations towards future generations. If one genocidal event occurred, another could also occur, and it is our duty as members of mankind not to forget ..."

We must likewise keep in our memory the State terrorism that took place during the last military dictatorship in Argentina between 1976 and 1983. This involved the armed forces taking power and instrumenting a systematic imposition of terror and physical elimination of thousands of citizens who were kidnapped, tortured, incarcerated in clandestine prisons and subjected to abuses and violations of every nature. "... Those who embodied any kind of dissension or opposition to the National plans, or were suspected of not sharing the philosophy of the usurpers of power, whether militating politically or socially or not, were physically eliminated. (...)"

Rejecting the refusal to acknowledge systematic mass human rights violations is an essential aspect of the fight against impunity, and is a fundamental objective of the international community as a whole, as reaffirmed by the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action, Republic of Austria, in June 1993.

Memory not only pays homage and rehabilitates the victims of extremely grave offenses to human dignity, but is an indispensable exercise to sustain the fabric of society, the moralization of public life and to establish the bases to guarantee that the atrocious, aberrant events committed by criminal use of the power of the state never occur again.

It is the responsibility of the constitutional institutions of the Republic to maintain the permanent memory of this cruel stage of Argentine history as a collective exercise with the purpose of teaching our present and future generations the irreparable consequences involved in substituting a constitutional State by the enforcement of illegal violence by those who exercise State power, to prevent oblivion from being the breeding ground for future repetition.

In this connection memory plays a fundamental role in the construction of a more equitable, more humane society, based on the lessons that the past has left us in building a better future in line with the regulations and values affirmed by national and international human rights law¹³

¹¹ Foundations of Law 26.199

¹² Enacted on 13 December 2006; Promulgated on 11 January 2007; Published in the Official Bulletin on 15 January 2007

¹³ Foundations of Law 26.085

It is in the light of these principles that we must forbid denial and refusal to acknowledge such atrocious crimes.

The Federal Criminal Court in La Plata # 1 has acknowledged in several cases that the aberrant crimes perpetrated by the military dictatorship in our country between 1976 and 1983 are crimes against humanity committed within the framework of the genocide that took place in our country in those years.¹⁴ All this based on the fact that "The system used – kidnapping, questioning under torture, clandestineness and illegitimate deprivation of freedom, and in many case elimination of the victims was substantially identical across the entire country, and prolonged over time ".¹⁵

Sociologist Daniel Feierstein has pointed out that "The annihilation in Argentina was not spontaneous, coincidental or irrational: it involved systematic destruction of a 'substantial part' of the national Argentine group, with the purpose of transforming it as such, of redefining their manner of being, their social relations, their destiny, their future".¹⁶

6.

This author has stressed the reasons why different historical processes can be given a similar name "...using the same concept does imply suggesting the existence of a conductor referring to a power technology where the 'denial of the other' reaches breaking point: their disappearance at material level (their bodies) and symbolical level (the memory of their existence)".¹⁷

Genocide is not only a feature of human atrocity and barbarism but also involves symbolical value. Though the term was coined for the first time in connection with the heinous crimes committed during the Holocaust, with the indiscriminate mass murder of the Jews, using this term solely to refer to that historical moment would reduce the strength of what it seeks to typify, which would make it difficult to guarantee the intervention and punishment of future genocides.¹⁸

While these atrocities occurred in different times and places, in a variety of sociopolitical circumstances, they all involved a common characteristic, the systematic, indiscriminate destruction of group members simply because they belonged to a certain group.

Shielded behind a historiographic revisionist methodology (which bases its principles on discussing great milestones of the past, de-structuring explanations about them and turning them into the idea of a "Myth") a current developed, known as negationism, which attempted to invalidate or negate historical events, in particular genocides and the Holocaust.

¹⁴ Oral Criminal Federal Court La Plata # 1: "Etchecolatz, Miguel O. s/privación ilegal de la libertad, aplicación de tormentos y homicidio calificado" [on illegal deprivation of freedom, application of torture and qualified homicide], 26/09/2006 and "Von Wernich, Christian F", sentence dated Nov. 1 2007.

¹⁵ Von Wernich, Christian F, Trib. Oral Crim. Fed. La Plata, n. 1, sentence dated Nov. 1 2007.

¹⁶ Feierstein, Daniel and Levy, Guillermo, "Hasta que la muerte nos separe, Prácticas sociales genocidas en América Latina", [Until death us do part; Social genocidal practices in Latin America] Ed. Al margen, Buenos Aires, 2004, p. 76.

¹⁷ Idem, p. 88.

¹⁸ KOK-THAY ENG, Redefining Genocide, Available at: <http://www.genocidewatch.org/redefininggenocide.html>

This current which began to be embodied as a defensive argument of post-war Nazis went broadening its vision seeking to construct empirical "evidence" to refute accusations, in principle by the Third Reich, and other actions aimed at the physical destruction of human groups.

As regards the Holocaust, negationists focus their discourse on three fundamental axes: a) that there was no official policy, plan or intention to exterminate the Jews during the Second World War; b) that six million did not die during the war in concentration camps, but only about two millions due to the physical war situation; and c) that there were no gas chambers in the concentration camps used specifically for collective killing.

In an effort to support this argumentation, they hold that: a) there is no Nazi document ordering or decreeing the extermination of Jews; b) that there was not that number of Jews in the European population; and c) that there is no material proof to sustain the use of cyanide gas in the disinfection chambers in the concentration camps; among other arguments. Some negationist versions even hold that the entire construction of the Holocaust was a North American propagandistic design to justify their war actions, particularly the nuclear bombs.

7.

It can therefore be held that negationism attempts to construct a pseudo explanation, discrediting argumentation lines or evidence with the selective use of facts, negation or derision towards others, *ad ignorantiam* fallacies (if it cannot be proved it does not exist) as opposed to supposing other unproven events, or event, inventing events.

All this talk is impossible to sustain; as Judge Daniel Rafecas says, the Holocaust is the most widely documented historical episode in the history of humanity, and proof is clearly available, suffice it to observe "...the barracks in the Birkenau extermination camp... or the Majdanek gas chambers, to see the terrifying bluish hue of the walls and roofs as a result of the incessant use of hydrogen cyanide crystals ...".¹⁹

In fact, in 2006, UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan declared:

"Remembering is a necessary rebuke to those who say the Holocaust never happened or has been exaggerated. Holocaust denial is the work of bigots. We must reject their false claims whenever, wherever and by whomever they are made..." And in January 2007, the UN General Assembly condemned "without reserves any negation of the Holocaust".

The emergence of those who sowed doubts as to the existence of the genocides, questioning the number of victims or distort dates and facts seeking to relativize or trivialize what happened, to the extent of denying the existence of the genocides is what has led to this project for the right to truth is a fundamental right, independent and inalienable, reflecting the ethical dimension of new parameters. "The fight against oblivion and impunity has taken on a legitimacy such that overflows the secretiveness of international relations and is projected even on national realities historically subjected to the dictatorship of silence."²⁰

At this point it is necessary to examine the provisions our legal regulations establish for protecting freedom of expression with the purpose of defining the constitutionality of the proposed restriction. Here it should be noted that we place ...

19 Clarín, 2/2/2009.

20 DESPOUY, Leandro, La condena de los genocidios, [Condemnation of Genocides] Diario Clarín, Tribuna, 08/05/2008 (archive note in issue # 13232)

... at your disposal a large amount of national and international doctrine and jurisprudence, and consider that the appropriate criterion when applying restrictions to any type of freedom of expression and information, should not deem dominant one of the rights being affected (right to intimacy, dignity, equality, non-discrimination, etc. vs. freedom of expression), but should instead consider the circumstances and evaluate whether the expressions are within a constitutionally protected setting, or whether they go beyond that setting.²¹

Article 14 of our Constitution grants all the country's inhabitants the right "to publish their ideas in the press without prior censorship". Freedom of expression is likewise set forth in article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; article 5, number VIII of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; article 13 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child; while the American Convention on Human Rights, a document that makes a wider reference to this subject, provides in article 13:

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought and expression. This right includes freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing, in print, in the form of art, or through any other medium of one's choice.
2. The exercise of the right provided for in the foregoing paragraph shall not be subject to prior censorship but shall be subject to subsequent imposition of liability, which shall be expressly established by law to the extent necessary to ensure:
 - a) respect for the rights or reputations of others; or b) the protection of national security, public order, or public health or morals.
3. The right of expression may not be restricted by indirect methods or means, such as the abuse of government or private controls over newsprint, radio broadcasting frequencies, or equipment used in the dissemination of information, or by any other means tending to impede the communication and circulation of ideas and opinions.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 2 above, public entertainments may be subject by law to prior censorship for the sole purpose of regulating access to them for the moral protection of childhood and adolescence.
5. Any propaganda for war and any advocacy of national, racial, or religious hatred that constitute incitements to lawless violence or to any other similar action against any person or group of persons on any grounds including those of race, color, religion, language, or national origin shall be considered as offenses punishable by law."

It is important to point out once again that all the international documents on human rights cited above, in addition to being binding on the Argentine state because of having undertaken the commitment at national level to observe all such human rights, enjoy constitutional hierarchy because they were included in our Constitution under section 75, subsection 22 after the 1994 constitutional reform. It is worth noting here that the Argentine Supreme Court of Justice holds that when applying any provision in these documents, enforcement should be done as "effectively applied at international level and particularly bearing in mind jurisprudence by the competent international

²¹ Cfr. Constitutional Spanish Court, Room One, sentence issued on 06/06/1990, reference # 105/1990

courts for the interpretation and enforcement thereof...".²²

This judicial doctrine makes the declarations of international human rights organizations, such as the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, sources for our legal system which should be resorted to when trying to establish the scope of a right expressly set forth in any international document which is part of federal constitutionality.²³ It is therefore important to stress the opinion of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, expressed in its jurisprudence, in connection with freedom of expression, which says that:

"64. As regards the contents of the right to freedom of thought and of expression, those who are under the protection of the Convention have not only the right and freedom to express their own thoughts but also the right and freedom to seek, receive and impart information of all kinds. Hence, freedom of expression involves an individual and a social dimension, to wit: it requires on the one hand that nobody should be arbitrarily demeaned or hindered in making manifest their thoughts and this therefore represents a right for each individual; however, it likewise implies, on the other hand, a collective right to receive any information and achieve insight into the thoughts of others. [...]"

67. The Court considers that both dimensions are equally important and are to be guaranteed simultaneously to make fully effective the right to freedom of thought and expression under the terms provided in article 13 of the Convention. [...]"

69. The European Court for Human Rights has pointed out that: [the] supervisory role [of the Court] requires it should [...] give particular attention to the principles typical of a "democratic society". Freedom of expression is one of the essential foundations of any society, one of the basic conditions for progress and development of mankind. Article 10.2 [of the European Convention on Human Rights] is valid not only for information or ideas that are favorably received or considered as harmless or indifferent, but also for those that shock or offend the State or any fraction of the population. Such are the demands of pluralism, tolerance and openness, without which a "democratic society" cannot exist...".²⁴

However, not all declarations are protected under this right to freedom of expression.

With the purpose of determining the boundaries of the protection provided under the right to freedom of expression, careful attention should be given to distinguishing between expressions referring to events in connection with which it is possible to predicate truth or falsity and those set forth in the form of opinions, ideas or value judgments.

22 Cfr. CSJN, "Giroldi", see text in "La Ley", Volume 1995-D, p. 461.

23 Made up of our Constitution and international human rights documents having constitutional hierarchy.

24 Inter-American Court of Human Rights, on *The Last Temptation of Christ* (Olmedo Bustos and others) vs. Chile, sentence issued on 5 February 2001. See also: Inter-American Court of Human Rights, *Compulsory membership in Association prescribed by Law for the Practice of Journalism* (Art.13 and 29 American Convention on Human Rights), Consultative Opinion OC-5/85 dated 13 November 1985. Series A No. 5, paragraph 30; *Ichter Bronstein v. Peru*, sentence issued by the Court on 6 February 2001; *Herrera Ulloa v. Costa Rica*, sentence dated 2 July 2004.

10.

The Spanish Constitutional Tribunal draws a difference between freedom of expression (i.e. issuing judgments and opinions) and freedom of information (i.e. describing facts): "The first, which involves stating personal opinions and beliefs, without affirming facts or objective data provides a field of action solely restricted by refraining from clearly injurious expressions not related to the ideas or opinions being set forth, and unnecessary in their expression: a field of action that becomes even broader when freedom of expression affects ideological freedom (...). Instead, when what is sought, rather than giving opinions, involves supplying information on facts and events that are held as true, constitutional protection extends solely to veracious information, which requirement of veracity cannot, obviously, be required of personal and subjective opinions. Certainly, it may be difficult or almost impossible on occasion, to separate, in a single text, informative elements from evaluative elements: in this case attention should be given to the prevailing element".²⁵

Freedom of expression finds its boundary in statements that are denigrating, racist or humiliating, or that directly incite such constitutionally unacceptable attitudes. Thus, a clear example of statements that do not receive protection under freedom of expression is "hate speech", which has been widely developed by foreign and international jurisprudence and has been defined as "all forms of expression which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance".²⁶

In our country, some statements of this nature receive penal punishment under section 3 of National Law 23592, which establishes that:

"A prison term of one month to three years will be given to any persons taking part in an organization or doing propaganda based on ideas or theories of superiority of a race or of a group of persons of a certain religion, ethnic origin or color with the purpose of justifying or promoting racial or religious discrimination of any nature. A similar punishment will apply to any person who in any manner encourages or incites persecution or hatred against a person or groups of persons for reasons of race, religion, nationality or political ideas".

A reading of this article shows it describes participation in organizations or propagandistic activities and encouragement or incitement to persecution or hatred. However, in the light of the definition of "hate speech" put forward above, section 3 of National Law 23592 does not cover all the behaviors catalogued as such.

Negation, justification or minimization of genocides – in particular the Shoah (Holocaust), the Armenian genocide and the State terrorism that took place during the last military dictatorship in Argentina – as historical events contrary to human rights, is a discriminatory practice

25 Cfr. Spanish Constitutional Tribunal, *op. cit.*

26 Cfr. European Court of Human Rights, *Gündüz v. Turkey*, sentence issued on 4 December 2003. Doctrine of the U.S. Supreme Court of Justice, known as "hate speech".

against persons and groups persecuted and/or exterminated solely because they belong to those groups, whether national, religious, ethnic, political, etc. It is therefore deemed necessary to expressly include the legislative proposal attached to this message in the national legal regulations, given that in many cases behaviors of this type occur concurrently with other actions or demonstrations which make it possible to frame them within the provisions in our Criminal Code in the light of full constitutional recognition or human rights, and are of a severity such that merits the creation of a specific criminal type.

In this instance it is worth resorting to comparative law, and it can be noted that similar provisions exist in several countries in the world, such as Germany, France, Switzerland, Belgium, Austria and Spain.

In Germany, negation of the Holocaust is considered a crime. Section 130 of the German Criminal Code establishes:
[...] "(3) Whoever publicly or in a meeting approves of, denies or renders harmless an act committed under the rule of National Socialism of the type indicated in Section 220a subsection (1) [genocide], in a manner capable of disturbing the public peace shall be punished with imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine".²⁷

France's "Gayssot Act" introduces a new article to the Law of Freedom of Press dated 29 July 1881, which amends the French Criminal Code, establishing:

"Article 24 b: The punishments provided for in paragraph six of Article 24 will apply to anybody denying, by the means set out in article 23, the existence of one or several crimes against humanity such as those defined in article 6 of the international military tribunal bylaws attached to the London agreement dated 8 August 1945 whether committed by members of an organization held as criminal under application of article 9 of said bylaws, or by a person held guilty of such crimes under French or international jurisdiction...".²⁸ Likewise, in connection with statements of a negationist nature – which cast doubts on gas chambers in the concentration camps being used for extermination – the U.N. Human Rights Committee held that such statements could potentially increase anti-Semitic feelings and, therefore, encroach on the right of the Jewish community to live without the fear of an anti-Semitic environment.²⁹

In Switzerland, article 261 b of the Criminal Code considers it a criminal offense subject to a punishment of up to one year of prison or the payment of a fine of 40 Swiss francs to: "...he who publicly, by word of mouth, in writing, by image, by gesture, by assault or in any other way, belittles or discriminates in a way which affects the human dignity of a person or a group of persons because of their race, their ethnic

27 Cfr. 1985 German Criminal Code, section 130.

28 Cfr. Law 90-615 dated 13 July 1990. Original text in French: "Article 24 bis: Seront punis des peines prévues par le sixième alinéa de l'article 24 ceux qui auront contesté, par un des moyens énoncés à l'article 23, l'existence d'un ou plusieurs crimes contre l'humanité tels qu'ils sont définis par l'article 6 du statut du tribunal militaire international annexé à l'accord de Londres du 8 août 1945 et qui ont été commis soit par les membres d'une organisation déclarée criminelle en application de l'article 9 dudit statut, soit par une personne reconnue coupable de tels crimes par une juridiction.

29 Faurisson v. France, U.N. Doc. CCPR/C/58/D/550/1993.

belonging to their religion or who, for the same reason, denies, grossly minimizes or tries to justify a genocide or other crime against humanity".³⁰

Belgium likewise has a law forbidding the negation of the Holocaust, article 1 of which establishes:

"Whoever, in the circumstances given in article 444 of the Penal Code³¹ denies, grossly minimizes, attempts to justify, or approves the genocide committed by the German National Socialist Regime during the Second World War shall be punished by a prison sentence of eight days to one year, and by a fine of twenty six francs to five thousand francs. For the application of the previous paragraph, the term genocide is meant in the sense of article 2 of the International Treaty of 9 December 1948 on preventing and combating genocide. In the event of repetitions, the guilty party may in addition have his civil rights suspended in accordance with article 33 of the Penal Code".³²

In Austria, negation of the Holocaust is punished under Law 148 since an amendment in 1992. This is an amendment to the law proscribing the Nazi Party (1945). The law declares that negation of the Holocaust and the crimes committed against humanity by the German National Socialist regime, or publicly endorsing, justifying or minimizing it in public involve a criminal offense³³ if the statements are political or propagandistic in nature.

For cases in which behavior is not of this nature, the offense shall be administrative.³⁴

The Spanish Criminal Code, on the other hand, contains the following text:

30 Cfr. Swiss Criminal Code, article 261 b)

31 Article 444 of the Belgian Criminal Code refers to: meetings or public places; or in the presence of several people, in places that are not public but accessible to a number of people who are entitled to meet at or visit said place; or anywhere in the presence of the offended person and before witnesses; or documents, whether printed or otherwise, illustrations or symbols shown, distributed, sold, offered for sale or publicly exhibited; or finally using documents that are not public but have been sent or distributed to several people.

32 Cfr. Law dated 23 March 1995, article 1.

33 The punishment established in Austrian legislation for committing a "criminal offense" is between 1 and 20 years of prison.

34 The punishment established in Austrian legislation for committing an "administrative offense" is a fine of 3,000 to 30,000 schillings (180 to 1,800 US dollars).

"Article 607.2: The spread by any means of ideas or doctrines denying or justifying the crimes [genocide and other similar] typified in the previous paragraph of this article, or seeking the rehabilitation of regimes or institutions to safeguard practices leading to this type of crimes will be punished by a one to two-year prison sentence".

13.

The Spanish case has a particular twist; the wording of this article was submitted for review by the Supreme Constitutional Tribunal of Spain, which declared the fragment "denying or" used in the article because it was deemed that – as the sentence is drawn up – the ban encroached on freedom of expression to the extent the el article did not require anything more than the "...mere expression of a point of view on certain events, and holding that they did not occur or were not performed in a manner that could be qualified as genocidal". The Tribunal likewise confirmed the constitutionality of the ban on justifying genocide, given that this implies "...relativizing or denying its illegitimacy based on a certain identification with the perpetrators (...)" the precept would be in line with the Constitution if it could be deduced from the wording that the behavior being penalized necessarily involves a direct incitement to violence against certain groups or contempt towards the victims of the crimes of genocide".³⁵

However, the abovementioned Tribunal held that "...allowing the right to express and spread a certain understanding of history or conception of the world with the deliberate intent of disparaging or discriminating, at the time such expressions are made, against persons or groups by reason of any personal, ethnic or condition or circumstance would be equivalent to admitting that, simply for citing a more or less historical version of events the Constitutions allows the violation of one of the higher values of legal regulations, which is equality (art. 1.1 CE) and one of the foundations of political order and social peace: a person's dignity (Art. 10.1 CE)".³⁶

The European Human Rights Tribunal also had the opportunity to given an opinion on the subject upon reviewing a petition concerning several articles devoted to combating the reality of the Holocaust with the declared aim of attacking the State of Israel and the Jewish people as a whole.³⁷ On that occasion it deemed that the denial of the Holocaust cannot be understood to be protected by freedom of expression to the extent it has the purpose of "racial vilification towards the Jews and inciting hatred towards them".³⁸

35 Spanish Constitutional Tribunal, sentence # 235/2007 dated 7 November 2007.

36 Spanish Constitutional Tribunal, sentence # 214/1991 dated 11 November 1991.

37 Solemn hearing of the European Court of Human Rights on the occasion of the opening of the judicial year: Thursday, 22 January 2004: "I would mention the Court's decision in the case of Garaudy against France. The applicant had challenged, among other things, his conviction for having questioned crimes against humanity, following the publication of a book with strong Holocaust denial overtones. The Court denied him the protection of Article 10 of the Convention, which protects freedom of expression, on the basis that Article 17 applied. According to the Court, a denial of the reality of clearly established historical facts, such as the Holocaust, was not the same thing as genuine historical research work aimed at establishing the truth. The true purpose of such research was to rehabilitate the National-Socialist regime and by the same token to accuse the victims themselves of having falsified history. Denial of crimes against humanity thus appeared to be one of the most acute forms of racial defamation of the Jews and of incitement to racial hatred of the Jews. That type of denial or rewriting of history called into question the values underpinning the fight against racism and anti-Semitism and posed a serious threat to public order. Such acts were incompatible with democracy and human rights, and were plainly intended to achieve objectives of the kind prohibited by Article 17 of the Convention. On the ground that the applicant's book as a whole displayed clear Holocaust denial overtones, the Court found it to be contrary to the fundamental values of the Convention, namely justice and peace."

On the basis of the national and international legislation and jurisprudence cited, it is legally valid to criminally prosecute any statements which, though pretending to take cover behind the broad protection of freedom of expression, affect the dignity and right to non-discrimination, particularly when such statements can be a direct incitement to committing crimes of violence, persecution or hatred;

14.

provided they are not understood to be the mere ideological expression of political positions of any nature, which would be fully protected by the constitutional acknowledgement of such right.

It should likewise be pointed out that on 26 January 2007, la the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution³⁹ condemning any attempt to deny the Holocaust and urging all the State Members to reject without reservations any total or partial negation of the Holocaust as a historical event, or any other activity having this as its aim.

It can, in short, be stated that the proposed project involves a constitutional limitation to freedom of expression by criminal law although it is not sanctioning the mere spread of ideas, but rather attempting to protect the constitutional value of dignity, sustaining the acknowledgement of the right to equality, non-discrimination and human rights in general.

For the reasons set out above, it is hereby requested Your Honor should give prompt treatment and approval to the bill of law attached hereto.

15.

THE SENATE AND CHAMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ARGENTINE NATION, MET TOGETHER IN CONGRESS, HEREBY ENACT THE FOLLOWING LAW:

Ban on the negation of the historical existence of genocide

Article 1: The following text shall be included in National Law 23.592 as article 3 bis:

A prison sentence of one (1) month to two (2) years will be applied to the crime of spreading or communicating by any means ideas or doctrines flagrantly denying, justifying or trivializing the historical existence of behaviors that could be framed within the crime of genocide, in particular the Shoah (or Holocaust), the Armenian genocide and the State terrorism that took place during the last military dictatorship in Argentina, in a manner affecting the dignity or right to non-discrimination of any person or groups of persons under any pretext, either directly or indirectly.

In those cases in which such behavior were executed in a manner such as to possibly imply an incitement to violence, persecution or hatred, the last paragraph of article 3 shall apply.

³⁸ Cfr. European Human Rights Tribunal, Garaudy c. France, 24 June 2003.

³⁹ MESSAGE 39 Resolution 61/255. Original text in English: "... 1. Condemns without any reservation any denial of the Holocaust; 2. Urges all Member Status unreservedly to reject any denial of the Holocaust as a historical event, either in full or in part, or any activities to this end."

Article 2: For the purposes of enforcing this law, the definition of "genocide" adopted is the one accepted at the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of the Crime Genocide⁴⁰ and in the Statute of Rome by the International Criminal Court.

Article 3: This present is to be communicated to the NATIONAL EXECUTIVE POWER.

The 57 senators present approved the law which already had the approval of the House of Representatives

On Wednesday 13 December 2006 the bill of law establishing 24 April as the "Day of Tolerance and Respect among Peoples" entered its last stages when submitted by the majority Frente para la Victoria block as a motion for order, abbreviating any legislative formalities with various commissions, in a clear reaffirmation of the will of the legislators in both chamber of the national Congress to approve this bill of law.

After approving the 2007 Budget, the Upper House chief Miguel Ángel Pichetto requested that treatment should be given to the bill of law that already had the approval by the House of Representatives. With the support of other legislators such as senators Vilma Ibarra (Ciudad Autónoma) and Negri de Alonso (San Luis) and senators Rubén Giustiniani (Santa Fe) and Carlos Alberto Rossi (Córdoba), the president of the Chamber, Vice President Daniel Scioli, approved the motion and treatment was given to the law.

The formalities were brief, for agreement had already been given previously, and following a further proposal by senator Pichetto, the law was submitted for consideration by the legislators present in the house, who unanimously voted affirmatively for this long-awaited legal regulation which marked the close of a painful chapter for the Armenian community.

"If we understand the enactment of this law by President Néstor Kirchner as a triumph, I feel the task of achieving our target is being conducted normally both by the political media and the community.

*** Armenia Newspaper**

ECHOES OF TURKISH NEGATIONISM protest against the Argentine law on Armenian genocide

The Turkish government officially complained to the Argentine authorities about a ruling issued by the National Congress. The law approved by the Argentine Parliament that sparked the irate reaction from the Turkish government is the law recognizing the genocide of over one million Armenians between 1915 and 1917 by the Ottoman Empire, the predecessor of what is currently Turkey.

In a statement published by the Argentine press, the Turkish Foreign Ministry expressed its repudiation and condemnation against the enactment in 2007 of the Argentine law on the Armenian "genocide", a term categorically rejected by Turkey. According to the Turkish ministry, the law would undermine the efforts towards reconciliation and create more enmity and hatred between the Turkish and Armenian peoples. "A country that has to confront certain incidents in its own history seeks to judge a certain part of the history of another country. This is neither serious nor ethical", held the Foreign Ministry statement, according to **The New Anatolian** newspaper. It likewise added that provided refuge to tens of thousands Armenians who pressured the government into acknowledging the petitions assuring the Ottoman Empire committed genocide against this ethnic group over ninety years ago.

Ratified by the Argentine Republic on 5 June 1956, under decree law 6286/56, and subsequently ratified under law 14467.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Armenia (Jean P.Alem) Buenos Aires, 1963
- Armenia. 90º Aniversario del genocidio armenio (Armenian Cultural Association)
- A Summary of Armenian History (A.Toynbee) London, 1915
- Armenia y la cuestión armenia (Simón Vratzian) Library of the La Plata University
- Armenia y la causa armenia (H.Thorosian) Buenos Aires, 1995
- Armin T.Wegner: polémica por los derechos humanos de armenios y judíos (Sybil Milton) Ierevan, 1990
- Cuatro años bajo la Media Luna (Raphael de Nogales) Buenos Aires, 1924
- El genocidio armenio. Su interrelación con el holocausto judío (Rita C. Kuyumciyan) Buenos Aires, 2006
- El derrumbre del negacionismo. Leandro Despouy, el informe Whitaker y otros (Khatchik Derghougassian (comp.) Buenos Aires, 2009
- El genocidio armenio en la prensa argentina (Nélida Boulgourdjian) Buenos Aires, 2005
- El mercado de esclavas de Kemal y el tratado de Lausana. El turco no ha cambiado (William T.Manning) United States, 1924
- El primer genocidio del siglo XX. Regreso de la memoria armenia (Rita C.Kuyumciyan) Buenos Aires. 2009
- El grito armenio: crónica de un genocidio y lucha por su reconocimiento (Mariano Saravia, Osvaldo Bayer) Córdoba, 2007
- El genocidio contra los armenios (Alfred de Zayas) Buenos Aires, 2009
- El Estado criminal. Los genocidas en el siglo XX (Yves Ternon) Barcelona, 1995
- El genocidio contra los armenios. 1915-1923, with a prologue by the International Commission of Jurists (Alfred de Zayas) Buenos Aires, 2009
- Historia del pueblo armenio (Ashod Artzruni) La Plata University Library
- La cuestión armenia y las relaciones internacionales (Pascual Ohanian) Buenos Aires. 1994
- Le rapport secret sur les massacres d'Arménien (Johannes Lepsius) París, 1918
- Les massacres en Arménie turque (Faiz el Hussein) Bombay, 1917
- Los determinantes del genocidio armenio (Vahakn N. Dadrián) Buenos Aires, 1999
- Los factores comunes en dos genocidios (Vahakn N. Dadrián) Buenos Aires, 2005
- Los elementos claves en el negacionismo turco del genocidio armenio (Vahakn N. Dadrián) Buenos Aires 200
- Los armenios. ¿El primer negacionismo del siglo XX? (Gunter Lewy) EE.UU. 2005
- Los armenios. Retrato de una esperanza (Huberta von Voss) Buenos Aires, 2007
- Los armenios en la Argentina (Eva Tabakian) La Plata University Library
- Los cuarenta días del Musa Dagh (Franz Werfel) Buenos Aires, 2004
- Memorias (Henry Morgenthau) Buenos Aires, 1975
- Media: Newspapers: Armenia, Clarín, La Nación, Página/12; Magazine: Realidad Económica. Internet
- Responsabilidad alemana en el genocidio armenio (Vahakn N.Dadrian) Massachusetts, 1996 Seis estudios sobre genocidio (Daniel Feierstein) Buenos Aires, 2000
- The Armenian Genocide in Perspective (Richard Hovannisian) United States, 1986
- Una visión desde Uruguay: el genocidio armenio noventa años después (Coriún Aharonián) Brecha, Uruguay, 1995



About the author

Súlím Granovsky was born in 1924 in the Buenos Aires neighborhood of Barracas. He went to a state school for primary and secondary schooling. To scrape together the money he needed to go to medical school at the University of Buenos Aires he worked in the publishing sector as a translator and corrector. Together with Eva Traiber, his teenaged girlfriend, later university mate and eventually his wife, he corrected the first Argentine edition of the **Diary of Anna Frank**, which, in response to the publisher's demand, they had to complete on their honeymoon.

His vocation for journalism evolved over the decades. Following the birth of his first son he started signing his articles with a pseudonym using his son's names inverted (Martín Enrique/Enrique Martín), a hunch that turned out to be a self-fulfilled prophecy, for from a very young age Martín opted for the wonderful trade of journalism.

Súlím worked freelance for **El Economista** and published opinion columns in other media, including **Página/12**. He edited the weekly financial back cover for **El Mundo** newspaper, directed the foreign trade magazine **Intercambio** and shared with constitutionalist and political expert Arturo Sampay in the creation and leadership of the magazine **Realidad Económica**. Over the years he editorialized in the cooperative journal **Acción**.

Comments: sulimgra@gmail.com

Copyright Súlím Granovsky

PARA MÍ!!!

<http://www.armenian-genocide.org/press.html>