

EDWARD G. DANIELYAN

THE ARMENIAN GENOCID OF 1894-1922
AND
THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE TURKISH STATE



Babylonian Map of the World
(VI century B.C.)

YEREVAN 2005

11680909
ՀՀ Դատախազի պաշտոնատեղում
20.04.2005



NOYAN TAPAN
YEREVAN 2005

Edward G. Danielyan

**THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE
OF 1894-1922 AND THE
ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE
TURKISH STATE**



ՀԱՅԿԱՆ ԳԵՂԱՐԱՆ
2003 ՆԱԽԱԳԻՐ

9(47.925)

W 94

D-18

Էդվարդ Գ. Դանիելյան

**ՀԱՅՈՑ ՑԵՂԱՍԴԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ
1894-1922 ԹՎԱԿԱՆՆԵՐԻՆ ԵՎ
ԹՈՒՐԷԱԿԱՆ ՊԵՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ
ՊԱՏԱՍԽԱՆԱՏՎՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ**

8753

Է. Դանիելյանի Զին

The publication of this book is guaranteed by the Armenian History Department and the Assembly of the History Faculty of Yerevan State University.

E. Danielyan

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE OF 1894-1922
AND THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE
TURKISH STATE /Edward Danielyan. - Yerevan,
"Noyan Tapan" Publishing House, page 56.

Editor: **Babken Harutyunyan**

Doctor, Professor of Historical Sciences

Translator: **Sevan Yousefian**

For the first time the author is examining the major issues of the Armenian Genocide from a new perspective and demonstrates, using factually rich materials, that the Genocide was implemented from 1894-1922. The author sheds light upon the causes of the Genocide, its various stages, and the accountability of the three Turkish regimes, as well as upon the lessons and consequences of the Genocide.

This book is intended for use by Armenologists, historians, students, and by a wide international readership.

Հեղինակն առաջին անգամ նոր տեսանկյունից է քննում հայոց ցեղասպանության հիմնահարցը և փաստական հարուստ նյութով ցույց է տալիս, որ այն իրագործվել է 1894-1922թթ: Լուսարանվում են ցեղասպանության պատճառները, փուլերը, թուրքական երեք վարչակարգերի պատասխանատվությունը և ցեղասպանության դասերն ու հետևանքները:

Նախատեսվում է հայագետ-պատմաբանների, ուսանողության և օտարալեզու ընթերցողների լայն շրջանների համար:

ISBN 99941-44-16-2

© E. Danielyan

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	7
1. THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE AS THE BASIS FOR THE UN CONVENTION ON GENOCIDE	9
2. THE CAUSES OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE	12
3. THE FIRST STAGE OF GENOCIDE: THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE SULTAN'S REGIME	21
4. THE SECOND STAGE OF GENOCIDE: THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE YOUNG TURK REGIME	24
5. THE THIRD STAGE OF GENOCIDE: THE GENOCIDE OF THE EASTERN ARMENIANS AND THE CREATION OF AN OGHUZ STATE	31
6. THE FOURTH STAGE OF GENOCIDE: THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE KEMALIST REGIME	39
7. THE LESSONS AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE GENOCIDE	42
THE GENOCIDE OF THE ARMENIANS, 1894-1922	46
ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ	47
WORKS CITED	52

ԲՈՎԱՆԴԱԿՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

ԱՌԱՋԱԲԱՆ	7
1. ՀԱՅՈՑ ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ ՈՐՊԵՍ ՆԱԽԱՀԻՄՔ «ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՄԱՍԻՆ» ՍԱԿ-Ի ԿՈՆՎԵՆՑԻԱՅԻ ՀԱՍԱՐ	9
2. ՀԱՅՈՑ ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՊԱՏՃԱՌՆԵՐԸ	12
3. ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ 1-ԻՆ ՓՈՒԼԸ. ՍՈՒԼԹԱՆԱԿԱՆ ՎԱՐՉԱԿԱՐԳԻ ՊԱՏԱՍԽԱՆԱՏՎՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ	21
4. ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ 2-ԻՆ ՓՈՒԼԸ. ԵՐԻՏԹՈՒՐՔԱԿԱՆ ՎԱՐՉԱԿԱՐԳԻ ՊԱՏԱՍԽԱՆԱՏՎՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ	24
5. ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ 3-ԻՆ ՓՈՒԼԸ. ԱՐԵՎԵԼԱՀԱՅԵՐԻ ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ. ՕՂՈՒԶԱԿԱՆ ՊԵՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՍՏԵՂԾՈՒՄԸ ԳՈՐԾՈՂՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՄԵՋ	31
6. ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ 4-ԻՆ ՓՈՒԼԸ. ՔԵՍԱԼԱԿԱՆ ՎԱՐՉԱԿԱՐԳԻ ՊԱՏԱՍԽԱՆԱՏՎՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ	39
7. ՀԱՅՈՑ ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԴԱՍԵՐՆ ՈՒ ՀԵՏԵՎԱՆՔՆԵՐԸ	42
ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ	47

INTRODUCTION

After the Congress of Berlin the Ottoman Empire proclaimed the Genocide of the Armenians to be state policy, as the Turkish means of "solving" the Armenian Question. The practical application of the Genocide began in the 1890s and continued in several stages until 1922. It is the Turkish state that is accountable for the Genocide, because it was implemented by all of its regimes; that of the Sultan, the Young Turks, and the Kemalists. However, that which took place during the years of the First World War was unprecedented in its scale and in the wicked manner in which it was executed. It was during these years that the Turkish government, which cultivated the massacres with the greatest attention to detail, carried out the universal Genocide of the Armenians. The Ottoman government destroyed and forcibly deported not only the Armenians of Western Armenia, but those living in other parts of the Empire as well. Over 1,500,000 Western Armenians perished during the Genocide, and Western Armenia was drained of its Armenian population.

Turkey, however, was not satisfied with the Genocide of the Western Armenians alone. The Bolshevik coup in Russia and the abandonment of the Caucasian front by Russian soldiers provided the perfect moment for the Turks for fulfilling their pan-Turkish program. They intended to completely destroy the Armenian wedge separating Turkey from other Turkish-speaking peoples by occupying Eastern Armenia and annihilating the eastern portion of the Armenian people. The Turkish campaigns of 1918 and 1920 were launched with this goal in mind. It is easy to imagine what fate the Armenian people would have had, had it not been for the heroic battles of May (from Sardarabad to Baku) and the reestablishment of Armenian statehood in 1918.

The Armenian Genocide is an unfinished chapter in world history, for the guilty party has yet to receive the punishment it deserves, and the Armenians have yet to be compensated. If, in the case of the Jews, the victim receives material compensation, which Germany is paying to this day, then in the case of the Armenians it is to be the return of the captured homeland which was emptied of its Armenian population, as well.

Multiple works, memoirs, and articles about this unprecedented crime in the history of man have been written in many different languages, compilations of documents have been published in which the process of the wide spread massacre and deportations of the Armenians are described in great detail. The general conclusion is that the methodic extermination of the Armenians was implemented according to a highly detailed, pre-cultivated program.

The academic study of the consequences of the massacres of the Armenians does not have merely academic significance, but political significance as well, as it demonstrates the tragic results that may occur when a state authority adopts an ideology of race-worship.

The lessons of history show that different peoples pay dearly when crimes against humanity are forgotten. The size of a people has no significance when the theory of race-worship is raised to the level of an official state policy. One recalls German fascism, which proclaimed that the destruction of the numerically superior Slavic peoples was a necessity for the Germans. It was the lack of punishment for the Armenian Genocide that encouraged Hitler during the implementation of the physical destruction of the Slavs, Jews, and Gypsies. In Oberzaltsberg, on August 22, 1939, during a consultation with the High Command of the Third Reich, Hitler cynically announced that, "our strength is in our blitzkrieg and in our brutality...who today remembers the massacre of the Armenians?"

This was a challenge to the memory of humanity, and testifies to that truth, that forgetting the lessons of history always commands a high price from man.

1. THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE AS THE BASIS FOR THE UN CONVENTION ON GENOCIDE

If the 20th century, on the one hand, was a period of unprecedented progress in the history of mankind, it was also, on the other hand, an era of great ethno-political tremors, and the continual genocides of peoples. It is no accident that a new field of historical study has been formed, the field of genocide studies. Centers of genocide studies have been founded in many countries; the United States, Germany, France, England, Austria, Sweden, Russia, Armenia, Israel, and elsewhere.

The Polish-Jewish lawyer, Raphael Lemkin, had a massive role in the birth of the above mentioned field of scholarship. He created the term "genocide" (from the Greek "genos", clan, tribe, nation, and from the Latin "cide", to kill). Lemkin also had a significant role in the formulation of the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of December 9, 1948. We can say without exaggeration that through his works of the 1930s, Lemkin was the father of an ideology in the sphere of historical-law, genocide studies. In October of 1933, appearing in a conference dedicated to the unification of international criminal law, Lemkin gave a presentation on the specific elements of crimes against humanity. According to Lemkin such elements are:

- a) The forcible handing over of children from one group of people to another;
- b) The systematic and compulsory destruction of specific elements of the culture of a certain group;
- c) The prohibition of the use of a national language, even in personal communication;

d) The demolition of schools, museums, historical monuments, and other cultural institutions, or the prohibition of their use.¹

In his report Lemkin suggested that all activities intended to annihilate a national, religious, or social group be proclaimed barbaric crimes from the standpoint of international law, and that a convention on the punishment and prevention of similar acts be accepted.

Let us turn our attention to the fact that, when Lemkin was defining genocide (although he did not use the term "genocide" at the time) and characterizing it as a barbaric crime, the Holocaust of the Jews and the genocide of the Slavs and Gypsies by Hitler's Germany had not yet taken place. In this case, the position of genocide scholars is correct that the Armenian Genocide, as the first genocide of the 20th century, served as the foundation for Lemkin's characterization of genocide in 1933.²

The facts allow us to make further conclusions. The Armenian Genocide served as a basis for Lemkin not only in his characterization of crimes against humanity, but also in the creation of the term "genocide", and in the cultivation of the 1948 UN Convention on Genocide. In one of his letters, Lemkin writes, "[t]hat convention [the UN Convention on Genocide, E.D.] was a question of compassion and the examination of our personal attitude towards evil. I know, that July and August are extremely hot for working, but not wanting to be sentimental or to make colorful pronouncements, I shall say nevertheless, let us not forget, that this month's heat is not as heavy for us as the temperature of the crematoriums of Auschwitz, or of the killer heat of the desert of Aleppo, which turned the bodies of the victims of the 1915 genocide, of hundreds of thousands of Christian Armenians, into ashes".³ As we can see, Lemkin, the founder of a convention "on the crime of genocide", regarded the cannibalistic crime of the Young Turk regime as genocide.

Our studies have shown us that the "era" of genocide began with the Armenian Genocide, which, however, was committed by the Turkish state not only in 1915, but from 1894-1922. In their studies and theoretical conclusions scholars of genocide (Christopher Walker,

David Marshall Lang, Jean-Marie Carzou, Yves Ternon, Franklin Littell, Helen Fein, Viktor Raevski, Moussa Prince, and others)⁴ have made use of the materials of the Armenian Genocide. They accept that, of crimes against humanity by means of genocide, the first was implemented against the Armenians⁵, and that it was indeed a "model genocide".⁶

Scholars of genocide have outlined several basic issues as topics for investigation; the causes and standards of genocide, their general and distinguishing features, the system of government of the country implementing genocide, the role of racist ideology, the victim and the executioner of genocide (victimization) and so on.

2. THE CAUSES OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

What were the causes of the Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire? Was it at all possible to avoid genocide?

According to the Turks, the Western Armenians "were threatening" the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire, which became a reason for their massacre and deportation, which subsequently raises the question, if that was the case, why, then, did the thuggish Turkish government subject the Eastern Armenians to genocide as well? Shedding light upon these questions is necessary in order to demonstrate the Turkish government's false and deceptive conception of the Genocide and the Armenian Question.

In the theoretical system of genocide studies the scholars (Michael Banks, Barbara Harff, and others)⁷ have brought forth the theory of victimization, according to which a certain people becomes the victim of genocide not at the moment of the genocide's execution, but, in a chronological sense, long before. Victimization is a lengthy process, conditioned by certain causes and factors. The complete study of the causes of the Armenian Genocide provides a typical example of victimization.

The policy of the physical destruction of the Armenians at a state level was implemented from 1894-1922. However, the roots of genocide and the victimization of the Armenian people run much deeper. They must be sought in the essence of the Ottoman Empire.

Why was Ottoman Turkey genocidal from the beginning? This is explained by the following. The Turks were nomadic tribesmen, who, through predatory warfare, settled in foreign countries, including Armenia. **In all occupied countries the Turks were an alien element and composed a very small part of the population. In such**

conditions the turkification of the homelands of the conquered peoples and their transformation into a new Turkish homeland became a pressing issue for the Turks.

Conquering most of Armenia, the Turks, from the beginning, perpetuated a policy of ethnic discrimination, with various manifestations:

- a) The forcible conversion of Armenians to Islam and their assimilation;
- b) The massacres of non-submissive Armenians, and the creation of conditions conducive to the emigration of Armenians from their homeland;
- c) The changing of the demographic make-up of Armenia via the settlement of Turkish and Kurdish tribal units;
- d) Levies of Armenian boys and girls ("Forcibly transferring children from the group to another group", UN Convention).

In agreement with the UN Convention on Genocide, each of the following five actions is considered to be an act of genocide:

1. The killing of the members of the group;
2. Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
3. Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
4. Imposing measures intended to prevent birth within the group;
5. Forcibly transferring children from the group to another group.⁸

It is easy to see, that in Western Armenia and other conquered Christian countries the Turkish government from early on consistently executed actions cited in the UN Convention. The Western Armenians were a target of victimization from the 16th to the 18th centuries. The Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbs, and Romanians, were also subjected to victimization. However, if the above mentioned peoples were saved from mass genocide by the reestablishment of their national-political independence, the same did not take place, unfortunately, in the case of the Western Armenians.

We can conclude that, although the Turkish state executed the mass genocide of the Armenians in several stages from 1894-1922,

the ideological roots of genocide go back centuries, and its main purpose was the creation of a new Turkish homeland in Western Armenia by ridding it of Armenians.

The goal of the Genocide was the elimination of the Armenian Question. There are no Armenians, therefore there is also no Armenian Question. This was the nature of the Turkish manner of eliminating the Armenian problem.

Beginning from the Congress of Berlin in 1878, the liberation of Armenia ceased to be an internal Armenian issue and, now known as the "Armenian Question", was raised to the level of international diplomacy through the efforts of the European Powers. The internationalization of the Armenian Question made the implementation of the massacres of the Armenians more and more of a necessity for the Sultan's court.

The Sultan and his associates spoke aloud and without fear of the need to physically exterminate the Armenians. The deputy of the Russian vice-consul in Van wrote to Novikov, the Russian ambassador in Constantinople, that "besides, more high level government officials are openly pronouncing that a second Bulgaria is forming here, and that, really, having learned from experience, they will be able to strangle the element that poses a danger to their government, and, by those means, once and for all put an end to the Armenian Question."

It is clear that the Turkish manner of "solving" the Armenian Question was the wiping out of the Armenians, which after 1878 became state policy. Leaving that to the opportune moment, the Sultan's government took measures which would make the implementation of the reforms outlined in Article 61 of the Congress of Berlin impossible, which were to be carried out in Western Armenia, and which could have been one of the first steps on Armenia's path to independence.

Instead of carrying out his promised reforms, Sultan Abdul Hamid intensified the discrimination and persecution of the Armenians. The use of the term "Armenia" was forbidden in official correspondences, where it was replaced by the words "Kurdistan" and

"Anatolia". The authorities organized the wide-scale seizure of land belonging to Armenians, as a result of which the economically ruined Armenian villagers were forced to leave their homeland. The seeds of an artificial hostility were sown between the Armenian and Muslim peoples. Armenian language performances were banned in Constantinople in 1879. Armenian schools were placed under the strictest supervision, the teaching of Armenian history was forbidden.

From the end of the 1870s the Sultan's regime drastically changed the nature of its colonial policy in Western Armenia. Its administrative and demographic policies acquired new form, with the goal of artificially increasing the percentage of the Muslim population in Western Armenia. One historical document states that "the Turks will not be satisfied with massacres and the forced conversion to Islam of the Armenians... They have consecutively applied the following methods:

1. Divide those regions, where the Armenians form a majority, into multiple sections and attach those sections to parts that are located outside of Armenia... by that new administrative method they are succeeding in strangling the Armenian element;
2. They were placing Muslims who have emigrated from the Caucasus and Balkans among the peaceful Armenian population. The Turks avoid releasing the actual number of immigrants, although their detailed list currently exists in the immigration office. By accident I acquired some official information along those lines. In a March, 1339 AH sitting of the Palace of Deputies the director of the immigration office, Hamid bey, defending his agency from criticisms... announces that from 1878-1908 the number of Muslim settlers was over 854,000 (official paper, page 750, record of the 49th sitting of the Palace of Deputies). After the Constitution, 1908-1911, and especially after the Balkan War, the number of Muslim immigrants was enormous and they were all placed in Armenia, in order to reduce the Armenian majority in Armenia, whose name is even prohibited from being pronounced, and now they have officially named Armenia the 'six Eastern

Vilayets';

3. Publish not only incorrect statistical information, but also inflate the number of Muslims by implementing a variety of machinations."¹⁰

In order to demonstrate the non-existence of the Armenian Question in the Ottoman Empire, Turkish statistics employed fairy-tale falsehoods, which have been refuted by even Turkish sources. Until the internationalization of the Armenian Question Turkish statistics were relatively objective in their representation of the number of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. According to the official Turkish "Salname" (statistical chronicle) the Armenian population in the six Armenian vilayets was **3,015,000** in the 1850s. According to other data there were, in 1870, 17,218,000 people living in the Asian regions of the Empire, of whom **3,600,000** were Armenians.¹¹ Only two years after the internationalization of the Armenian Question, on July 5, 1880, the foreign minister of Turkey, Abedin Pasha, noted in a reply to be sent to European ambassadors in Constantinople, that there was a total of 700,000 Armenians in the entire Empire.¹² No more, no less, even when from 1870-1880, in a span of ten years, the Armenian population would have grown by at least several hundred thousand.

From that moment until today, the Turkish state, in order to cover up the great crime it committed, has always presented a reduced number of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, "forgetting" that contemporary Turkish sources give a more or less accurate account of the size of the Armenian population.

One of the major results of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878 and the Congress of Berlin was that the Turks were virtually expelled from Europe, after which the issue of the establishment of a separate homeland became even more imperative for the Turkish authorities. They fixed their eyes upon the East, especially upon Armenia. Foreign researchers have also documented this fact. The English historian David Kushner writes in his work, **The Rise of Turkish Nationalism, 1876-1908**, that even in the period of Abdul Hamid, the

Turkish press was widely promoting the concept of "Turkish Anatolia", according to which Anatolia belonged to no one but the Turks.¹³

The other cause of the Armenian Genocide must be seen in the widespread ideology of pan-Turkism. In what conditions did pan-Turkism come forth, and what was its leading aim? The viability of the Ottoman Empire was based upon wars of conquest, and it is no coincidence that the downfall of the Empire began from the moment those wars ceased. From the mid-19th century the major concern of the Sultan's regime was the preservation of the territorial integrity of the Empire. With that goal in mind, ideologies of race-worship sprang forth, such as **Ottomanism, pan-Islamism, Turkism, and pan-Turkism**. The process of history, however, has shown that through Ottomanism and pan-Islamism the prevention of the break-up of the Empire was impossible. The rise of the liberation movements of the native peoples living under the domination of the foreign Turks, particularly in the Balkans, forced the Turkish government to adopt Turkism and pan-Turkism as the cornerstones of the domestic and foreign policies of the Young Turk regime.

In one of the secret meetings of the Young Turk Party Dr. Nazim, justifying Turkism and Pan-Turkism, made the nonsensical argument that "[w]e [the Turks] should ponder well, why did we start a revolution, what goal were we pursuing? I do not want to think that our goal was to eliminate Sultan Hamid's men and take their places. I have become your comrade, your comrade-in-arms, and your brother, *so that we revive Turkism*. I desire that on this land the Turk, and only the Turk, will live and become the full lord and master. *Let all non-Turkish elements disappear, no matter what nationality and religion they may belong to. Our country must be cleansed of all non-Turkish elements. Religion has no significance or meaning to me. My religion is Turan.*"¹⁴ [Italics are mine, E.D.]

Party Central Committee member Dr. Behaeddin Shekir added, stressing the deficiencies of Ottomanism, that, "If a wretch, such as Moses, if a fugitive, such as Jesus, and an orphan, such as

Mohammed, were able to create the separate major religions of the world, why cannot we, men in possession of strong will and intelligence, *create and spread the religion and idea of Turan?...We are required to cleanse our homeland of the remaining foreign peoples, to uproot them like weeds. This is the goal and motto of our movement.* For that reason we have given the name 'Government of New Turkey' to the authority of Ittihad, *reducing to zero the name of 'Ottoman'...* Being divided into various elements, the Ottoman mongrel does not have its national face, it is similar to the piling of different domestic animals into one household...It is necessary to reject similar conceptions. Just as the goose, the duck, the chicken, the sheep, the cow, the goat, the ox, the buffalo, and the horse live side-by-side on the farm and do not change their species, so have those nationalities remained on our land, without changing their nationality or language. In favorable circumstances they even press the Turks and secede...as have done, for example, the Romanians, the Serbs, the Bulgarians, and just recently, the Albanians."¹⁵ [Italics are mine, E.D.]

The 1911 congress of the party of "Union and Progress" officially rejected Ottomanism, and even the leaders of Russian pan-Turkism, Gasdrinski, Ali Husein Zade, and Akchura, were elected to the Central Committee of the Young Turk Party. The defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan Wars was at the same time celebrated as the final victory of pan-Turkism in and of itself. Pan-Turkism was then proclaimed as the official ideology of Young Turk Party and of the Turkish state.¹⁶

The main concern of pan-Turkism was the unification of all Turkish speaking peoples in one unified Turkish state, Great Turan. Essentially, a Turkish speaking eastern empire was to be created, which was to include the territory falling between the Bosphorus and China and the Arctic Ocean.

Armenia was so situated that it formed a great barrier in the path of Great Turan. The Armenian people were separating the Turks and the Turkish speaking people of Russia from one another like a wedge, which had to be destroyed.

The ideologue of pan-Turkism, Zia Gyok Alp, who at the same time was a member of the Young Turk Central Committee, describing the essence of Turkism in detail, in his work, "The Foundations of Turkism", separates its implementation into three stages¹⁷:

1. Turkism: In this stage it was assumed that Ottoman Turkey would be turkified, during which both the intelligentsia and the government had their respective roles:

- a. The intelligentsia was to deal with the turkification of the people, which meant inundating the instinctual patriotism of the Turkish people with the ideology of Turkism, and to create a national culture;
- b. The government had to turkify the country, knowing that the Ottoman nation does not exist. It must rely exclusively upon the Turkish element, and avoid mixing the Turk with the Muslim. Other peoples do not have the right to exist, they must assimilate or disappear, "henceforth, only one single nation can be in Turkey, the Turk."¹⁸

One can see that, according to the first stage of pan-Turkism, the conquered peoples, including the Western Armenians, had to assimilate into the alien Turkish people, or be exterminated.

2. The creation of an Oghuz state. A new Turkish state was to be created in this stage. It was to include Ottoman Turkey and both Russian and Persian Adrbadakan (Azerbaijan). Therefore, the implementation of the second stage of pan-Turkism required the conquest of Eastern Armenia and the destruction of the Eastern Armenians.

3. Pan-Turkism. In this stage a united Turanic state was to be formed. All Turkish speaking peoples were to be united within Great Turan. Pan-Turkism afforded the Armenians no third alternative. The two portions of the Armenian people had to either turkify, or be annihilated.

Economic factors also played a certain role in the causes of the Genocide. In the infamous secret meeting of the Young Turk Party, where the necessity for the destruction of the Armenians was “laid out”, one of the presenters, Djavit, apart from political motives singled out economic motives as well. “As much as the extermination of the Armenians is necessary to our national policy, *it is equally necessary for the founding of the economic authority of the Turks.*”¹⁹ [Italics are mine, E.D.]

Despite the unfavorable conditions, the Armenian merchant class was able to acquire great wealth. By exterminating the Armenians the Turks, first and foremost, would gain control of their wealth, and secondly, they would destroy a potential formidable rival of the rising Turkish bourgeoisie. Documenting this fact, the English historian Gotlieb notes the envy of the Turks towards the more economically and culturally developed Armenians.²⁰

The Armenian Genocide, without historical precedent, was implemented in a time period of over a quarter of a century, and continued, with certain pauses, until 1922. It is possible to divide the Genocide into four stages.

3. THE FIRST STAGE OF GENOCIDE: THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE SULTAN'S REGIME

The first stage included the time period of 1894-1896. **This was the period of the Sultan's rule.** It was at this time that the partial, albeit continuous, massacres of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire were replaced by massacres on a mass scale. Military and political authorities, Kurdish Hamidiye cavalry units, and Muslim mobs all participated in the crime. The pogroms of the Western Armenians took place not only in Western Armenia, but in the other Armenian populated regions of the Empire as well. A large number of documents have been preserved, which testify to the organization of the genocidal activities by the Sultan's regime, their premeditated nature, and the barbaric manner in which they were carried out. A part of these was published overseas. In “Les Massacres d'Arme'nie. T'moignages des victimes”, published in Paris in 1896, we find the following description of the massacres taking place in Arabkir, “[t]hey began to murder, to burn...some they throw into the fire, some they hang upside down and skin like sheep, the others they slaughter and cut up with axes and sickles, they pour oil on others and light them on fire, upon whom they throw other victims, who suffocate from the smoke...They tear of the women's breasts, quarter them, pour gunpowder on their braids and light them. They slice open the stomachs of pregnant women, remove the child, and kill them. Scenes of the same sort are continuously repeated in other areas as well, for example, in Balu, Sivas, Erzerum, Caesarea.

“As the documents testify, the military directly participated in the massacres: 3000 regular and 1500 Hamidiye soldiers in Urfa; in Arabkir, 1600 regulars and redifs... In Sivas, regular troops and gen-

darmanie; the same in Erzerum, Balu, Trabzon, Sghert."²¹

Although it is true that in some areas the Armenians were able to defend themselves, the losses, however, were gigantic. In agreement with the reports of the ambassadors of the European powers and contemporary press releases 300,000 Western Armenians fell victim to the pogroms of 1894-1896, about 100,000 were forcibly converted to Islam, over 3,000 Armenian villages were razed and pillaged, many formerly populated regions of Western Armenia were deserted. 300,000 Armenians emigrated to Persia, France, the Balkans, and America. Tens of thousands of girls and women were abducted.

The following table presents a clear picture of the consequences of the genocidal policy practiced by the Sultan's government towards the Western Armenians:

Table 1²²

Location	1882	1912
Western Armenia	1,630,000	1,018,000
Cilicia	380,000	407,000
Other Regions of the Ottoman Empire	650,000	675,000
TOTAL	2,660,000	2,100,000

In normal conditions the growth rate of the Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire would have been close to 4 percent.²³ We see a similar trend in demographic data of Modern Turkey:

Table 2²⁴

Population growth in Turkey in approximately 30 year periods

	Population
1927	13,648,000
1960	27,755,000
1950	20,947,000
1983	47,279,000

As the numbers show, in a period of about 30 years the population of modern Turkey doubled, growing at a yearly rate of approximately 3.5%. Certainly, in the agricultural Ottoman Empire of the 19th century, the rate of growth would have been higher.

In a period of 30 years, from 1882-1912, the size of the Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire declined by 560,000 people, despite the fact that in normal conditions it should have more than doubled, reaching approximately 5,500,000. The significance of this number is clear when we see that when the Republic of Turkey was proclaimed in 1923 the total population was 12,532,000 people.²⁵

4. THE SECOND STAGE OF GENOCIDE: THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE YOUNG TURK REGIME

The second stage of the Genocide encompasses the years of the First World War, **during the reign of the Young Turk regime**. The primary concern of the Sultan's regime was the preservation of the territorial integrity of the Empire, the prevention of a new Bulgaria appearing in Western Armenia. This blood-soaked policy was "founded" on the shameless and oft repeated proclamations that in order to solve the Armenian Question it was necessary to exterminate the Armenians. The Young Turks inherited that policy, but gave it a theoretical foundation springing from pan-Turkish imperialism.

Turkish falsifiers of history today continue to put into circulation the arguments of the leaders of the Young Turk regime that the deportation and massacres of the Western Armenians took place due to the threat posed to the Ottoman Empire by Armenian uprisings. It is hardly necessary to explain that the decisions of the Salonica Congress of 1910, several years prior to the heroic battle of self-defense at Van, decided the fate of the non-Turkish peoples. The program of the extermination of the Armenians was especially important:

- a) Once and for all bring an end to the Armenian Question;
- b) The country will be freed of Armenians, all of Anatolia will become a homogenous country inhabited by Turks;
- c) The wealth of the Armenians will become the property of the Turkish state;
- d) With the disappearance of the greatest barrier a path will open for the realization of the great ideal, the idea of pan-Turkism.²⁶

The Ottoman imperial state entered WWI with grand and futile plans, which yielded nothing to the dreams of the Kaiser's Germany.

The Young Turk regime planned to create a vast Turkish state, which was to include the Caucasus, Crimea, the Volga region, and Central Asia, as well as parts of Iran, China, and India.

The Armenian people formed a great barrier in the path of the Turkish adventurers, the expansive Armenian homeland was stuck like a wedge between Turkey on the one side, and the Turkish speaking peoples of Russia on the other. It was necessary to destroy the Armenian wedge, to exterminate the Armenian people, to completely empty Armenia of Armenians.

The Turkish government saw WWI as the opportune moment to remove the impediments to the implementation of its mad program. First, it was convinced of the impending defeat of Russia in the war. Second, they would turn the entire world upside-down, pushing into the background the international barriers hindering the enactment of the plan to kill the Armenians. "The Armenians are dangerous, like a tumor...It is necessary to work quickly. If we are satisfied with a partial massacre, as occurred in Adana and other areas in 1909, that will do more harm than good, because we will create the danger of awakening those elements, which we also intend to remove from our path; the Arabs, the Kurds...In this meeting I have told you several times, and I am repeating it now, if the cleansing is not universal and final, then instead of good, harm is unavoidable. We must uproot the Armenian element from its foundation, in order that not one Armenian will remain in our land...It is now war, a convenient moment like this will not come again. The interference of the Great Powers and the world press will go unnoticed, and if they do find out, they will stand before the established fact and like that the question will be closed...it is necessary to annihilate all, to the last man."²⁷ Such was the nonsense preached by Dr. Nazim in one of the meetings putting into operation the massacre of the Armenians.

Those present at the same meeting voted unanimously in favor of the extermination of the Armenians. "At the suggestion of Talaat the votes were collected and counted. The results showed that all those present voted unanimously in favor the wiping out of the Armenians

right up to the last man."²⁸

The application of the mass destruction and deportation of the Western Armenians was assigned to the Committee of Three, Nazim, Behaeddin, and the Minister of "Enlightenment", Midhat Shukri. One of the figures of the Young Turk Party, Mevlan Zade Rifat, revealed the details of the prior organization of the Armenian Genocide by the government in his memoirs. He notes that the Committee of Three was an independent, unofficial executive body responsible to no one. It was a state within a state. It had its office officialdom and regulations. By its decision it enlisted criminals from prisons and created the "chete" gangs.²⁹

Each member of the Committee was to organize the killing of Armenians in one of three zones, which were composed of various Armenian populated regions of the Empire; Western Anatolia, Eastern Anatolia (Western Armenia), Cilicia and Northern Syria. The supervision of the Committee was assigned to Minister of the Interior Talaat.

In such a way, The Armenian Genocide was premeditated, planned with the utmost attention to detail, and prepared by the Turkish Government.

The application of that diabolical program began with "politicide", the extermination of the internal strength of a people; its chief public, political, national, and religious figures. The goal of the Turkish government was to deny the Western Armenians the opportunity to organize an effective resistance, allowing the government to carry out the mass extermination and deportation of the Western Armenians with impunity. First, the militarily capable portion of the Western Armenian population was isolated. Under the pretext of a general conscription and the assignment of Armenians to labor units, Armenian males from the age of 15-60 were separated from their families and conscripted. They were then, from late 1914-early 1915, gradually, under the strictest secrecy, liquidated.

The second stage of the program's application was the destruction of the intellectual strength of the Western Armenians. On April 24,

1915, 235 recognized Armenian intellectuals were arrested in Constantinople. Several days later their number reached 800. After unheard of torture they were brutally murdered.

With the amputation of the hands and the decapitation of the Western Armenians, and through their isolation from the outside world, the government took the third step, the mass murder, deportation, and exile of defenseless and helpless women, children, and the elderly. This was a genocide that, by its cruelty, was unprecedented in the history of man, during which over 1,500,000 people perished.

The Armenians who escaped the massacres can be divided into three groups. One group, mainly women and children, were forcibly converted to Islam and remained in the country. According to the British "Blue Book" they numbered 250,000 people³⁰, according to Lepsius: 200,000.³¹ The second group was exiled to the Arabian deserts of Mesopotamia. The third group, approximately 200,000 people, fled and found refuge in areas near the Caucasian front, generally in Eastern Armenia.³²

The second and largest group was made up of those Armenians, whom the Turkish government was not able to destroy on the path of deportation. They were exiled to the northern and eastern regions of the Mesopotamian deserts, where concentration camps were constructed. According to document #139 of February 3, 1916, of the "Blue Book", these survivors numbered 586,000.³³

The deserts of Mesopotamia, however, were not the savior of the exiles. Orders from the Turkish government, bearing Talaat's signature, arrived demanding the physical destruction of the deportees. In the spring of 1916 they were subjected to three terrible massacres, as a result of which approximately 320,000 Armenians perished.³⁴

The ringleaders of the Young Turk regime, as well as the modern Turkish historians and politicians that mimic them, argue that the displacement of the Armenians was a "necessary" measure arising from wartime conditions. The massacres of the Western Armenian exiles sent to the Arabian deserts demonstrate that the true purpose of the deportations was the extermination of the Armenians. By 1916 no

Armenians remained in Western Armenia. Alluding to the removal of Armenians from Armenia and the Armenian Genocide, Lord Curzon, in the December 13 sitting of the Conference of Lusanne, addressed the Turkish delegation, headed by Ismet pasha, asking "how did it occur, that the number of Armenians living in Asia Minor has decreased from 3,000,000 to 130,00...perhaps they committed suicide, or they left voluntarily? Under what pressure did that decrease take place...why are hundreds of thousands of Armenians scattered in all parts of the world as a result of those deportations, at a time when they must follow the loving invitations of the Turkish government? And finally, why is the Armenian Question considered to be one of the world's greatest scandals?"³⁵

As much as Turkish historians attempt to deny the existence of the Armenian Genocide, they cannot hide from the fact that the Turkish government itself organized the trials of government figures for the crime of "Armenocide". During these trials the testimony of Turkish witnesses and official documents of the Young Turkish government demonstrated the genocidal nature of the massacres. The materials and stenography of the trial have been published in Turkish and foreign language publications, including the official "Takvim-i Vekayi".

The following is a segment of one of the documentations of the trials that proves the genocidal nature of the massacres:

"Finally, after long indecision, that trial began yesterday. A thick crowd filled the small hall of the military tribunal...The Turkish press considers that trial to be an historical event...Grand Vizier Said Halim pasha, senate president Halil bey, Zia Gokalp, and Midhat Shukri are in the defendant's chair...After the hearing the prosecutor general required that the tribunal try the defendants and announced, that the charges are founded on the basis of known facts...

"From those documents it became clear that the committee of "Union and Progress" was divided into two special organizations, one official and open, the other secret and based upon oral directives. That had the quality of a secret committee. The existing evidence proves that the accountability [of that secret committee's] influential

chiefs is evident. The crimes committed by them is proven by the above mentioned data...After the examination it becomes clear that the crimes committed during the exile of the Armenians in different places and at different times were not separate and localized occurrences, but organized from the center, previously planned and applied by people, made up of the above mentioned individuals, or based upon secret orders, or upon oral directives...The chief of the office of the Interior Ministry, Ihsan bey, maintains that when he was gay-magam (county governor) of Kilis, that Nuri bey, who was sent from Constantinople to Aleppo, announced that the motive behind the deportation of the Armenians was their extermination, and added that he had met with Talaat, and that he had received from him an order for the extermination of the Armenians. Talaat had said, that the salvation of the country required it...

"In agreement with the above mentioned testimonies and data, the following have participated in the massacres...and are guilty of the committed crimes, it has been decided, according to Article 45 and punitive Article 170, that Dr. Behaeddin Shakir, Dr. Nazim, Atif Riza, Djevad, Aziz bey, Enver, Djemal, Talaat, are to be handed over to the Military Tribunal of Constantinople as criminals..."³⁶ April 12, 1919.

Leading figures of the Young Turk regime were found guilty of the crime of organizing and ordering the massacres of the Armenians and dragging Turkey into the war. In July of 1919 Nazim, Enver, Djemal, and Talaat were sentenced to death in absentia by the military tribunal of Istanbul.

The Turkish court, however, was not, and could not have been, on the same level of the Nuremburg Trials. The majority of the judges were biased due to their prior relations with the members of the Young Turk regime. The Turkish court merely documented the fact of the Armenian Genocide and outlined different means of punishment for the guilty.³⁷ In the papers of the trials nothing is mentioned of the repatriation of the survivors or about material compensation. The material losses of the Western Armenians were of astronomical proportions, reaching 15 billion francs according to not fully corrob-

orated data.³⁸ The military expenditures of Turkey as whole were, from 1914-1918, 9-10 billion francs.³⁹

Prior to the trials the Turkish government published the English-language circular, "The Turco-Armenian Question: The Turkish Point of View" in early 1919, in which the leaders of the Young Turk administration were characterized as some of the greatest criminals in the history of man. It was they who implemented the pre-meditated policy of the extermination of the Armenians with all its cruelty. The government document attempts to absolve the Turkish people of any moral responsibility for the massacres, placing the blame solely on the government.⁴⁰

The post-War Turkish government also promised compensation to the Armenian people. Shortly we will see, however, that the government did not make reparations, and that the return of Armenian survivors was stopped, but that the new Kemalist regime continued the established policy of genocide.

5. THE THIRD STAGE OF GENOCIDE: THE GENOCIDE OF THE EASTERN ARMENIANS AND THE CREATION OF AN OGHUZ STATE

Only the Genocide of the Western Armenians and their deportation from Western Armenia has been a subject of study in the field of genocide studies. However, the Young Turk regime, differing from the Sultan's government, raised the question of the destruction of the Armenian people as a whole. From 1914-1918 the Genocide was composed of three waves, each aimed at the destruction of three Armenias; Western Armenia, Eastern Armenia, and Persian Armenia. Beginning from the end of December, 1914, the Armenians living in the Armenian populated regions of Persian Hayk and Adrbadakan became the first victims of the massacres, resulting from the withdrawal of Russian troops from the region, and the penetration of Turkish forces. In late 1914 the Armenian public was already making great efforts to settle tens of thousands of refugees from the regions of Khoy, Salmast, Dilman, Urmia, and Tavriz.⁴¹ In addition to the Armenian population, the Assyrian population also became victims of the massacres, as the establishment of the Oghuz state assumed that Persian Armenia and Adrbadakan would also be transformed into homogeneous, Turkish populated regions. This not only meant the murder of the native Armenian population, but of the long-standing Assyrian population as well. From late 1914-early 1915, about 40,000 Assyrians fled to Eastern Armenia from the Urmia region of Persian Hayk alone.⁴²

The horrors that accompanied the Turkish occupation have been documented. The following record describes the nature of the massacres that took place in Persian Armenia:

"The 750 Armenians that have reached Salmast from Urmia are completely stripped, the women, abducted. In Dilman there is also the same amount of murdered Armenians, whose martyrdom was carried out in the most horrific manner. They cut off the feet of living people with saws, they cut their wrists in the same way, they cut noses, cheeks, and lips off with scissors. They burned those parts of the body which are the most sensitive. Both the elderly and the young were killed by frightful tortures, without regard to gender. We saw the traces of boundless brutality, glowing skewers were run through the genitals of both women and men, and they were put to death this way. It is evident that there has been no limit to the atrocities, which have been committed by the Turkish and Kurdish soldiers."⁴³

In this manner the practical application of the Armenian Genocide began months before the demonic directive of the Young Turks of April 15, 1915. The first victims were Persian Armenians, not citizens of Turkey. The nonsense espoused by Turkish historians and present-day politicians, that the deportation and massacre of the Western Armenians took place due to the fact that they were not law abiding Ottoman citizens, is completely unfounded.

Via the wiping out of the Western Armenians the Turkish yataghan, with all its cruelty, was soon to hang over the heads of the Eastern Armenians. The bloodless Bolshevik coup and the subsequent unilateral Russian withdrawal from the war significantly changed the world's balance of power. This not only put into question the fate of the Western Armenian lands liberated by Russian forces and Armenian volunteers, but also opened the gates of the Caucasus to the Turks, creating ideal conditions for the practical application of the pan-Turkish program, the annihilation of the eastern segment of the Armenian people, which would completely destroy the barrier separating the Turkish speaking peoples of Turkey and Russia. The Young Turk regime raised the following issues in the achievement of that strategic goal:

1. Separate Transcaucasia from Russia, which would provide the legal foundation for the violation of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk

signed with Soviet Russia, and penetrate the Caucasus. Under the pressure of Turkish bayonets the Transcaucasian Seim seceded from Russia on April 9 (22), 1918, and proclaimed an independent, federative republic;

2. Create a new Turkic state in the Caucasus (this occurred at the end of May, 1918, with the creation of "Azerbaijan"), which was to include native Armenian lands lying between the Arax and Kur rivers. This would bridge the Turkish speaking peoples of Turkey, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. This would require the deportation and extermination of the Eastern Armenians. We must note that this was a correct practical move on the part of the Turks. At that time, when the Turks had invaded the Caucasus, it was becoming clearer and clearer that the Central Powers would be defeated, and that, in time, the Turks would be forced to leave Transcaucasia. In order to legally establish their conquests in the Caucasus, the Turks began the creation of a new Turkish state structure with the name of Azerbaijan. The Musavatists were not yet conscious of this fact. During the peace negotiations in Batum in 1918, they triumphantly approached Halil bey with the request that the occupied part of Transcaucasia be united with Turkey in its entirety. Halil replied that the "great policy of Turkey for the meantime requires the independence of a strong Azerbaijan."⁴⁴ The creation of the new Azerbaijani Turkish state was a veil for the future Turkish conquest of Eastern Armenia and the Caucasus, but by the hands of Azerbaijan. It was no accident that this artificial Turkish entity, founded on Armenian lands and historical Aghvank, was named after a landmass located in Persia, Adrbadkan (the Greek Atropane, Persian Aderbegan, Arabic Adarbaijan and Azribejan). The conquest of the real Azerbaijan was planned for future enactment. The creation of the new Turkish state of "Azerbaijan" had far-reaching objectives. The current conflict over Gharabagh shows that even today Azerbaijan is an active volcano of pan-Turkism;
3. Create ties with the newly established state of Azerbaijan. This

meant, in fact, the creation of an Oghuz state. However, the Armenian cradles of Gharabagh, Zangezur, and Nakhichevan, were hindering the establishment of those ties. For that reason Azerbaijan claimed those lands from the Republic of Armenia and attempted to seize them with the help of the Turkish military. The Armenians of Gharabagh and Zangezur, however, defended their liberty by force of arms, and when Azerbaijan was proclaimed a soviet republic in April of 1920, neither Gharabagh, Zangezur, nor Nakhichevan, were located within its borders. That goal Azerbaijan would try to accomplish with the help of the Bolsheviks.

It was with such goals that the Young Turk government broke the ceasefire of Erzincan, in January, 1918, and ordered its troops to go on the offensive along the entire front. The situation was complicated by the fact that there was no real unity between the different peoples of the Transcaucasian Republic. Internal disagreements and differing national and political orientations put the Transcaucasian peoples on different sides of the conflict. The Caucasian Tatars ("Azeris") had a completely Turkish orientation and strived to unite with Turkey. The Georgians were conducting secret negotiations with the Germans, through whom they would save Georgia, but at the expense of the Armenians. It was clear that the upcoming war was not going to take place between Turkey and the Transcaucasian Republic, but between Turkey and the Armenians. The responsibility of the defense of the former Russo-Turkish front fell upon newly formed Armenian military units.

From January until May of 1918 the few Armenian army units, for all practical purposes, fought the Turkish armies single handedly, while clashing with Tatar partisan groups attacking the Armenian flanks. In such conditions the Armenian troops fell back under the pressure of the larger Turkish forces, from Erzincan, over Karin, and toward the pre-war Russo-Turkish frontier. The Turkish army, strengthened by the addition of two divisions from the Syrian front, did not stop at the border and penetrated into Eastern Armenia.

The struggle for the survival of the Armenian people began. The Armenian people stood as one, and at the end of May, 1918, all able bodied Armenians, men and women, young and old, intellectual and worker, fought the Turkish invaders face to face at the battles of Sardarabad, Karakilisa, and Bash-Abaran. The battles of May saved the Armenian people from complete annihilation and the Turkish armies were stopped. Turkey was forced to be the first to recognize the resurrection of the political independence of Armenia.

The resurrection of Armenian statehood was in itself a serious barrier in the path of pan-Turkism. This historically significant event stands out in the scope of pan-Armenian history, and for human civilization as well.

The Armenians were the main force fighting the Turkish armies from the months of January-September, 1918. We also include the Baku Commune, for Armenians accounted for close to 80% of the Commune's fighting force. The German Chief of Staff, General Ludendorff, documents the reality of the situation in his memoirs with bitter sadness, "The lack of fuel was the greatest impetus to the destruction of the German Western Army, for the Turks were not able to capture Baku in time, and it was the Armenians who stopped the Turks from capturing Baku in time."⁴⁵

The heroic battle of Baku has not been studied correctly in the past. The approach has been one sided. Because of the name "Baku Commune" it has been viewed as a part of Bolshevik history. However, the battle of Baku is one of the heroic pages from the 1918 struggle for survival of the Armenian people, having the same significance of the battles of Sardarabad, Karakilisa, and Bash-Abaran.

It can be concluded, that the struggle for survival fought by the Armenians against the criminal Young Turkish state, due to its significance, was of great importance not only to Armenian national history, but to the history of the world, as well.

It is true that the Young Turk regime and Azerbaijan, created with Turkish aid, were unable to form a united front and completely destroy the Armenian barrier to pan-Turkism. About 500,000 Eastern

Armenians perished at the hands of the Turks. A large number of documents have been preserved attesting to the premeditated massacres organized by the Turkish government in Eastern Armenia and Armenian populated regions of Transcaucasia, and the hideous manner in which they took place. A portion of those documents have been published and have reached a wide public audience. The Turks did not hide the fact that their policy towards the Eastern Armenians was the result of the practical application of pan-Turkism, which was echoed from the highest levels. At a meeting dedicated to the issue of boundaries at the Batum Peace Conference, Vehib pasha, while pointing to a map and describing Turkish goals, told the Armenian delegation, "[y]ou will see that fate will draw Turkey from the west towards the east, we left the Balkans, we will leave Africa as well, but we must spread towards the east, over there is our blood, our religion and language. And this will drag on for years; our brothers are in Baku, Dagestan, Turkistan, and Azerbaijan. We need a path towards there. And you Armenians are standing in that, our path... You must pull to one side and give way to us. Here is our basic disagreement. We need two wide paths, which will give our armies the opportunity to move forward and be defended. One is the Kars-Akhalkalak-Borchalu-Kazak route, which will take us towards Ganja, the other will run Nakhichevan-Sharur-the Kur river valley. You may remain between those two, around the regions of Nor-Bayazit and Etchmiadzin."⁴⁶

The Turkish hand had cut away the largest portions of northern and southern Eastern Armenia and had attached them to either Ottoman Turkey or artificial Azerbaijan. The de-facto Oghuz state was created (the second stage of pan-Turkism). Turkey was connected with Azerbaijan via wide corridors, and the Armenian state, resurrected by the battles of May, was squeezed into the area surrounding Yerevan, Etchmiadzin, and Nor-Bayazit.

Multiple testimonies to the wide scale massacres and the goals pursued by Turkey in the conquered regions of Eastern Armenia have been preserved in the documents of Ottoman Turkey's ally, Germany. The following is part of a telegram sent by General Von-Kres to the

German Chancellor (August 4, 1918), and of an official report (August 5, 1918): "Enver's contradictory assertions are a mere curtain for the devastation of the occupied country [Eastern Armenia]. The Turks also want, via Azerbaijan, to penetrate and destroy the ancient Armenian province of Gharabagh. New fighting between the armed mountaineers and the Muslims is unavoidable... The Turks intend to wipe out the Armenians and, whenever possible, are provoking them and gaining pretexts for new attacks. If that is unsuccessful, then they forcibly hand them over to starvation and poverty."⁴⁷

The official documents of Turkey's wartime ally Germany, not those of Armenia or even a neutral country, clearly demonstrate that the goals of the Ottoman Empire in Eastern Armenia were:

1. The depopulation of Armenians from Eastern Armenia and the country's devastation;
2. The mass extermination of the Armenians (in this case, the Eastern Armenians) through massacre, or, if unsuccessful, by means of starvation;
3. The connection of Ottoman Turkey with Azerbaijan, which would result in the creation of a de-facto Oghuz state. The Turks, however, did not achieve this goal, as they were met with armed resistance in Zangezur, and in "ancient Armenian Gharabagh."

It should be noted that the Turks and Azerbaijanis, in 1918 and in the future, were not able to attach Zangezur and Gharabagh to the artificial Azerbaijani state by force. When Azerbaijan was sovietized in April of 1920, Gharabagh, Zangezur, and Nakhichevan, were not located within its borders. Only in 1921, when Kemalist Turkey and Soviet Russia had already invaded the Republic of Armenia, were Armenian Mountainous Gharabagh and Nakhichevan handed over to Soviet Azerbaijan as a result of Kemalist-Bolshevik flirtations.

As strange as it may seem, the issue of the Genocide of the Eastern Armenians has not become a special topic of interest in academic literature, although its consequences were tragic and irreversible. In what are now the boundaries of the present day Republic of Armenia 300,000 Armenians were massacred. In the province of

Baku, 50,500 were killed; in the city of Baku itself, 30,000; in the counties of Nukhi and Aresh, 40,000; in Gharabagh, 10,000. There were also enormous numbers of victims in the other Armenian populated regions of Transcaucasia; Elizavetpol, and the counties of Shamakhi and Gyokchai.⁴⁸

As a result of the Turkish campaign of 1918, over 600,000 Eastern Armenians became refugees. This included 120,000 from Kars, 30,000 from Akhaltsikha, 40,000 from the region of Batum, 60,000 from the county of Alexandropol, 100,000 from the counties of Yerevan, Nakhichevan, and Sharur, 80,000 from Surmalu and Etchmiadzin, and 85,000 from the county of Akhalkalak.⁴⁹ 400,000 of the refugees found sanctuary in the tiny, completely strangled Republic of Armenia, 150,000 in Georgia, and 100,000 in the North Caucasus.⁵⁰

Turned into refugees from their homeland and lacking the necessary means for survival, a large portion of these exiles fell victim to starvation, exposure, and disease. A telling example is the fate of the Armenian of Akhalkalak. Fleeing from the carnage accompanying the Turkish occupation, 90,000 Armenians abandoned their native Akhalkalak for the safety of the forests of Bakuriani and Tsalka. When the Turkish forces left Akhalkalak, however, only 45,000 Armenians returned, the remainder having been claimed by famine and epidemic.

One of the major consequences of the Genocide of the Eastern Armenians was the seizure of vast Eastern Armenian lands by Azerbaijan, such as Gandzak, Lower Gharabagh, Paytakaran, and others. The creation of a new, artificial Turkish state structure by the name of Azerbaijan by Turkish bayonets was intended to legalize their conquests in Transcaucasia, and to take a major, practical step on the path of pan-Turkism.

6. THE FOURTH STAGE OF GENOCIDE: THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE KEMALIST REGIME

The fourth stage of the Armenian Genocide encompasses the period of 1920-1922. This is the period of the Kemalist regime of Turkey. The Kemalists inherited the genocidal methods of pursuing their policies towards the Armenians which were developed by the Sultan and Young Turks.

The Treaty of Sevres (August 10, 1920) awarded freedom to many of the peoples living under Turkish domination. The treaty gave international recognition to the historical rights of the Armenian people in Western Armenia, and solved the Turko-Armenian problem through the spirit of mutual compromise. However, the Great Powers did nothing to establish the independence of Western Armenia. The interests of and the conflicts between the powers were more important than the promises of justice and philanthropy given to the Armenians, which they gave before, during, and after the war.

The appearance of the Red Army at the approaches to Transcaucasia sharply changed the applied policy of the European states in the Near and Middle East. The basic content of their regional policies became the so-called blockade of the socialist revolution of the Bolsheviks. The Kemalists, who were no stranger to pan-Turkism, could become such a barrier. The Congresses of Erzerum (Karin) and Sivas, which occurred in July and September of 1919, respectively, took place in the spirit of pan-Turkism. In September of 1920, with the start of the war against the Republic of Armenia, Kemal announced that if the war against the Armenians was successful, it would safeguard the connection between Turkey and Azerbaijan.⁵¹

There was a way out. In the East two incompatible and wide-

spread ideologies were glaring at each other, pan-Turkism and Bolshevism, and a showdown between the two was inevitable. It was necessary to destroy the buffer separating Turkey and Soviet Russia as quickly as possible, to create an immediate line of contact. It was possible to do so by sacrificing the Republic of Armenia. That is why, during the Turko-Armenian War of September-December of 1920, the Great Powers abandoned their junior ally of yesterday and took on the role of silent observers. The frequent requests for help from the Armenian government, pleading for an end to the war and salvation for the Armenians from final destruction went unanswered. Kemalist Turkey seized Kars, Ardahan, Artvin, Olti, Kaghisman, and Surmalu from the Republic of Armenia. Under Kemalist pressure, their god-child Azerbaijan received Nakhichevan and Mountainous Gharabagh, the corridor of pan-Turkism. Shortly after Kemalist Turkey gave Persia relatively large territories in exchange for a sliver of land that would connect it with Nakhichevan, yet another manifestation of pan-Turkism.

The campaign of the Kemalist armies was also accompanied by the wide spread, barbaric massacre of the Armenians. According to approximate data 198,000 were murdered in the occupied regions of the Republic of Armenia.⁵²

From 1920-1922 the Kemalist regime continued the policy of the forced deportation and physical destruction of the Western Armenians in Cilician Armenia, Izmir, and in a number of other provinces of Turkey.

The fate of the Western Armenians who had repatriated to Cilicia was especially tragic. After the First World War, with the fate of Western Armenia still undecided, and with the presence in Cilicia of Armenian Legionnaires and Anglo-France forces, caravans of Western Armenian repatriates, who had been driven to the Arabian deserts, stretched in one direction, towards Cilician Armenia. Native Cilicians were not the only ones returning to Cilicia. Other Western Armenian survivors from other regions were traveling there as well. In the summer of 1918, the number of survivors in the Arabian deserts reached

250,000⁵³, of whom about 200,000 returned to Cilicia. This portion of the Western Armenian exiles who survived the Genocide demonstrated surprising resilience and efficiency, resurrecting the economic and cultural life of Cilician Armenia in a very short period of time. However, this new chapter in the history of Cilician Armenia was to be a very short one. The Anglo-French conflict of interests in the region and their flirtations with the Kemalist regime brought new tragedies for the Western Armenians. Seeing no restraints before them, with the silent agreement of the Great Powers, the Turkish forces attacked. Without receiving any aid from yesterday's "allies", fragments of the Western Armenians fought heroic battles for survival against the Kemalist partisans from 1920-1921, at Hadjin, Urfa, Aintab, Zeitun, and elsewhere. Those battles signified the end of the centuries old history of Cilician Armenia. Due to the numerical superiority of the Turks, the Armenians were forced to abandon their Cilician homeland once again. During the massacres 50-60,000 Armenians were killed. The question of the surviving refugees was "studied" by the League of Nations without any results up until 1929.

In such a manner the Kemalist regime completed the deportation and massacre of the Armenians, which was begun by the Sultan and the Young Turks.

7. THE LESSONS AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE GENOCIDE

1. The Genocide was the sole means of the Turkish state to accomplish their goal of establishing a new Turkish homeland in Armenia. By emptying Armenia of its Armenian inhabitants, they would destroy the wedge hindering the realization of pan-Turkism, and separating the Turkish speaking peoples;
2. Along with the Western Armenians, the Eastern Armenians as well were subjected to Genocide;
3. It is the Turkish state that is accountable for the Genocide, regardless of the regime, for it was implemented by the Sultan, the Young Turks, and the Kemalists;
4. The greatest consequence of the Genocide was the disappearance of Armenians from the largest part of Armenia, Western Armenia, which is now under Turkish rule. The death of 700,000 Eastern Armenians during the Genocide resulted in the disappearance of Armenians from Eastern Armenian lands such as Utik, Gandzak, Lower Gharabagh, and elsewhere, which were subsequently attached to Azerbaijan. Turkey was also able to attach Nakhichevan and Mountainous Gharabagh to Azerbaijan with the help of the Bolsheviks. The inclusion of Armenian lands within the boundaries of Azerbaijan was a great accomplishment for the followers of pan-Turkism;
5. The regional, post-Soviet policy of today's so-called "civilized" Turkey concerning the "question" of Mountainous Gharabagh, an inseparable part of Armenia, shows that pan-Turkism is still the cornerstone of Turkish policy. The barbaric methods used against Kurdish rebels show that genocide is still a means used by Turkey to achieve its goals;

6. The Armenian Genocide, as opposed to the Jewish Holocaust, still continues, as is demonstrated by the following:
 - a. The millions of Armenians in the Diaspora, formed as a result of the Genocide, will not be allowed to return to their native Western Armenia. Now, the Diasporan Armenians who were forcibly expelled from their homeland have been continuously losing their national identity for 90 years. From the perspective of international law this constitutes genocide. In Article 2 of the UN Convention on Genocide five actions are listed, with the practice of one being considered genocide. In point "c", the act of "[d]eliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part" constitutes an act of genocide;
 - b. The systematic destruction of Armenian religious and cultural treasures, material testimonies to Armenian civilization, is taking place in modern Turkey. The first to be destroyed were architectural monuments. By this "cultural genocide" the Turkish state machine is pursuing the goal of turkifying Western Armenia. If this is unsuccessful, the Turks make Armenian cultural treasures their own. Prior to the start of WWI, the number of Armenian religious institutions in the Ottoman Empire was 2549. According to data provided by UNESCO, only 913 of those structures were preserved in 1923. Of those 484 were completely destroyed, and 252 were ruined from 1923-1974. 197 are in need of repair.⁵⁴
- Concern over "cultural genocide" has been expressed in the Council of Europe in the June 18, 1987, resolution entitled "About the Political Solution of the Armenian Question". The resolution not only recognized that, in agreement with the UN Convention on Genocide, the crime committed against the Armenians by the Ottoman Empire from 1915-1917 was, in fact, genocide, but also requires the Turkish government to maintain a proper

attitude towards Armenian monuments found on the territory of today's Turkey.⁵⁵

Official Turkey, knocking on the door of the European Union in pursuit of membership, is, on the one hand, applying methods to "academically put to rest" the fact of the Armenian Genocide by attempting to trick us into thinking that it is merely an issue for historical study, and to "forget" that Turkey was the first to recognize the Genocide in 1919, and, on the other hand, continues to practice "cultural genocide". A prime example of this is the organization of two expositions, in Brussels and London, by the Turkish government in 2005. The cultural treasures of peoples conquered by the Turks, including those of the Armenians, were presented as Turkish cultural treasures. This act of "cultural genocide" was so obvious and scandalous, that it was documented by authoritative European publications. Noting that the expositions were organized for political motives [to be accepted into the EU, E.D.], the papers also considered the Turks to be "dedicated robbers". The assessment of the "Times Literary Supplement" was typical in its views, "[t]he sensational Turkish art exhibitions organized in Brussels and London are a cultural and political storm....Each one presents more than 350 displays...In the introduction of the catalogue Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan reflects upon Turkish membership in the EU, presenting the great Seljuks and Ottomans as 'dedicated patrons of the arts'. 'Dedicated robbers' would be a more precise characterization... They were probably brought to Istanbul as a result of Turkish raids. Put bluntly, those are stolen goods. It would be surprising for many to call those items 'Turkish', since they were created by masters living under the authority of the Turkish conquerors...just as it would be surprising to call 19th century 'Indian art' 'British', simply because it was under the authority of that country. Here they have presented the Mongols as 'Turk-Mongols', which is a highly suspicious label...One of the interesting paintings of the women of the Ottoman Palace is the painting of the daughter of

Sultan Suleiman I, to whom was dedicated the beautifully constructed mosque of Sinan [Sinan was a 16th century Armenian architect. Nowhere in the catalogue was it mentioned that he was Armenian, which is natural, because Sinan, due to his architectural accomplishments, is considered the pinnacle of Ottoman architecture, E.D.]...Observing the paintings and displays, the question arises for the visitor, who were they created by? And the catalogue does not give an answer."⁵⁶

7. "The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide" was not accepted to merely define and punish genocide, but, first and foremost, to prevent it. It follows that the UN is required to employ the necessary means to put a stop to the Armenian Genocide and all its forms.

THE GENOCIDE OF THE ARMENIANS, 1894-1922

Table 3

Turkish Government System	Date	Number of Victims	Location of Genocide
Reign of Sultan Abdul-Hamid II	1894-1896	300,000	Western Armenia and Other Armenian populated regions of the Ottoman Empire
Young Turks	1909	30,000	The Vilayets of Adana and Aleppo
	1915-1916	1,500,000	Western Armenia and other Armenian populated regions of the Ottoman Empire
	1918	500,000	The Republic of Armenia and other Armenian populated regions of Transcaucasia
Kemalist Turkey	1920-1922	200,000	The Republic of Armenia
		60,000	Cilician Armenia, Izmir
TOTAL		2,590,000	

ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ

1. Յեղասպանությունը թուրք պետականության ձեռքին լոկ միջոց էր, Նպատակը՝ Հայաստանում թուրքական նոր հայրենիքի ստեղծումն էր և պանթուրանական ճանապարհին ընկած ու թուրքական երկու աշխարհներն իրարից բաժանող Հայկական սեպի վերացումն էր՝ Հայաստանը հայազրկելու միջոցով:
2. Յեղասպանության ենթարկվեց ոչ միայն արևմտահայությունը, այլև արևելահայությունը:
3. Յեղասպանության պատասխանատուն թուրք պետականությունն է՝ անկախ վարչակարգից. այն իրագործվել է և՛ սուլթանական, և՛ երիտթուրքական, և՛ քեմալական վարչակարգերի կողմից:
4. Յեղասպանության ծանրագույն հետևանքը Հայաստանի մեծագույն մասի՝ Արևմտյան Հայաստանի հայազրկումն էր, որն այսօր գտնվում գտնվում է Թուրքիայի տիրապետության տակ: Յեղասպանությանը զոհ գնացին մահ շուրջ 700 հազար արևելահայեր, որի հետևանքով Արևելյան Հայաստանի հայազրկված շրջանները՝ Ուտիքը, Գանձակը, Դաշտային Ղարաբաղը և այլ երկրամասեր բռնակցվեցին Ադրբեջանին: Հետագայում թուրքերին հաջողվեց բուլղարների աջակցությամբ Ադրբեջանին բռնակցել մահ Նախջանգն ու Լեռնային Ղարաբաղը: Հայկական երկրամասերը թուրքերի ջանքերով ստեղծված Ադրբեջանի կազմի մեջ մտցնելը խոշոր գործնական քայլ էր պանթուրքիզմի ճանապարհին:
5. Խորհրդային կայսերապետության փլուզումը և տարածաշրջանում Թուրքիայի վարած քաղաքականությունը, մասնավորապես՝ Հայաստանի անբաժանելի մասը հանդիսացող Լեռնային Ղարաբաղի «հարցում» թուրքական դիրքորոշումը, ինքնին, վկայությունն է այն բանի, որ այսօրվա այսպես կոչ-

ված «քաղաքակիրթ» Թուրքիայի քաղաքականության անկյունաքարը շարունակում է մնալ պանթուրանականության վաղդապետությունը: Իսկ քուրդ ապստամբների նկատմամբ գործադրվող բարբարոսական միջոցները ցույց են տալիս, որ ցեղասպանությունը ժամանակակից Թուրքիայի համար շարունակում է մնալ նպատակին հասնելու միջոցներից մեկը:

6. Հայոց ցեղանպաստությունը, ի տարբերություն հրեաների հոլոքոսթի, դեռևս շարունակվում է: Զանի դեռ.

ա) Ցեղասպանության արդյունք միլիոնավոր սփյուռքահայերին չի թույլատրվի վերադառնալ հայրենիք՝ Արևմտյան Հայաստան: Թուրքական իշխանությունների այդ արգելքի պատճառով հայրենիքից բռնությամբ վտարված սփյուռքահայերը, 90 տարի շարունակ կորցնում են ազգային ինքնությունը: Սա միջազգային իրավունքի տեսակետից ցեղասպանություն է: Ցեղասպանության մասին ՄԱԿ-ի 1948թ. դեկտեմբերի 9-ի կոնվենցիայի 2-րդ հոդվածում նշված են այն հինգ գործողությունները, որոնցից յուրաքանչյուրի առկայության դեպքում ցեղասպանությունը փաստ է: «Գ» կետում ցեղասպանության գործողություն է համարվում «որևէ խմբի համար միտումնավոր այնպիսի պայմանների ստեղծումը, որոնք հաշվարկված են նրա մասնակի կամ լրիվ ոչնչացմանը»:

բ) Ժամանակակից Թուրքիայում կա՛մ յուրացվում են հայերի հոգևոր-մշակութային արժեքները, կա՛մ ծրագրավորված ոչնչացվում հայկական քաղաքակրթության նյութական վկայությունները, առաջին հերթին՝ ճարտարապետական հուշարձանները («մշակութային զենոցիդ»): «Մշակութային զենոցիդով» թուրքական պետական մեքենան նպատակ է հետապնդում Հայաստանը թրքացնելու՝ զուգընթաց՝ ոչնչացնել, իսկ եթե չի հաջողվում, ապա սեփականացնել հայոց մշակութային արժեքները: Այսպես, առաջին համաշխարհային պատերազմի նախօրեին միայն հայկական եկեղեցական հաստատությունների թիվը Օսմանյան կայսրությունում 2549 էր: Ըստ ՅՈՒՆԵՍԿՕ-ի տվյալների՝ այդ քանակից 1923թ. պահպանվել էին 913 կառույցներ: 1923-1974թթ. ընթացքում դրանցից

484-ը ամբողջովին անհետացել էին, 252-ը՝ ավերվել, 197-ը՝ վերանորոգման կարիք ունեին⁵⁴:

«Մշակութային զենոցիդի» վաստը և մտահոգությունն իր արտահայտությունն է գտել Եվրոխորհրդարանի «Հայկական հարցի քաղաքական լուծման մասին» 1987թ. հունիսի 18-ի բանաձևում: Փաստաթուղթն արձանագրելով, որ «Օսմանյան կայսրության մեջ հայ բնակչության հանդեպ 1915-1917թթ. գործադրված ողբերգական իրադարձությունները, համաձայն ՄԱԿ-ի 1948թ. դեկտեմբերի 9-ի կոնվենցիայի, հանդիսանում է ցեղասպանություն», միաժամանակ պահանջում է թուրքական կառավարությունից (6-րդ կետ)՝ պատշաճ վերաբերմունք դրսևորել այժմյան Թուրքիայի տարածքում գտնվող հայկական հուշարձանների նկատմամբ⁵⁵:

Եվրոմիության դռները «ջարդող» և նրան անդամակցել փորձող պաշտոնական Թուրքիան այսօր էլ մի կողմից՝ ջանքեր է գործադրում «Գիտականորեն քննեցնել» Հայոց ցեղասպանության փաստը (բարբաջելով՝ թե դա պատմաբանների գործն է) և «մոռանալով», որ Թուրքիան առաջինն է 1919թ. պաշտոնապես ճանաչել հայոց ցեղասպանությունը, մյուս կողմից՝ շարունակում է «մշակութային զենոցիդ»-ը: Դրա վառ օրինակը 2005թ. սկզբներին Բրյուսելում և Լոնդոնում Թուրքիայի կողմից պետականորեն կազմակերպված երկու մեծ ցուցահանդեսներն են, որտեղ թուրքերի կողմից նվաճված ժողովուրդների, այդ թվում՝ հայերի, մշակութային արժեքները ներկայացվել են որպես թուրքական, «Մշակութային զենոցիդ»-ը այնքան ճշգրտ է, որ դրան արձանագանքել են եվրոպական հեղինակավոր հրատարակությունները: Արձանագրելով, որ ցուցահանդեսները կազմակերպվել են քաղաքական դրդապատճառներով (հեշտացնելու համար Թուրքիայի մուտքը Եվրոխորհուրդ-Է.Դ.), միաժամանակ թերթերը թուրքերին համարում են «նվիրյալ թալանիներ»: Հատկապես տիպական է անգլիական «Թայմս լիթթերի սափլիմենթ» պարբերաթերթի գնահատականը. «Բրյուսելում և Լոնդոնում կազմակերպված թուրքական արվեստի զգայացունց ցուցահանդեսները մեծա-

մասշտաբ քաղաքական և մշակութային գրոհ են: Յուրաքանչյուրում ներկայացված է ավելի քան 350 ցուցանմուշ:... Կատալոգի առաջաբանում Թուրքիայի վարչապետ Ռեջեփ Թալիփ Էրդողանն անդրադառնում է Թուրքիայի ԵՄ անդամակցությանը՝ ներկայացնելով մեծ սելջուկներին և օսմանցիներին որպես «նվիրյալ արվեստասերների»: «Նվիրյալ քալանչիներն» ավելի ճշգրիտ բնութագրում կլինեն:... Դրանք հավանաբար Ստամբուլ են բերվել օսմանյան զորքերի ասպատակությունների՝ հետևանքով: Կարճ ասած, դրանք կողոպտված իրեր են, ինչպես դրանց ստեղծած վարպետները, որոնց իրենց բնօրրաններից բերել են աշխատելու տեղական պալատներում: Չարմանալի կլինեն շատերի համար այդ բոլորը «թուրքական» անվանել, քանի որ դրանք ստեղծել են թուրք նվաճողների իշխանության տակ ապրող վարպետները: Ճիշտ այնպես, ինչպես զարմանալի կլինեն 19-րդ դարի «հնդկական արվեստն» անվանել «բրիտանական», պարզապես որովհետև այդ տիրապետության տակ է եղել երկիրը: Մոնղոլներին այստեղ ներկայացրել են որպես «թուրք-մոնղոլներ», որը չափազանց կասկածելի պիտակ է...: Օսմանյան պալատի կանանց հետաքրքրական նկարներից է Սուլեյման Ա-ի դստեր նկարը, որին նվիրված է **Սինանի** կառուցած գեղեցիկ մզկիթը, որը Ստամբուլի ճարտարապետության գլուխգործոցներից է... (Սինանը 16-րդ դարի հայ ճարտարապետ է: Կատալոգում ոչ մի հիշեցում չկա նրա հայ լինելու մասին և դա բնական է, որովհետև Սինանը իր գործունեությամբ նշանավորել է Օսմանյան Թուրքիայի ճարտարապետության բարձրակետը - Է.Դ.): Նկարներն ու ցուցանմուշները դիտելով՝ այցելուների մեջ հարց է առաջանում, թե դրանք ու՞մ կողմից են ստեղծված, իսկ կատալոգը դրան պատասխան չի տալիս»⁵⁶:

7. ՄԱԿ-ի 1945թ. դեկտեմբերի 9-ի ընդունած «Ցեղասպանության հանգործությունը կանխելու և դրա համար պատժի մասին կոնվենցիան» ոչ միայն ցեղասպանությունը բնորոշող և պատժող փաստաթուղթ է, այլ առաջին հերթին, կանխարգե-

լող: Հետևաբար, ՄԱԿ-ը պարտավորված է միջնեկ ձեռնարկել կանխելու հայերի շարունակվող ցեղասպանությունն իր ամենատարբեր դրսևորումներով:

ՀԱՅԵՐԻ ՑԵՂԱՍՊԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ 1894/1922 ԹԹ.

Աղյուսակ 3

Թուրքիայի պետական վարչակարգը	Թվաքանակը	Ձոռների քիվը	Ցեղասպանության վայրը
Սուրբանական	1894-1896թթ.	300.000	Արևիցն Հայաստան, Օսմանյան կայսրության հայաբնակ ալյ վայրեր
Երիտթուրքական	1909թ.	30.000	Արևիցն և Հալեպի վիլայեթներ
	1915-1916թթ.	1.500.000	Արևիցն Հայաստան, Օսմանյան կայսրության ալյ վայրեր
	1918թ.	500.000	Հալեպի համայնություն և Անտակի հայաբնակ վայր
Քեմալական	1920-1922թթ.	200.000	Հալեպի համայնություն
		60.000	Կիլիկիա Հայաստան, Իզմիր
ԸՆԴԱՄՏԵՆԸ՝		2.590.000 -	

WORKS CITED

- 1 Ю. Г. Барсегов, Геноцид армян - преступление против человечества, Ереван.
1990, с. 7; Lemkin R., "Les actes créant un danger general (interetatique) considérés comme délits de droit des gens", Paris, Pedon, 1933.
- 2 Problems of Genocide, Canada, 1997, p. 181.
- 3 Ю. Г. Барсегов, Геноцид армян — преступление против человечества, с. 11.
- 4 Christopher J. Walker, Armenia. The Survival of Nation, London, 1980; David Marshall Lang, The Armenians. A People in Exile, London, 1981; David Kushner, The Rise of Turkish Nationalism, 1878-1908, London, 1977; Problems of Genocide, Canada, 1997; Jean-Marie Carzou, Un genocide exemplaire. Armenie 1915, Paris, 1975; Ives TERNON, Les Arme'niens. Histoire d'un genocide, Paris, 1977; Moussa Prince, Un ge'nocide impuni: L'Armenocide, Beyruth, 1975.
- 5 Problems of Genocide, Canada, 1997, p. 29.
- 6 Jean-Marie Carzou, Un genocide exemplaire. Armenie, 1915, Paris, 1975.
- 7 Նիկոլայ Հովհաննիսյան, Հայոց ցեղասպանությունը ցեղասպանագիտության հայեցակարգային համակարգում, Երևան, 2002, էջ 18-19:
- 8 "The Crime of Genocide. A United Nations Convention — is Aimed of Preventing Destruction of Groups and of Punishing those Responsible", N. Y., 1949.
- 9 Геноцид армян в Османской империи. Сборник документов и материалов, Ереван, 1982, стр. 14.
- 10 Հայաստանի Ազգային Արխիվ (ՀԱԱ), ֆ. 200, ց. 1, գ. 237, ք. 134-136:
- 11 Е. К. Саркисян, Административная и демографическая политика Османского правительства в Западной Армении (տե՛ս, Մերձավոր և Միջին Արևելքի երկրներ և ժողովուրդներ, հ. 5, Թուրքիա, էջ 366-367).
- 12 Положение армян в Турции до Вмешательства держав в 1895 г., М., 1896, стр. 94.
- 13 David Kushner, The Rise of Turkish Nationalism. 1878-1908, London, 1977, p. 51-52.
- 14 "Геноцид армян в Османской империи: сборник документов и материалов", Ереван, 1982, стр. 410.
- 15 Ibid. P. 410-411.
- 16 Зареванд, Турция и Паитуранизм. Введение А. Н. Мандельштама, Париж, 1930, стр. 11.
- 17 Ibid. P. 89-101.
- 18 Ibid. P. 95.
- 19 "Геноцид армян в Османской империи", стр. 412.
- 20 В. В. Готлиб, Тайная дипломатия во время первой мировой войны, М., 1960, стр. 153.
- 21 "Геноцид армян в османской империи...", стр. 146.
- 22 Е. К. Саркисян, Административная и демографическая политика Османского правительства в Западной Армении (տե՛ս, Մերձավոր և Միջին Արևելքի երկրներ և ժողովուրդներ, հ. 5, Թուրքիա, էջ 376):
- 23 Ե. Խաթանետյան, Հայերի թիվը, Բոստոն, 1965:
- 24 С. И. Брук, Население мира: этнографический справочник, Москва, 1986, стр. 429; «Ժամանակակից Թուրքիան. տեղեկատու», Երևան, 1967, էջ 29:
- 25 «Ժամանակակից Թուրքիան. տեղեկատու», Երևան, 1967, էջ 28:
- 26 Հր. Միմոնյան, Թուրք — Հայկական հարաբերությունների պատմությունից, Երևան, 1991, էջ 214 — 215:
- 27 "Геноцид армян...", стр. 409.
- 28 "Геноцид армян...", стр. 412.
- 29 Մելվան Զատե Բիֆար, Օսմանեան հեղափոխության..., էջ 112:
- 30 Английская Синяя книга по армянскому вопросу, "Кавказ-

- ское слово", 2 марта, 1917г., N 49.
- 31 Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, ԳԱ հրատ., հ. 6, էջ 575:
- 32 Է. Գ. Դանիելյան, Անդրկովկասում ապաստանած արևմտահայ գաղթականության թվաքանակի հարցի շուրջ, «Լրաբեր» հասարակական գիտությունների, 2002, N 2, էջ 112 – 119:
- 33 Английская Синяя книга..., "Кавказское слово", 2. 03. 1917г., N 49.
- 34 Արամ Անտոնյան, Մեծ ոճիրը: Հայկական վերջին կոտորածները և Թալեադ փաշա /վավերագրություն /, Երևան, 1990, էջ 18:
- 35 Հայաստանը միջազգային դիվանագիտության և սովետական արտաքին քաղաքականության փաստաթղթերում (1828 – 1923), Երևան, 1972, էջ 750:
- 36 ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 200, ց-1, գ. 237, ք. 51- 64 (կրճատումները մերն են - Է. Դ.):
- 37 Documents relating to the trials of the Armenian Genocide were translated from their original languages into Armenian and published by A.H. Papazian in «Հայերի ցեղասպանությունը ըստ երիտթուրքերի դատավարության փաստաթղթերի» Yerevan, 1989.
- 38 Հուշամատեն մեծ եղեռնի, էջ 1028:
- 39 Мустафа Кемаль, Путь новой Турции, Т. I, стр. XXXI, М., 1929.
- 40 "The Turko – Armenian Question. The Turkish Point of View", Constantinople, 1919, p. 83 – 84.
- 41 ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 28, ց. 1, գ. 109, ք. 165:
- 42 «Մշակ», 26 հունվարի, 1916:
- 43 «Մշակ», 14 մարտի, 1915:
- 44 А. Б. Кадимев, Интервенция и гражданская война в Закавказье, М., 1960, стр. 63.
- 45 Հուշամատեն մեծ եղեռնի, էջ 132:
- 46 Ալ. Խատիսեան, Հայաստանի հանրապետութեան ծագումն ու զարգացումը, Պեյրուք, 1968, էջ 86 (ընդգծումն իմն է - Է. Դ.):
- 47 "Геноцид армян...", стр. 522 – 523 (ընդգծումներն իմն են - Է. Դ.):
- 48 "Геноцид армян...", стр. 534 – 540; Ե. Գեղամյանց, Տա-

- հիկները Կովկասում և Բագուի անկումը, պրակ II, Բագու, 1919, էջ 140; «Հայերի ցեղասպանությունը Օսմանյան կայսրությունում. փաստաթղթերի և նյութերի ժողովածու», Երևան, 1991, էջ 626:
- 49 "Կոմմունիստ", օրգան հայկական գործերի կոմիսարիատի, Մոսկվա, 1918, N 8:
- 50 ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 200, ց. 1, գ. 55, ք. 27:
- 51 «Բանբեր Հայաստանի արխիվների», 1967 թ., N 1, էջ 242:
- 52 "Советская историческая энциклопедия", Том I, М., 1961, стр. 753.
- 53 ՀԱԱ, ֆ. 200, ց. 1, գ. 657, ք. 190:
- 54 "Армянский вопрос: Энциклопедия", Ереван, 1991, стр. 241.
- 55 Сафрастян Р. А., О решении Европейского парламента по вопросу геноцида армян (ԲՀԱ, 1988, N 2, стр. 54 – 58).
- 56 «Ազգ», 1 մարտ, 2005 թ.:

Edward G. Danielyan

**"THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE OF
1894-1922 AND THE ACCOUNTABILITY
OF THE TURKISH STATE"**



Noyan Tapan Publishing House

Peper: Offset N1, 60x84 1/16, volume: 3.5 printer's sheet
signed for printing 18/04/05, number of copies 250

Armenia, Yerevan 9, 28 Isahakian street

tel.: (3741) 565965

E-mail: contact@noyan-tapan.am

URL: <http://www.nt.am>