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At the present stage of high technologies The National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia is publishing electronic magazines and journals covering different fields of science. Taking into account the fact that Armenology has been proclaimed a priority direction of the scientific policy of the Republic of Armenia and that the concept of Armenology and the strategy of the development of the field of Armenology through 2012-2025 have been approved by a RA government decision, presently an opportunity is offered to present to the international scientific community studies in the sphere of Armenology by the Internet. The “Fundamental Armenology” journal in the English language, created with the support of “The All Armenian Foundation Financing Armenological Studies”, is called to undertake this project.

The publication of the journal is taking place on the eve of the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide, thus the articles, publications and documents included in the journal are for the most part dedicated to the memory of the innocent victims, international recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide. The vivid evidence of the Motherland-Diaspora unity is a just demand reflected in the all-Armenian Declaration on the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide adopted at the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic high state level under the spiritual patronage of the Armenian Apostolic Church.

“Fundamental Armenology” includes studies devoted to the history of Armenia, historical geography, philosophy and law, demography and governance, archaeology, linguistics, literature, political science and informational security. Along with the articles and books elucidating current Armenological issues, attention is paid to the publication of works having actual significance and written by the preceding generation of prominent Armenologists which emanates from the principle of heredity contributing to the development of science.

Armenology has great experience of international cooperation, the foundations of which were laid in the Golden Age of Armenian culture, with translations into Armenian of numerous literary works of the Ancient World thanks to the Armenian alphabet created by St. MesropMashtots for the millennia-old Armenian language. Among them are also a number of important works, the Greek and Assyrian originals of which have been lost with the lapse of time and presently it is possible to get acquainted with them only through Armenian translations.

Armenology has a history of centuries and due to historical circumstances expanding beyond the boundaries of the Motherland it has included numerous centers and research schools founded abroad, a considerable part of which have harmonized the development of studies in the fields of Armenian history and philology, architecture
and art. Thus, within the framework of international cooperation the publication of fundamental Armenological studies will be realized.

But there are also centers that are actually engaged in falsifications of history and in the information sphere with political purposes, so special attention is paid to unmasking and strict criticizing of falsifications and distortions and, in particular, the Turkish-Azerbaijani ones pursuing the denial of the Armenian Genocide.

Vivid evidence of the current international cooperation of Armenian and foreign Armenologists has been the First (2003) and Second International Armenological Conferences (2013), the discussed issues and published materials of which testify to the need to research and give solutions at the academic level to the urgent problems and contemporary challenges faced by Armenology.

“Fundamental Armenology” offers great opportunities to introduce the outcomes of works by Armenian and foreign Armenologists, to discuss through academic research work the existing problems and to outline and implement their solutions, as well as theoretically substantiate and present the upcoming projects at the international level.
PAN-ARMENIAN DECLARATION ON THE CENTENNIAL OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The State Commission on the Coordination of Events Dedicated to the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide, in consultation with its regional committees in the Diaspora,

-expressing the united will of the Armenian people,

-based on the Declaration of Independence of Armenia of 23 August 1990 and the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia,

-recalling the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 10 December 1948, whereby recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,


-taking into consideration that while adopting the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the United Nations specifically underlined the importance of international cooperation in the struggle against that criminal offence,

-emphasizing the inadmissibility of impunity of the constituent elements of the crime of genocide and the non-applicability of statutory limitation thereto,

-condemning the genocidal acts against the Armenian people, planned and continuously perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire and various regimes of Turkey in 1894-1923, dispossession of the homeland, the massacres and ethnic cleansing aimed at the extermination of the Armenian population, the destruction of the Armenian heritage, as well as the denial of the Genocide, all attempts to avoid responsibility, to consign to oblivion the committed crimes and their consequences or to justify them, as a continuation of this crime and encouragement to commit new genocides,

- also considering the 1919-1921 verdicts of the courts-martial of the Ottoman Empire on that grave crime perpetrated “against the law and humanity” as a legal assessment of the fact,
- appreciating the joint declaration of the Allied Powers on May 24, 1915, for the first time in history defining the most heinous crime perpetrated against the Armenian people as a “crime against humanity and civilization” and emphasizing the necessity of holding Ottoman authorities responsible, as well as the role and significance of the Sevres Peace Treaty of 10 August 1920 and US President Woodrow Wilson’s Arbitral Award of 22 November 1920 in overcoming the consequences of the Armenian Genocide:

Commemorates one-and-a-half million innocent victims of the Armenian Genocide and bows in gratitude before those martyred and surviving heroes who struggled for their lives and human dignity.

Reiterates the commitment of Armenia and the Armenian people to continue the international struggle for the prevention of genocides, the restoration of the rights of people subjected to genocide and the establishment of historical justice.

Expresses gratitude to those states and international, religious and non-governmental organizations that had political courage to recognize and condemn the Armenian Genocide as a heinous crime against humanity and even today continue to undertake legal measures to that end, also preventing the dangerous manifestations of denialism.

Expresses gratitude to those nations, institutions and individuals, who often endangering their lives, provided multifaceted humanitarian assistance and rescued many Armenians facing the threat of total annihilation, created safe and peaceful conditions for the survivors of the Armenian Genocide, thus promoting orphan care and the international Armenophile movement.

Appeals to UN member states, international organizations, all people of good will, regardless of their ethnic origin and religious affiliation, to unite their efforts aimed at restoring historical justice and paying tribute to the memory of the victims of the Armenian Genocide.

Expresses the united will of Armenia and the Armenian people to achieve worldwide recognition of the Armenian Genocide and the elimination of the consequences of the Genocide, preparing to this end a file of legal claims as a point of departure in the process of restoring individual, communal and pan-Armenian rights and legitimate interests.

Condemns the illegal blockade of the Republic of Armenia imposed by the Republic of Turkey, its anti-Armenian stance in international fora and the imposition of preconditions in the normalization of interstate relations, considering this a consequence of the continued impunity of the Armenian Genocide, Meds Yeghern.

Calls upon the Republic of Turkey to recognize and condemn the Armenian Genocide committed by the Ottoman Empire, and to face its own history and memory through commemorating the victims of that heinous crime against humanity and
renouncing the policy of falsification, denialism and banalizations of this indisputable fact. Supports those segments of Turkish civil society whose representatives nowadays dare to speak out against the official position of the authorities.

Expresses the hope that recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide by Turkey will serve as a starting point for the historical reconciliation of the Armenian and Turkish peoples.

Proudly notes that during the last century the Armenian people, having survived the Genocide,
- Demonstrated an unbending will and national self-consciousness and restored its sovereign statehood, lost centuries ago,
- Preserved and developed national values, achieved the renaissance of their national culture, science and education, bringing its unique contribution to the development of world heritage,
- established a powerful and effective network of religious and secular institutions in the Armenian Diaspora, thus contributing to the preservation of their Armenian identity in Armenian communities worldwide, the shaping of a respected and esteemed image of the Armenian, and the protection of the legitimate rights of the Armenian people,
- united and restored the national gene pool that was facing extermination as a result of the Genocide, through a pan-Armenian cooperation and extensive repatriation program,
- made its valuable contribution to international peace and security during the First and the Second World Wars and won glorious victories in the heroic battle of Sardarapat and the Artsakh war.

Considers the 100th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide an important milestone in the ongoing struggle for historical justice under the motto “I remember and demand”.

Calls upon the coming generations of Armenians to protect their sacred native heritage with patriotism, consciousness and intellect and resolutely struggle and serve for:
- a stronger Homeland, free and democratic Republic of Armenia,
- the progress and strengthening of independent Artsakh,
- the efficient unity of Armenians worldwide, - the realization of the centuries-old sacrosanct goals of all Armenians.

Source: www.genocide-museum.am
EDITORIAL

Since ancient times the civilizational and geopolitical importance of Armenia has been conditioned by the rich natural resources of the Armenian Highland (400,000 km²), its defense power and strategic position in Western Asia and cultural creativeness of the native Armenian nation. The more than five millennia-old ethno-spiritual and cultural roots and political, economic, social and, on the whole, civilizational developments of the Armenian statehood (Aratta, Armanum/Armani, Hayasa, Nairi, Ararat (Van)-Urartu, Great Armenia, Armenia Minor, Cilician Armenia, etc.) are testified to by the archaeological monuments (particularly the early urban sites of the Shengavitian culture), cuneiform, antique and medieval written sources (on the state system, governance and traditional institutions), architecture (temples, churches), craftsmanship [armor craft, building crafts (urban planning, castles, towers, bridges and roads), numismatic data, etc.].

The civilizational significance of Armenia is shown by more than ten-millennia old historical resources: the archaeological sources, petroglyphs, as well as rooted in the natural and ethno-spiritual environment of the Armenian Highland the Armenian language, and on the whole, ancient cultural values; and since early Middle Ages original Armenian literature and translated literature in the Armenian alphabet created by St. Mesrop Mashtots (405 AD), scientific achievements, manuscripts and miniatures, music, architectural masterpieces and khachkars (cross-stones), jeweller’s art, carpet weaving, etc. It has been researched by Armenian, French, Russian, British, German, Greek, Italian, American and many other specialists in archeology and anthropology, history, astronomy, philosophy and theology, philology and linguistics, arts and architecture. Since ancient times the Armenian Highland has been one of the world centers for the processing and export of obsidian, cultivated wheat and apricot (Prunus armeniaca), astronomical observations and creation of the Zodiac, as well as the origin of metallurgy, horse-breeding and chariots, specific features of architecture, etc. The spiritual roots of mankind’s civilization and Armenia – the Motherland of the Armenian nation coincide, as follows from the location of Paradise in the region of the sources of the Euphrates and the Tigris, and the resting place of Noah’s Ark on the Ararat Mountains, according to the Bible; Mt. Ararat-Masis - the highest peak of the Armenian Highland. All these have contributed to the assessment in exegetical literature and historiography: “L’Arménie doit être considérée comme le berceau du monde” (Dom Augustin Calmet); “Armenia: Cradle of Civilization” (David M. Lang).

The Armenian Kingdoms (since the 3rd mil. BC) of the periods of kings: Aram (according to Movses Khorenatsi), Hukkana (the 14th c. BC), Argishti I [the founder of Erubuni-Erevan (782 BC)], Tigran Ervanduni (6th c. BC), Artashes I (189-160 BC), the Armenian Empire’s King of Kings Tigran II the Great (95-55 BC), Trdat III the Great (when Armenia became the first country in the world to proclaim Christianity the state religion (301 AD)], Vramshapuh (388-414), Vachagan the Pious in Artsakh (484 - the mid-6th c.), Ashot I (885-890) and Gagik I Bagratuni (990-1020) in Great Armenia, Levon II the Magnificent (1198-1219) in Cilician Armenia, are classical examples of the civilizational developments and political weight of Armenia and the Armenian state in the regional and global spheres. Civilizational contribution of Armenia to the history of the Silk Road has a particular importance.

It is well known that deep-rooted cultures and civilizations do not come into collision, but enrich each other. At the same time, there is the competitiveness of cultures and civilizations due to diversities in cultural values; but cultures, owing to their immanent creative potential as basic ingredients of civilizations do not originally bear the elements of destruction. Those states which pursue expansionist aims, politicize ideological processes in extreme ways, violating,
abusing and deforming the field of culture; consequently an aggressive policy is accompanied by a violent destruction of cultural values and annihilation of their creators.

The destruction of the Armenian architectural monuments in Western Armenia and Cilician Armenia, together with the falsifications and distortions of history and toponyms are the continuation of the Armenian Genocide: the crime, as jointly declared by France, Great Britain and Russia (May 24, 1915), was committed by “Turkey against humanity and civilization”. The denial of the Armenian Genocide by all Turkish governments, characterizes them as accomplices in this crime. “Denial, the final stage of genocide…” (Gregory H. Stanton). Twenty one countries, the European Parliament and many other international organizations have already recognized and condemned the Armenian Genocide.

**Divine Liturgy offered in St. Peter Cathedral by Pope Francis I in commemoration of the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide has been an important event in the cause of international recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide**1.

**April 23, 2015, Mother See of Holy Etchmiadzin of the Armenian Apostolic Church: the canonization ceremony of 1,5 million victims of the Armenian Genocide**2.

***

The Armenian statehood was restored in a part of Eastern Armenia due to the Armenian people’s victories in the May Heroic Battles against the Turkish invaders. After the Battle of Sardarapat on May 28, 1918 the Republic of Armenia was established (1918-1920).

From the middle of 1918 artificially formed Azerbaijan [a pan-Turkic project with an illegally misappropriated name of Iranian Atropatene-Azerbaijan] following the Turkish genocidal policy periodically committed massacres against Armenians (Baku - September, 1918, Shushi - March, 1920). After the illegal and plunderous treaties (signed between the Kemalists and Bolsheviks) and the Kavburo unlawful and forced decision (1921), during the following decades AzSSR perpetrated inhuman acts of deportations, racial, political and religious persecutions of the native Armenian population, and the destruction of Armenian cultural monuments in some regions of Eastern Armenia (Nakhijevan, Artsakh, Utik), as well as committed genocide against Armenians in Sumgait, (February,1988), Baku (January, 1990), Getashen (April, 1991). In November 1988 Armenians were severely persecuted and deported from Gandzak (Kirivabad), Chardakhlu [a home village of the heroes (from Artsakh) of the Sardarapat Battle and the Great Patriotic War, Marshals Hovhannes Bagramyan and Hovhannes Babajanyan, 12 generals et al] and neighbouring villages.

The demand of the Artsakh Armenians, powerfully supported by all Armenians in the Motherland and the Armenian Diaspora, to restore historical justice resulted in the Resolution of the joint session of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR and the National Soviet of NKAO on re-unification of Artsakh with the Motherland (December 1, 1989). In 1991 the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic declared their independence.

The ethnic purges, deportations and massacres of Armenians (Maragha - April, Shahumyan - June-July, 1992, etc.) intensified during aggression of Azerbaijan against the Arstakh Republic. The falsification of Armenian history and destruction of historic monuments (among which were all churches and khachkars in Nakhijevan and the Jugh'a Cemetery, 2005) have been raised to the presidential level, becoming amalgamated with the revanchist propaganda, particularly after Azerbaijan's defeat in the war, unleashed by itself.

---

2 [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HgMA34GzZFY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HgMA34GzZFY)
Thanks to the heroic struggle of the Armenian freedom fighters in the Artsakh Liberation War (1991-1994) the native Armenian population and Armenian historic monuments are protected in the Artsakh Republic.

The guarantors of the security of the Armenian civilizational heritage are the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic. The Artsakh Glorious Victory - a token of future victories - has proved the might of the Armenian spiritual potential and steadfast will in protection of the foundations of national security of the Motherland based on more than five millennia of Armenian holistic cultural creativeness and freedom-loving traditions in the spirit of the Victory of Armenian Patriarch Hayk.

Armenology is a field of studies of the Armenian language, the history of Armenia and culture, and, on the whole, materials relating to historical and current realities of Armenia and the Armenian people, and constitutes an ideological component of the national security’s system confronting current challenges. Weighty achievements are attained in Armenology due to a wide range of scientific, educational and cultural activities and publications of Armenological institutes and analytical centers in the Republic of Armenia (NAS RA, Division of Armenology and Social Sciences: Institutes of History, Philosophy and Law, Archaeology and Ethnography, Oriental Studies, Arts, M.Kotanyan Institute of Economics, H. Acharian Institute of Language, M.Abeghyan Institute of Literature, Museum-Institute of Genocide, Shirak Armenology Research Center, “Armenian Encyclopaedia” Publishing House, All Armenian Foundation Financing Armenological Studies; Erevan State University, Armenian State Pedagogical University after Khachatur Abovian; The Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts - Matenadaran, Komitas State Conservatory, the Drastamat Kanayan Institute for National Strategic Studies of the RA Ministry of Defence, "Noravank" Scientific-Educational Foundation, “Ararat” Center for Strategic Research, “Voskanapat” Armenian Analytical Center, Razminfo), the Artsakh Republic (Artsakh State University, Shushi’s “Katchar” Scientific Center) and the Armenian Diaspora (Mkhitarian Congregation, La Bibliothèque Nubarian, Haikazian University, Society for Armenian Studies, Zorian Institute, Armenian National Institute, International Association for Armenian Studies, Nizhny Novgorod State University and others) a vivid evidence of which are the First and Second International Congresses on Armenian Studies (2003, 2013, NAS RA, Erevan).

The use of the term Armenology is not enough to say that the centers under that name are busy with studies of Armenological problems. For example, misusing that term with the aim of falsification, some centers have been opened in Turkey which are actually engaged in the anti-Armenian hostile politics, particularly, the denial of the Armenian Genocide. Turkey fears of territorial (Western Armenia and Cilician Armenia) reparations and restitution for the Armenian Genocide.

Armenology is declared the priority direction in the science policy of the Republic of Armenia determined by the necessity of the national security; the concept and the development strategy of Armenology have been approved by a decision of the Government. The definition and application of criteria for the subject research is becoming more important in Armenology. Accordingly, every Armenological branch along with its singularities is a part of the united system, conditioned by a complete comprehension of the historical and current realities. Conceptual studies in Armenian history, historical geography and cartography, philosophy and law, archaeology, anthropology, demography, state system and governance, ethnography, literature and philology, culture and history of science, as well as international relations and information warfare, spiritual and intellectual security, based on the national-civilizational value system, the ontological concept of the territorial entity of Armenia and the Armenian Highland, and scientifically grounded research, are within the framework of FUNDAMENTAL ARMENOLOGY.
HISTORY
The development of the statehood in the Armenian Highland started in the 3rd millennium BC and in the next millennium one of its manifestations was the state of Hayasa. During the Bronze Age the western part of Armenia entered into active economic, political and cultural relations with the countries of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia. This contributed much to the formation of the state units: Hayasa (Azzi), Isuwa (Tsopk) and Alzi (Aghdznik).

Starting from the first half of the 14th century BC the Hittite cuneiform sources inform us about the state of Hayasa (Azzi) in the territory of the Armenian Highland. As in the name Haya(-sa), known since the 3rd millennium BC, as well as in the toponym Hayasa (with the Hittite toponymic suffix -asa) the root is the endonym (self-name) of the Armenians - hay (հայ)

The first record of Hayasa is found from the period of the reign of the Hittite King Tudhaliya III (1360-1344 BC). In a relatively short period of time this state displayed a great vitality by playing an important role in the region’s political life.

Political unrest in the east and northeast, which started before the reign of Hittite King Suppiluliuma I (1344-1322 BC) (Tudhaliya’s son) continued to preoccupy his successors. Hittite texts such as the Annals of Mursili II (1321-1295 BC) tell us of rather frequent armed conflicts in the east including armed incursions against the towns of the Hittite Upper Land from the direction of Hayasa (Azzi).

After the Hayasian troops invaded the Hittite Upper Land (mainly the territory of

---

1 These place names are identical. In Hittite sources both names are used referring to the same country: Hayasa and Azzi (see. Keilschrifttexte aus Boğhazköy (KBo) III 4 IV 17–21; KBo IV 4 II 70–75; Keilschrifturkunden aus Boğhazköy (KUB) 4 XIV.

2 In Armenian historiography the first researcher of the History of Hayasa was Nshan Martirosyan, who believed that this toponym had a connection with the self-designation of the Armenians (see Մարտիրոսեան Ն., Հայերէնի յարաբերութիւնը հեթիտերէնի հետ, Հանդէս Ամսօրեայ, 1924, 9–10, էջ 453–459, 1926, 7–8, էջ 369–374). A great contribution to the study of the history, language and culture of Hayasa was made by Grigor Kapantsyan as well (see Կապանցյան Գ.Ա., Հայասա-ողբերգի արմեն. էթնոգենեզ արմեն և իր նախարարային պատկերագրություն, Երևան, 1948).

3 At this time Tudhaliya III chose the city of Samuha in the Upper Land as a temporary home for the Hittite royal court. This town was an important cult centre located at the upper course of the Marassantiya (Halys) river.

Armenia Minor, King Tudhaliya III began his march to the east, to stop the invasion. Near the town Kummaha (Ani-Kamakh in the Armenian sources, on the bank of the river Euphrates) the Hittite army met Hayasian troops led by the King of Hayasa Karanni. However, we do not know about further developments because the part in the Hittite annals telling about it is damaged.

During the reign of Suppiluliuma I a new era of strengthening the Hittite Empire began. Before starting military operations in the south against Mittani and Egypt, the king of Hatti decided to secure the rear of his state from the side of the Armenian Highland. According to the annals of Suppiluliuma Hittite forces began military actions in Isuwa, they entered the country Tsukhapa, then they invaded Hayasa near the mountains of Lahha (mountains hAykakan par- Armenian Ridge).

Following these events, a treaty was signed between Hatti and Hayasa. The contract mentions ruler Hukkana from the Hayasian side. One of the main goals in the treaty for Suppiluliuma was to secure the eastern borders of Hatti. For this purpose, he even gave his sister - the Hittite princess in marriage to Hukkana. Both sides pledged to help each other in case of war against a third state. Here, above all, they meant the state Mittani, against whom war was planned. There is a Hittite oracle text, which states that the King of Hatti, Suppiluliuma I, wished to predict Hukkana’s loyalty to the signed contract. It is interesting that in this text Hukkana is referred to as the ruler of the country of Azzi (he is called in the treaty the ruler of Hayasa). After that Suppiluliuma launched a campaign to Syria and northern Mesopotamia.

After the death of Suppiluliuma I and Arnuwanda II (1322-1321 BC) of the plague that struck Hatti, young and energetic Mursily II (1321-1295 BC) ascended to the throne. He started to fight against those countries that threatened the territorial integrity of Hatti. Hayasa (Azzi) is mentioned as one of those countries. After solving the problems with the countries Kaska (area of the East Pontic Mountains) and Arzawa (western part of Asia Minor), Mursily II planned to neutralize also the Hayasian threat.

5 The Hittite Upper Land must mainly be located somewhere between the Upper Halys valley and the Iris and Gayr river valleys in the north-eastern part of Hatti. The Land of Hayasa (Azzi) was situated to the east of the Upper Land (see Del Monte G., Tischler J., Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes, VI. Die Orts-und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte, Wiesbaden, 1978 (RGTC, VI), S. 293-294).
6 KUB XIX 11 IV 38-44 (Güterbock H., The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as Told by his Son, Mursili II, Journal of Cuneiform Studies, 1956, 10, 2, p. 66).
7 KUB XXXIV 23 (see in detail Güterbock H., op. cit., p. 83).
8 A state in the region of the Upper Euphrates and Tigris, in the south-western part of the Armenian Highland (about the location of this state see RGTC, VI, S. 154-156; Հայաստանը մ.թ.ա. XV-VII դդ., էջ 61-63:)
9 See Հայկական լեռնաշխարհի տեղանունները (ըստ խեթական սեպագիր աղբյուրների), Երևան, 2004, էջ 61-63:)
11 KUB XVIII 2.
He sent a letter to the king of Hayasa (Azzi) Anniya, requiring him to return the Hittite fugitives who were in Hayasa (Azzi). Anniya refused to comply with these demands, as a result of which the Hittite forces attacked the Hayasian border town Ura\textsuperscript{12}. But to take the city they apparently failed. According to Mursili on the 9\textsuperscript{th} year of his reign Hayasian troops began hostilities against the Hittites in their land. The Hayasian army conquered the Hittite country Istitina and began the siege of the Kannuwara city. The Hittite army came to the rescue of the people of Kannuwara. Around the city a battle took place in which the Hayasian army with its 10,000 infantrymen and 700 chariots\textsuperscript{13} was forced to retreat.

In the 10\textsuperscript{th} year of his reign Mursili II marched into the country of Hayasa. During the campaign Hayasian troops were attempting to attack the Hittite army at night, but with no success. The Hittites reached the shores of Lake Van, where they occupied the city Aripsa. After that another Hayasian fortified city, Duggama surrendered. The next year Mursili II again moved his troops into Hayasa (Azzi). Hayasians started negotiations with the Hittite king and agreed to return the Hittite fugitives\textsuperscript{14}. In fact, Hayasians returned to “Hukkana’s Treaty”.

There is no information about the military clashes between Hatti and Hayasa after Mursili II during the reign of his successors. There are several inventory and oracle Hittite texts in which the country of Azzi is mentioned\textsuperscript{15}. Apparently, it was a time of peaceful relations between the two countries.

Chronologically, the latest information about Hayasa (Azzi) is given in the text of Tudhaliya IV (1237-1209 BC)\textsuperscript{16}. It says that several countries (Azzi, Lukka, Kaska) are hostile to the country of Hatti and Hittite governors of the Hittite border areas should be on the alert.

After the collapse of the Hittite Empire the toponym Hayasa or Azzi is not mentioned in the chronicles. Probably the united Hayasian kingdom broke up into smaller state formations that are mentioned in Assyrian sources of the 12\textsuperscript{th} -11\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC as “the countries of Nairi”\textsuperscript{17}.

According to Hittite sources, the state of Hayasa (Azzi) was located to the east of Hatti. It bordered on the Hittite Upper Land and the countries of Kaska and Isuwa. One of the cities (Aripsa) of Hayasa was located on the shores of Lake Van\textsuperscript{18}. From all this we

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item KUB XIV 17 (Götze A., Die Annalen des Muršiliš, S. 94-98).
\item KBo IV 4 V II; KBo III 4 IV.
\item KBo IV 4 4-55 (Götze A., op. cit., S. 130-139).
\item KUB XXII 62; KUB XLII 69; KUB XLVIII 105+KBo XII 53; KUB XLIX 1.
\item KUB XXVI 12 II 12-15.
\item In the 13\textsuperscript{th} century BC Hayasa (Azzi) was an independent state and was neither a subject to the Hittite Empire nor the Assyrian Empire. The division of the Hittite Empire into several states at the beginning of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century BC had to result in creating more favorable conditions for Hayasa (Azzi). Assyria also faced a political fall at that time. Thus, there was no serious external factor that could result in the fall of Hayasa (Azzi).
\item The Hayasian town Aripsa, which was mentioned in the campaign made during the 10\textsuperscript{th} year of Mursili’s reign, was described as a town “in the sea” (KBo IV 4 IV 5). It was not situated on the coast of the Black Sea because in that case the Hittites would have to pass through the Eastern-Pontic Mountains and their confrontation with the
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
can conclude that the state Hayasa (Azzi) included the main territory of the Western part of the Armenian Highland from the river Euphrates (according to the Hittite sources - the Mala river) to Lake Van. However, our existing ideas of the territory of Hayasa are drawn from Hittite sources, details of which apply to those areas of the Armenian Highland, which the Hittites were able to penetrate into. Therefore, the spread of Hayasa’s influence to the east through the valley of the river Arax is not excluded either. Hence, Hayasa (Azzi) stretched at least from the Upper Euphrates valley to the basin of Lake Van.

Hayasa (Azzi) was at that time (the 14th and 13th centuries BC) a powerful state in the Armenian Highland. Kings of Hayasa (Karanni, Anniya, Hukkana) had a difficult relationship with the kings of Hatti: for the most part it was a hostile relationship. But there were also periods of peace.

Judging from the correspondence between Hatti and Hayasa, it is worth mentioning that there should have been scribes in the Hayasaian court who conducted state correspondence. The “people of Hayasa” is mentioned as one of the parties in the “Hukkana’s Treaty”. This may mean that the power of the Hayasaen king was limited by either a People’s Assembly19 or a council of elders. One of the foundations of the state of Hayasa was the army. For that period, 10,000 infantrymen and 700 chariots were a considerable force. Since the Hayasians could field chariots in their battles against the Hittite cities in the Upper Land, it means that their settlements were not located only on high and rugged terrain, but on wide valleys and plains as well. As skillful and brave warriors the Hayasians also served in the Hittite army.

In Hayasa there were priests who conducted the cult of the Hayasian gods (UGUR, ISTAR, Zaga(-), Tarumus, Teritituni[s], Unagastas, U taksanas, Baltaik, [...]a[..]huhuhu, Sil[i...][i...]). The pantheon of Hayasa was presented in one Hittite inscription which was probably part of a treaty between the Hittite and the Hayasian kings. Fourteen cult centers and deities were mentioned in the treaty. According to that list we can conclude that there were temples in those 14 settlements20. It is noteworthy that the Hittites worshiped not only their gods, but others as well, especially the gods of neighboring states. Among them they venerated also the gods of Hayasa (Azzi). Thus,
Hittite texts tell us about the worship of Azzi’s Storm god, Hayasa’s Storm god and the god U.GUR in Hatti. Hittite sources give information about more than twenty Hayasian towns (settlements): Arhita, Aripa, Arniya, Azzi, Duggama, Gazu, Gasmiyaha, Halimana, Harsalasa, Hayasa, Kam, Lahirhila, Litta, Pahhuteya, Parraya, Patte, Tavatena, Tamatta, Tah(a)nisara, Ura, Utkunisa, Qad(k)usa. Thus, the towns of Hayasa (Azzi) mentioned in the Hittite sources testify to the existence of urban life in the country.

At the same time in one part of “Hukkana’s Treaty” the Hittite king threatens to destroy all the houses, fields, vineyards, cattle of the people of Hayasa, if they break the Treaty. Thus, it can be concluded that the Hayasians were farming and breeding cattle, developing agriculture and were sedentary. The Hayasian army had chariots, indicating the highly developed horse breeding in Hayasa.

The Late Bronze Age period (second half of the 2nd millennium BC) of the Armenian Highland was one of the culturally advanced stages of the history of ancient Armenia. Archaeological materials of this period have been found in the territory of Upper Armenia, Turuberan and Tayk, can be attributed to the time of the kingdom of Hayasa (Azzi). At this time, agriculture and animal husbandry rapidly developed; various types of crafts thrived, creating new forms in ceramics and in the arms production (axes, daggers and so on). Armenia in this period strengthened ties with the countries of the Near East, especially northern Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Syria and Palestine. This was the heyday of the Lchashen-Metsamor culture, which also spread to the western territory of the Armenian Highland.

In the Late Bronze Age Hayasa was a powerful state of the Armenian Highland. It could fight against Hatti, one of the “great powers” of Western Asia. In the political, cultural and economic spheres there were significant interrelations between the Hittite Empire and the kingdom of Hayasa (Azzi).

The kingdom of Hayasa (Azzi) due to its independent political power, economic resources and cultural values, and as an integral part of the Armenian statehood contributed greatly to the history of Armenia.

Translated from Armenian by S. E. Chraghyan

21 Bo 434 IV 18; KUB XII 2 24; KBo IV 13; KUB X 82 (Forrer E., Ḥajasa-Azzi, S. 22, 23).
22 Քոսյան Ա., Հայկական լեռնաշխարհի տեղանունները, Երևան, 2004: Ղազարյան Ռ., Հայասա. քաղաքական և մշակութային պատմությունը, Երևան, 2009, էջ 35-61:
23 At present there are a number of archaeological sites in that region – Sos, Karaz, Blur etc. The archaeological excavations in the territory of Upper Armenia and adjacent regions throw a new light upon the history and culture of Hayasa, its political and economic relations (see Ղազարյան Ռ., Հայասա-Ազզիի տարածքից, ՊԲՀ, 2004, 3, էջ 228-234).
Movses Khorenatsi’s “The History of Armenia” which extends from “The Root of Mankind” to c. 440 AD is a unique sample of world chronicle. The Armenian Father of History, stated: “History is not true without chronology”\(^1\). At present, a millennium and a half later this statement is adequately valid for the historiography and history of literature as well\(^2\).

The chronological classification of the authors of ancient and mediaeval Armenian works is of the utmost importance to accurately envision the course of literary history, which is inseparably associated with the general history of the Armenian people and, particularly, the development of the Armenian spiritual culture.

The first attempt to classify Armenian literature, parallel to writing the history of Armenia, belongs to the greatest representative of our modern historiography, Mikayel Chamchean. In his tri-volume monumental work, he relied mainly on traditional data\(^3\). The authors of “The New Haykazeian Dictionary” G. Avetikyan, Kh. Syurmelyan, and M. Avgeryan played a significant role in classifying ancient and medieval Armenian bibliography. They often unmistakably determined the time of writing or translation of works based on linguistic-stylistic characteristics\(^4\). Considerable also were the contributions of renowned Armenologists A. Aytnyan\(^5\), T. Tornyan\(^6\), N. Byuzandatsi\(^7\) and, particularly, G. Zarphanalyan. Their valuable works relate to medieval Armenian literature and the translations of ancient works\(^8\).

The credit of creating the systematic chronology and history of Armenian ancient and mediaeval literature belongs, however, to renowned literary critic and historian of literature M. Abeghyan, whose “History of Ancient Armenian Literature” in two volumes\(^9\) remains a handbook. “It appears that it would be impossible to compose a work with

---

\(^1\) Մովսէս Խորենացի, Պատմութիւն Հայոց, աշխատասիրութեամբ Մ.Աբեղեան եւ Ս. Յարութիւնեան, Տփղիս, 1913, էջ 224:
\(^2\) Մուշեղյան Ա. Վ., Մովսես Խորենացու դարը, Երևան, 2007:
\(^3\) Չամչեանց Մ., Պատմութիւն Հայոց, հտ. Ա-Գ, Վենետիկ, 1784-1786::
\(^4\) Սրբ. բարոյիկ ձեռագրագր գրքը, հոր.՝ Սրբ. Սրբ. կենսագրութեամբ, Երևան, 1836, էջ 9-20:
\(^5\) Այտընեան Ա., Քննական քերականութիւն աշխարհաբար կամ արդի հայերէն լեզուի, 1866:
\(^6\) Թոռնեան Թ., Հատընտիր ընթերցուացք ի մատենագիտութեանց նախնեաց, , հտ. 1, 1866, հտ. 2, 1910.
\(^7\) Բիւզանդացի Ն., Կորիւն վարդապետ և նորին թարգմանութիւնք, Երևան, 1900:
\(^8\) Զարպհանալեան Գ., Պատմութիւն հայերէն դպրութեանց, Երևան, 1883, նույնի՝ Հայկական մատենագիտութիւն, 1889:
\(^9\) Աբեղյան Մ., Հայոց հին գրականության պատմություն, Երևան, 1944, հտ. 1, 1946:
chronological succession, without sufficiently clarifying the main moments of our ancient literature,” he wrote\textsuperscript{10}. Such chronological difficulties are tangible for modern researchers even half a century later, at present.

During the last three to four centuries the progress of European Armenology has contributed to the recognition of ancient and mediaeval Armenian literature as one of the most unique expressions of world literature. Meanwhile, Armenological studies have posed serious questions for Armenian philologists and historians, particularly with regard to the chronological succession in this field, which is waiting for its solution. Many of these issues continue to await solution.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, in the course of the rapid development of comparative philology and the historical-comparative method, centuries-old traditional perceptions pertaining to the chronological order of famous Armenian historians, writers, and their works underwent serious scientific revision. Along with achievements of historical and philological thought, excessively “impartial” examination of texts and sources often led to unsubstantiated verdicts and a variety of whimsical hypotheses. Age-old traditions were dismissed and moving the authors from one century to another became the preoccupation of ambitious critics, whereby they were called “hypercritics”.

A greater temptation was reserved for Movses Khorenatsi, who became known to European philologists during the first half of the eighteenth century, in particular through two Latin translations of his “The History of Armenia”. The first translator was the Swedish Armenologist Heinrich Brenner (1669-1732). In 1697, Brenner traveled to Persia. On his way back he was arrested and sent to Moscow by the Russians, because the 1700-1721 war had erupted between Russia and Sweden. During the years of his captivity, Brenner became interested in ancient Armenian literature and in Movses Khorenatsi’s “The History of Armenia” in particular, and initiated its translation into Latin. After the Russo-Swedish peace treaty was signed in 1721, Brenner received permission to return to Stockholm and was appointed director of the Royal library. In 1723, he published in Stockholm the first annotated and abridged version of Movses Khorenatsi’s “The History of Armenia” in Latin.

The second complete and comprehensively annotated Latin translation belongs to two young English philologist brothers, William (1667-1752) and George Whiston, who published the translation in London (in the printing house of their father) along with the translation of the short recension of Movses Khorenatsi’s “Ashkharhatsoyts” (Geography) and the original Armenian text\textsuperscript{11}. The Whiston brothers applied their entire

\textsuperscript{10} Աբեղյան Մ., նշվ. աշխ., հտ. 1, Առաջաբան, էջ 1:

knowledge of classical philology and ancient and early-mediaeval Greco-Roman literature to this publication. In their annotations, many parallels were drawn between Khorenatsi’s History and the works of Greco-Roman classical authors, turning the Latin translation by the Whiston brothers into a valuable source. Along with the Latin translation, they placed the originals of Movses Khorenatsi’s “The History of Armenia” and “Ashkharhatsoyts” published by Tovma Vanandetsi in Amsterdam (the first in 1695, the second 1698).

The hypercriticism against Movses Khorenatsi reached its peak in the late nineteenth century (A. Gutschmidt, Q. Carrier, G.Khalatyants), when toponymy and historical events belonging to the sixth-seventh centuries were “denoted” in Khorenatsi’s History, thus these hypercritics claimed that he could not have lived in the fifth century. Simultaneously, they ascribed to the Armenian historian a whole series of borrowings from the historiographic works of the sixth-century Byzantine authors Malalas and Procopius, and from the late-seventh-century abridged Armenian translations of Silvestrus’ “Biography” and Socrates Scholasticus’ “Ecclesiastical History”. Therefore, they concluded that Movses Khorenatsi could not belong to the fifth century, nor could be a pupil of Sahak Partev and Mesrop Mashtots, as he tried to “fake” in his “The History of Armenia”. The facts were so impressive that they attracted the attention of other dedicated Armenologists, such as M. Ter-Movsisyan, J. Marquart, H. Hübschmann, N. Adontz, and N. Marr, who generally esteemed Khorenatsi highly.

In spite of this, a group of traditionalist philologists (B. Sargisean, N. Byuzandatsi, S. Malkhasyants, M. Abeghyan) ardently attempted to counter these attacks on Khorenatsi. Among them was the British Armenologist Frederick Cornwallis Conybeare (1857-1924) who in 1903, in a study refuted O. Carriere’s false theory, showing that Khorenatsi did not borrow from Malalas’ Chronology; rather, both of them used an older, the fourth-century Greek source12.

In 1904 Adontz harshly criticized G. Khalatyants, accusing him of intentionally defaming Khorenatsi; and he voiced the hope that with Khalatyants’ research on the Armenian Arsacid dynasty, the negative-biased study of Khorenatsi’s History would come to end and transition to a positive and more realistic view,13 in spite of this hope, new Armenian and non-Armenian names joined the ranks of Khorenatsi’s critics.

Decades later N. Akinyan came to replace Khalatyants. He proceeded to bring the critique of Khorenatsi’s History to the level of grotesque. In his work, Ancient Literary Researches, published in 1930, Akinyan suggested that Khorenatsi’s History was written in the beginning of the ninth century by the historian Ghewond Erets: “The forger


13 Ադոնց Հ., Գ.Խալատյանց, Արմենիական Արշակյաններ Իստորիայում Մովսես Խորենացու. - Զարգացանք արևելյան ու արևմտյան հայ գրության մասին, Երևան, 1929, էջ 60-65.
under the name Movses had before his eyes the Prophet Moses, the author of Pentateuch.” At the same time Akinyan with rather impermissible ridiculousness etymologized “Khoren atsi.”

In 1934, H. Manandyan, despite rightfully criticizing Akinyan, still, treated the issue with a similar spirit and suggested that “Lament” and “The History of Armenia” were written after Bugha’s invasion of Armenia in 852-855, during the reign of Catholicos Zakaria (855-875), thus furthering Marquart’s theory.

In 1940, in his introduction to the new Armenian translation of Khorenatsi’s History, S. Malkhasyants’ wrote: “In our opinion, the issue of the period the history was written in should be considered consumed after the numerous new and old evidences we have brought in the first addendum to our study “About Khorenatsi’s Mystery” (page LXXI). Nevertheless, in 1961, Cyril Toumanoff published an article (“On the Date of Pseudo-Moses of Chorene”) in English which he included again in his “Studies in Christian Caucasian History”. He considered the discussion over and revived the old arguments of the 1880s and 1890s, in particular, those belonging to Marquart. Thus Toumanoff moved “Pseudo-Moses” back from the late ninth century and placed him in the second half of the eighth century.

The climax of negative criticism against Khorenatsi must be considered Robert Thomson’s introduction to the English translation of Khorenatsi’s History, published in 1978. There, Khorenatsi is presented as a monk who lived as if during the second half of the eighth century and who, in order to establish reliability before the readers, camouflaged himself as the famous fifth-century philosopher and translator Movses and pretended to be a pupil of Sahak and Mesrop. Relying mostly on the arguments of G. Khalatyants and C. Toumanoff, and referring to all historical and geographical anachronisms found in Khorenatsi’s History during the last century, R.Thomson concluded that Khorenatsi’s History reflects the period following 750 when the Bagratids gained the upper hand over the Mamikonian’s princely family in Armenia and this coincided with the first decades of the Abbasid Caliphate established in Iraq. R.Thomson wrote that benefiting from the Armenian authors of the fifth to eighth centuries (from Agatangeghos to Sebeos and Stepanos Syunetsi), as well as the Armenian translations of foreign authors, Khorenatsi tried to restore the fifth-century texts to their original state and create a history that would give “Armenia an important role in Roman-Parthian history and forging a close link between the Bagratids and Palestine”, with intention to reserve a special role for Armenians on the stage of world

14 Մանանդյան Հ., Խորենացու առեղծվածի լուծումը, Երևան, 1934, էջ 130-131 և 176:
15 See in: “Հանդէս ամսօրեայ”, 1961, 10-12:
history\textsuperscript{18}. In his introduction, Thomson subjectively “qualifies” Movses Khorenatsi as “a mystifier of the first order,” “audacious, and mendacious, faker,” who “when he is recasting written texts - be they originally foreign or native Armenian - he is completely unscrupulous in his distortions\textsuperscript{19}.

Jean-Pierre Mahe, a French Armenologist, also mentions the anachronisms in the introduction and annotations of his new French translation of Khorenatsi’s History\textsuperscript{20}, but unlike Thomson, he retains a profound respect for Khorenatsi and his classical work.

The debate about the time of Khorenatsi has entered its second century, but the reviewers of his time have not yet reached a consensus. A. Gutschmidt, H. Hubschmann, A. Zaminyan, L. Melikset-Bek, and H. Orbeli considered Khorenatsi to be a seventh-century author. Others, such as O. Carrier, H. Tashyan, G. Ter-Mkrtchyan, S. Janashia, C. Toumanoff and R. Thomson, placed him in the eighth century. J. Marquart, K. Maclaire, N. Akinian, H. Manandyan moved him to the ninth century. Others mentioned a longer stretch: K. Krumbacher and F. Haage suggested the seventh to eighth centuries, whereas G. Khalatyants and Hans Levi offered the eighth to ninth centuries. N. Adontz suggested placing Khorenatsi’s History among the literary monuments of the sixth-eighth centuries. Thus, Khorenatsi’s time has been stretched over a period of more than 300 years, depending on which fact carries a greater weight in the eyes of researchers.

The current level of classical philology requires a more analytical approach toward the critical issues related to Khorenatsi and his work, and an optimal examination of ancient Armenian and non-Armenian sources. G. Sargsyan’s work is very important from this point of view, where he noted that Movses Khorenatsi was the author of the 5th century and criticized R. Thomson’s anti-scientific position in relation to Khorenatsi\textsuperscript{21}.

S. Malkhasyants suggested that Movses Khorenatsi was born around 410 AD, based on the presumption that he should have been 22-23 years old when he set out for Alexandria, Egypt, to study\textsuperscript{22}. But this date is unacceptable because Koryun, the youngest pupil of Mashtots, must have been at least 20-21 years old when in 431 he was in Constantinople during the Third Ecumenical council of Ephesus; therefore, he, too, would have been born in 410. Meanwhile, Khorenatsi belongs to the younger generation of the pupils of Mashtots and Sahak, like his brother Mambre the

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 57.  
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., pp. 56-58.  
\textsuperscript{21} Մովսես Խորենացի, Պատմություն Հայոց, թարգմանությունը, ներածությունը և ծանոթագրությունները ակադեմիկոս Ստ. Մալխասյանցի, Երևան, 1868, էջ 6.
Decipherer, Eghishe - the historian of the Vardan rebellion, and others. According to H. Acharyan, Khorenatsi was born in 425.

According to a tradition, before heading overseas Movses was an acolyte under Catholicos Sahak Partev. Considering that Movses would have been at least 18-20 years old to serve as an acolyte and, moreover, make a distant trip at the time Sahak Partev died (at the end of the month Navasard in year 438 or 439), it is appropriate to suggest that he was born around 420.

Moses Khorenatsi’s initial education coincided with the years when, thanks to Mashtots’ efforts and the order of Emperor Theodosius Junior (408-450), Armenian children were gathered in convenient places within the districts of Western Armenia (which was under the Byzantine rule) to receive stipends and learn the newly invented Armenian alphabet.

Khorenatsi, while telling of Mashtots’ teaching in the western parts of Armenia, and perhaps also by recalling his study memories and impressions, noted: “Mesrop, dwelling in the uninhabited and woody places called Shaghgomk, completed the instruction of the first groups. He taught not as if it were an art, but as if he were giving spirit to the students in the apostolic manner.”

Besides, Khorenatsi studied Greek language and literature, because only a youngster at the age of 18-20 with such knowledge could have been dispatched to Alexandria by Catholicos Sahak and Mashtots, along with peers, to become an expert of the language in a real academy. Young Moses was most likely sent to Alexandria after 435, when, in his own words, Sahak and Mesrop translated again the Holy Bible that had been originally translated “hastily.” They found that the Armenian translation was deficient in many parts, because “they were not versed in our technique,” that is, of the grammatical forms adopted by the Greek school and adjusted for the Armenian language.

Thomson and some others consider it questionable that Khorenatsi studied in Alexandria; they consider it a snobbish boasting on his part. But that Khorenatsi and his peers were indeed dispatched overseas by Sahak and Mesrop, in particular to Alexandria and other famous cities to complete their higher education is confirmed by a document produced in the second half of the sixth century, which here is being referred to for the first time.

According to the epistle “On Christ’s Manifestation”, the Armenian Catholicos Hovhannes opposed to the novelty of the Roman Church (which established Christ’s
Birth and Manifestation to be two separate feasts, and designated December 25 as Christmas), and together with some arguments noted, “the holy fathers who convened in Nicaea, and the blessed St. Grigorios and St. Aristakes, did not establish two feasts - Christmas and Manifestation, but rather one. Likewise, the spirit-bearing vardapets [Sahak and Mesrop-A.M.] and translators who were taught in Alexandria and other famous cities, did not translate anything more and new, neither they perceived [such things] and nor consigned them to us.”27 This letter of Hovhannes, in addition to providing reliable information that Khorenatsi had studied in Alexandria, provides the earliest reference to the existence of his History, because it was the main source that related to the studies carried out in Alexandria. This is so despite S. Malkhasyants' note that “There are no historical writings that have reached us from the sixth century which would contain a hint about Khorenatsi. Our literature of this century consists of translations, in general, and is Hellenistic in style.”28

On his way to Alexandria young Movses visited also Edessa, and “sailed gently over the depths of the archives” as he recalls figuratively, he examined slightly the rich local archive in Edessa. Thereafter, “we went on to worship the holy places and be engaged in the Palestinian studies for a brief period.”29 Thus, Movses had also been in Jerusalem and was introduced to the Hebrew language. Afterward, he with his peers entered the famous country - Egypt, where they studied in the “real academy” of Alexandria for a few years, during which, apparently, Movses called his teacher the New Plato. After completing their studies Movses and his peers headed for Hellada (Greece), but because of a stormy sea their boat found itself in Italy. After a short stay in Rome, the peers moved to Greece and spent the winter in Attica, Athens. There, young Movses discovered Ecclesiastes by David of Rome, incidentally containing a description of the flight of the seventy virgins named after Hripsime from Rome to Egypt and thence their arrival in Armenia by the command of the Mother of God.

Movses and his peers traveled from Athens to Byzantium (Constantinople) and from there to the Homeland. This confirms, as reported in the epistle “On Christ’s Manifestation”, that the translators had been in Alexandria and other famous cities. This, in fact, is an echo of Khorenatsi’s account, reaching us through the epistle reflecting the ecclesiastical debates of the sixth century. It is noteworthy that in both the second chapter of Khorenatsi’s first book (unlike his third book, where the city is called

27 Գիրք թղթոց, Թիֆլիս, 1901, էջ 88-89:
28 Մալխասյանց Ստ., Ժամանակագրական խնդիրներ հայոց հին մատենագրության մեջ. “Բանասիրական հետազոտություններ”, Երևան, 1982, էջ 31:
29 Մովսէս Խորենացի, էջ 344:
Alexandria\textsuperscript{30}) and the aforementioned epistle, the city is named \textit{Alexandr} instead of \textit{Alexandria}.

Reliable information on Khorenatsi’s birthdate and epoch can also be collected from his book, “The History of Armenia”. Beginning with the first chapter - “The reply to the epistle of Sahak and the promise to fulfill his request” (where he gratefully promises his patron, Prince Sahak Bagratuni, to write the history of our nation and praises him for such a patriotic work) until the end of the work, Khorenatsi engages in direct conversation with his patron. While describing historical events, he intermittently stops to ask him questions or respond to his suggestions or opinions. This lively dialogue, which most likely was conducted in writing on Prince Sahak’s part, also continues almost to the conclusion of “The History of Armenia”.

Khorenatsi proceeds with this unique dialogue so masterfully that the preferences and interests of the other side with regard to the heroic acts of other nakharar dynasties (princely families), become comprehensible. This allows us to conclude that Khorenatsi sent his History piecemeal to Sahak Bagratuni, to familiarize him with the work, and sometimes received from him suggestions with advice to include various historical tales, ancestral traditions, and episodes relating to other nakharars.

It appears that in order to make “The History of Armenia” comprehensive, Sahak Bagratuni also made considerable effort, prompting Khorenatsi not to omit the historical tales and events of big and small nakharar families, and he did this with utmost reverence toward Khorenatsi and his wisdom. Sahak did not want the History to become mere praise for the Bagratuni princely family. He wanted it to shed equal light on the significant deeds and valour of other princely families, at the same time not forgetting even the obscure and insignificant ones. The Father of History sometimes accommodated his patron’s requests, such as when relating tales about the heroic acts of Aram Haykazn (I. 12-14). He sometimes accepted the suggestions unwillingly. There were also instances when he opposed the high-ranking nakharar with great exasperation, in attempts to spare their important venture from unreliable tales.

“For this reason, we shall write nothing about those families that were established by the last Tigran, despite your frequent pleas with us, but we shall write only of the subsequent ones that we know for certain. Because we have avoided, as far as has been possible, superfluous and embellished words and whatever words and opinions tended toward unreliability, following only what was fair and true, whether from other [sources] or from our own [knowledge] to the best of our ability. Here, behaving in the same way, I am stopping the course of my account as I note anything unsuitable or prone to casting doubt upon reliability. And I beg you now, as I have done often, not to impose writing superfluous things on us, lest our whole great and reliable labor turn into

\textsuperscript{30} Նույն տեղում:
useless and unnecessary work because of such few or many accounts, for that brings equal danger to you as to me.\textsuperscript{31}

This unique and interesting dialogue, which Movses Khorenatsi conducted with his influential patron with conscious genius and resolute dignity, beyond all doubt was received respectfully by the renowned Bagratuni. In addition to revealing the personality and moral characteristics of these two persons, the dialogue gives researchers valuable information about Khorenatsi and Sahak, helping to determine their ages and the epoch in which the History was written.

As a result of sending the eight chapters\textsuperscript{32} of the epic of Tigran and Azhdahak to Sahak Bagratuni, Khorenatsi received from the patron an unexpected request to also tell the Persian myths that relate to Byurasp Azhdahak. These were neither included in Khorenatsi’s plan nor in concordance with his literary taste. And although he reluctantly fulfilled the patron’s plea, he excluded the chapter of Persian myths from his History’s narration by placing it between the First and Second books. At the beginning of the chapter Khorenatsi reproached his patron with those pleas attributing them to his nonage and immaturity: “But what then is your passion? The fables of Byurasp Azhdahak are bombastic and ugly; and why are you troubling us for those awkward and unstylish and especially senseless Persian fables?”.

Furthermore: “I repeat the same to you. What need have you of these and what wish is this to desire the undesirable and to trouble us more? We attribute this to your young age and consider it the desire of your nonage and immaturity. Therefore we shall here enact your will and fulfill your wish.”

Thus the angry Father of History reproaches his patron, a man of high rank whose thoughtfulness had fascinated him and made him write at the beginning of his History, “By keeping the spark of your prudence alive and aflame with a beautiful intellect, you adorn the reason, whereby you remain a perpetual image.”\textsuperscript{33}

Thanks to the “incident” that angered Khorenatsi, we now know that Sahak Bagratuni, the client of “The History of the Armenia” was rather young when the book was in the process of narration. Therefore, those scholars are quite right who identify him as Sahak Bagratuni the knight whom the Armenians at the beginning of the rebellion in 481 AD installed as governor, and who organized together with Vahan Mamikonyan the Armenian rebellion against the Sassanid domination and perished in young age in the battle beside the Kura river.

Khorenatsis’ last appeal to Sahak Bagratuni is made in one of the concluding chapters of “The History of Armenia”. At the beginning of his work Khorenatsi speaks of his own age and uncertain future without anxiety, “especially because the task that lies

\textsuperscript{31} Մովսէս Խորենացի, էջ 198:
\textsuperscript{32} Նույն տեղում, Ա. ԻԴ -ԼԱ, էջ 71-86:
\textsuperscript{33} Նույն տեղում, էջ 6:
before us is long, and time for mortals is short and uncertain.” At the end of the History, he speaks with trepidation of his own old age and unhealthy condition, paying little attention to the purity of his style. In haste to conclude the History, he addresses his patron with the following invaluable message:

“Because I am an old and sick man with no leisure from translating, and I have determined to hurry, without attention to the purity of style, so that your wishes may be accomplished and I may be free of your pressing demands and entreaties. I consider you to be a man with needs equal to ours and not, as the poets say, that princes are descendants of gods, relatives and kin to them.”

Khorenatsi uses the same words to describe his age and fragile health in the introduction to “Պատմութիւն սրբոց Հռիփսփմեանց” (“The History of Saint Hripsimyants”).

This means that Khorenatsi’s patron, Sahak Bagratuni, was still alive when “The History of Armenia” was completed. The dialogue permits us to almost unmistakably determine that Khorenatsi composed his History during the seventh decade of the fifth century and completed it around 480, when he was 60 years old, and although aged and ailing, steadily engaged in translations, “with no leisure from translating.”

In 1944, Malkhasyants offered a chronology of the famous works of Armenian literature of the second half of the fifth century in his study “Chronological Issues in the Ancient Armenian Literature”, suggesting: “Eghishe’s History is written in 461, Agatangeghos’ History - in 461-465, the Armenian translation of Labubna and following it Biography of Apostle Thaddaeus - in 461-470, Pavstos’ History - around 475, Khorenatsi’s History - in 483-485, Ghazar Parpetsi’s History - in the 490s”. H.Acharyan rightfully criticized this chronology.

The assumption that Khorenatsi’s History was written in 483-485 cannot be substantiated, because at that time, during the uprising of Vahan Mamikonean, Sahak Bagratuni had already been killed; whereas, as we saw, Khorenatsi communicated with his patron while writing the History. Therefore, “The History of Armenia” would have been completed a year or two before Vahan’s uprising (481/2-484). According to Hovsep Gatrchyan, Khorenatsi’s History was written in 480.

In his “ Chronicle”, Samuel Anetsi writes the Armenian year ՆՂԲ (corresponds to 492 AD) next to Khorenatsi’s name, without specifying what the date denotes. Nevertheless, the date is acceptable as the year Khorenatsi died.

34 Նույն տեղում:
35 Նույն տեղում, Գ.ԿԵ:
36 Սրբոց հօրն Մովսէսի Խորենացւոյ Մատենագրութիւնը, Վենետիկ, 1865, էջ 297:
37 Սալոմոն Սատ, Պատմագրություն Հայկական աշխարհի, Երևան, 1929, էջ 32-33:
38 Հայկական տեղեկագիր, Հայկական պատմագրություն կրճատ տեղեկագիր, Երևան, 1945, 3-4, էջ 47-50:
39 However, according to Saint-Martin, Khorenatsi must have died in 490 AD ( see Գաթրըճեան Յ., Հինգերորդ դարու չորս հայ պատմագրութեանց ժամանակը, Հանդէս ամսօրեայ, 1887, 1, էջ 9-12):
Western Armenia - the largest part (more than 270,000 square km.) of the Armenian Homeland. The overwhelming majority (about 2.5 million) of the Western Armenian population lived in their Homeland; if we were to take also into account the Armenians living in the mid 19th century beyond Western Armenia, throughout the Ottoman Empire - in Constantinople, Smyrna and other cities, towns and settlements, this number in total would be 3 million.1

The Ottoman government, having conquered Western Armenia, instantly took up to radically alter its demographic composition, aiming to decrease the Armenian population’s number in general balance. The Ottoman authorities encouraged and supported the penetration and settlement of Turkic and Kurdish elements in the regions of Western Armenia. These alien elements were settling in the Armenian villages and regions; the best arable lands and pastures passed on to their chieftains and feudal lords. In keeping to this policy, the Ottoman authorities later on, in the 19th century, in particular, began to settle Circassians in the Armenian provinces, granting them various economic privileges.

Ultimately, at the beginning of the 20th century, to be more precise, in 1912-1913, following the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the first Balkan war, big numbers of Turkish refugees migrated from the Balkans and settled in different regions of Asia Minor, and penetrated further east, into the Armenian Highland, thus worsening the demographic situation in Western Armenia.

The Ottoman authorities quite often perpetrated massacres of Armenians using the hands of Turkish bands, as well as the Kurds and Circassians. In a word, hellish conditions were created for Armenians in their own Homeland.

To sum up, we might say that the Ottoman authorities, by the policy of settling alien both ethnically and religiously (Moslem) elements in the Armenian lands sought to achieve two major goals.

In spite of the demonic efforts of the Ottoman authorities Armenians still represented a relative majority in all Western Armenia’s regions (“vilayets”) taken together and what is more important, Armenians did remain an overwhelming majority in

---

1Հայկական հարց: Հանրագիտարան, Երևան, 1996, էջ 233:
the whole of Western Armenia up until World War I.

At this stage the policy of the Ottoman government in effecting the administrative-territorial division was very much the same. The Ottoman authorities kept remodeling and restructuring the provinces in Western Armenia, until they found the version, which matched their expansionist policy towards non-Turkish peoples: to split up the Armenian provinces into fractions, and to annex these one by one to the neighbouring provinces where alien population dominated. As a result, aboriginal Armenian areas would “shrink”, thus distorting the demographic balance of those mixed provinces.

As a consequence of the Treaty of Qasr-i Shirin (1639) signed between Iran and the Ottoman Empire, Western Armenia was divided into seven pashaliks: Erzrum, Sebastia, Van, Diarbekir (Amid), Bayazet (Daruynk), Chaldiran and Kars. In the 19th century the pashaliks were replaced by the system of vilayets - provinces. Western Armenia from that time on consisted of the vilayets of Erzrum (Karin), Kharberd, Svaz (Sebastia), Trabzon (Trapezunt) and Diarbekir (Amid). In place of the former seven pashaliks five vilayets were formed.

Pursuing the anti-Armenian policy of fragmentation of the Armenian provinces and simulated increase of the number of the Moslem population in them, sultan Abdulhamid II founded the province of Bitlis (Baghesh) in 1879-1880, for that reason severing relevant portions from the Van and Diarbekir provinces. In the 1880s, he divided the Erzrum vilayet, the biggest among the administrative units with the predominating native Armenian population into four provinces: Erzrum, Van, Mush and Hakkari. Shortly after, the province of Mush with the predominating Armenian population stopped existing, too. In its place a new, Dersim vilayet was created, where Kurds and Turks predominated.

In 1897 a new division was carried out in the territory of Western Armenia. There were constituted the vilayets of Erzrum, Kharberd, Svaz (Sebastia), Van, Bitlis (Baghesh), Diarbekir (Amid) and Trabzon (Trapezunt).

At this stage, the Armenian Question, besides the above mentioned problems, had another important aspect. The matter at issue is the legal and political status of Western Armenians. Armenians, like all the other Christian peoples in the Ottoman Empire - Assyrians, Bulgarians, Greeks, Serbians, Romanians, and others, were in a desperate condition and deprived of all rights. They were treated as rayya, inferiors, or seconds to the Turks. It is appropriate to notice here, that the condition of the non-Turkish Moslem peoples, of Arabs in particular, was none the better.

There was no constitution in the Ottoman Empire. The will of the sultan ruled in the country, while in the provinces, valis and pashas, notorious for their tyranny, were the masters. The norms of Shariah - the law of Islam, and adat - the customary law worked, which did not defend the interests of the Armenians and other Christians.

As Christians, Armenians were deprived of the right to carry weapons; hence they were absolutely unprotected against the attacks and encroachments of Turkish, Kurdish and Circassian bands. Armenians were not allowed to provide evidence in the court, did
not have the right to ride a horse: it was the privilege of the Turks or other Moslems, to whom Armenians had to give way in the street. There were a great many other restrictions and bans, humiliating and insulting the dignity of Armenians.

Neither did the Armenians enjoy personal immunity and inviolability of the home. The acting laws, norms and customs did not grant them any of these guarantees. The sense of defenselessness chased Armenians all the way, making a nightmare of their and their family’s lives. In the Ottoman Empire it was commonplace to scorn the religious feelings of Christian Armenians. Religious oppression and the policy of national discrimination and forced de-ethnicization, entwined with the severe, desperate social-economic conditions were very much the same for all Christian peoples in the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, among historians it is common to define the Ottoman Empire as a prison for nations.

The imprisoned peoples undertook attempts to remedy themselves, to somewhat improve their condition. In the the 19th century, the national-liberation spirit of the non-Turkish peoples, the Armenian people including, grew high. Their protests against the legal anarchy and despotism often took the shape of armed struggle.

In the 20s of the 19th century the Greeks rebelled. They shook off the Ottoman yoke and became independent in 1830.

The Egyptian crisis followed this in 1831-1841, when the ruler of Egypt Muhammad Ali launched the military struggle against the Turkish sultan. Muhammad Ali was close to a definitive victory, but the interference of the Great Powers saved the sultan from imminent defeat.

Armenians of Zeytun rebelled in 1862. They stood up bravely against the divisions of the Turkish regular Army, and were able to force the enemy to respect their rights and national dignity.

Violent skirmishes and anti-Turkish manifestations took place in almost every province of the Empire. All of this came to show that the Ottoman Empire, typologically categorized as a country of massacres and carnages, a military-feudal political system, suffering a heavy crisis, which embraced the governmental, political, legal, social, economic, inter-ethnic, religious and spiritual-cultural spheres.

The Ottoman ruling clique, conscious of the impending serious threat to the integrity and the very existence of the Empire, endeavoring to find ways out of the existing backwardness, addressed the policy of partial reforms. By the Edict (Hatti
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Sherif of Gülhane) proclaimed in 1839 by the Ottoman sultan, the so-called Tanzimat reforms were set forth in the Ottoman Empire. Yet, even limited reforms, because of the decaying and regressive Ottoman state system had never been effected. The provisions, promulgated in the second phase of the Tanzimat reforms in 1856 (Hatti Hümayun in 1856) also remained on paper. As a result, no changes took place in the legal-political status and social-economic condition of the Western Armenians, in particular.

In the late 1870s - early 1880s, the Armenian Question became an international issue. This was preceded by a number of events, two of which were of crucial importance.

The years of the reign of Sultan Abdulhamid II (1876-1909) went down in the history of the Ottoman Empire as years of zulum - horror and autocratic dictatorship. Political killings and mass murders were one of the peculiar features of the time. Beginning with “the murder of all his brothers and members of their families”, he introduced individual and mass murders into the Ottoman political “culture”, as the “best” method for settling problems. One of the first killed was Midhat Pasha, the originator of the constitution, promulgated in 1876, which Abdulhamid II was induced to “adopt” within the first year of his reign, and which function he suspended after one year by his own order. Mass murders of all the non-Turkish peoples of the Empire was made an integral part of the rule of Abdulhamid. Armenians were among the first victims of the policy. Slaughters of the Armenians, executed by Abdulhamid II, were not accidental, neither were they the sultan’s caprice. They were conceptual by nature. The Syrian historian Marwan al-Mudawar wrote: "Sultan Abdulhamid II who had also been justly named al-sultan al-ahmar ("red sultan"-N.H.) reigned over the Ottoman Empire with his iron hand for 33 years". Such was the atmosphere in the Ottoman Empire, when the concept of settling the Armenian Question through the physical extermination of Armenians began to shape. And the formula "To solve the Armenian Question by way of physical extermination of Armenians" Abdulhamid II made a cornerstone of his policy. The carnivorous policy of Abdulhamid II earned him the title “bloody sultan” or “red sultan”.
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The other important event was the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-1878, and the defeat of the Turks. The Russian troops gained victories both on the Balkan and the Caucasian fronts. In the Balkans, the Russian troops occupied Bulgaria and advanced to the outskirts of Constantinople, while on the Caucasian war stage, they took Ardahan, Bayazet (Daruybnk), Alashkert (Vaghars hakert), Kars and Erzrum (Karin), i.e., a considerable segment of Western Armenia, as well as Batumi.

The Turks were forced to cease the war operations and seek for peace. The Peace Treaty between the Russian Empire and the Ottoman Empire was signed on March 3, 1878, in the township of San Stefano in the vicinity of Constantinople. It verified the victories gained by Russian weapons. According to the Treaty of San Stefano, the independence of Serbia, Montenegro, and Romania was recognized, Bosnia and Herzegovina received autonomy within the bounds of the Ottoman Empire. Bulgaria was announced an independent principality. The Turkish troops were to leave Bulgaria; the Russian troops, instead, were to stay on for two years. Under the Treaty, Ardahan, Kars, Bayazet and Batumi passed over to Russia.13

In the Treaty of San Stefano a special Paragraph 16 was added, concerning the reforms in Western Armenia.14 It said, "Taking into account that the withdrawal of the Russian troops from the occupied territories of Armenia bound to be returned to Turkey, may cause clashes and complications there, which may harm the good relations between the two states, the Sublime Porte undertakes to immediately carry out improvements and reforms in the provinces, inhabited by Armenians, proceeding from the local needs, as well as to secure Armenians' safety from Kurds and Circassians."15

The parties agreed that in "Asian Turkey", that is, in Western Armenia, the Russian troops would stay on for a period of six months, during which the reforms should be accomplished. Simultaneously, the Turkish side committed not to pursue those Armenians, who, in the time of the war, had communicated with the Russians. Thus, by the Treaty of San Stefano the Armenian Question constituted part of the international diplomacy.

Another important circumstance makes the Treaty of San Stefano unique: the goodwill of Russia and the consent of the Sublime Porte that the Russian troops remain in Western Armenia at least for six more months, until the completion of the reforms. This was a kind of guarantee.

The Treaty of San Stefano, undoubtedly, was not perfect and flawless. Thus, nothing had been said about constitution of an administrative unit, which would put on a legal basis the realization of the reforms and the solution of the Armenian Question within these frames, and which would, certainly, add hopes as to its final settlement.

14 Ibid, с. 123.
15 Հայաստանը միջազգային դիվանագիտության և սովետական արտաքին քաղաքականության փաստաթղթերում (1828-1923), Երևան, 1972, էջ 92.
The Treaty of San Stefano was the victory of Russian diplomacy, and it seriously worried its European opponents, who feared that the Ottoman Empire would become totally dependent on Russia, and the strategic balance in the Eastern Question would change in favor of the Russian Empire. This contradicted their interests, and they would never let it happen.

England and Austria-Hungary, supported by the German Chancellor, Otto von Bismarck, were particularly active in this matter. These forces achieved an agreement on convening an ad hoc congress to review the Treaty of San Stefano. A united front of the most powerful European Powers opposed Russia. The latter, finding itself in isolation, had no choice but to consent to the convening of the congress.

The Congress met in Berlin on June, 1878. The Chairperson was Bismarck. England and Austria-Hungary (supported by Germany), France and Italy succeeded in that the provisions of the Treaty of San Stefano were reviewed, Russia’s positions weakened, while their own positions and influence on the Ottoman Empire, quite understandably, reinforced.

By the Treaty of Berlin, Bulgaria, perceived by the European Powers as the major outpost of Russia in the Balkans, was torn apart. North of the Balkan mountains, the autonomous principality of Bulgaria was established, with the prince to be approved by the sultan, and that - with the consent of the Great Powers. The Bulgarian regions south of the Balkan mountains constituted a separate province, named Eastern Rumelia, which remained under the domination of the sultan. Bosnia and Herzegovina passed to Austria-Hungary. Serbia, Montenegro and Romania were recognized as independent.16

The Congress of Berlin addressed the Armenian Question, too. To participate in the discussion and to present the demands of Western Armenians in the Congress, a representative delegation arrived in Berlin, lead by the outstanding public and ecclesiastical figure Mkrtich Khrimyan (Khrimyan Hairik)17. He, however, was not allowed to participate in the work of the Congress, nor was his memorandum considered, the highlight of which was to grant limited autonomy to Western Armenia.

Under the resolution of the Congress, Russia returned Alashkert with the valley and Bayazet (Erzrum had been returned before) to the Ottoman Empire. Ardahan, Kars, as well as Batumi remained with the Russian Empire18.

In the Treaty of Berlin there was a specific Paragraph 61, dedicated to the Armenian Question. It differed from Paragraph 16 of the Treaty of San Stefano in several very important aspects, and this not to the benefit of Armenians. Here is what it said: “The Sublime Porte undertakes to immediately carry out improvements and reforms in the provinces inhabited by Armenians, proceeding from the local needs, as well as to secure Armenians’s safety from Kurds and Circassians. On the measures,
taken to this end, the Sublime Porte is bound to report on a regular basis to the states assigned to supervise their implementation”\(^{19}\)

If, under the Treaty of San Stefano, the reforms in Western Armenia were to be carried out in the presence of the Russian troops, which, as was mentioned, was a kind of guarantee for their implementation, now, under the Treaty of Berlin, the Russian troops were withdrawn, and everything was left to the discretion of the “red sultan”. He only claimed responsibility to periodically report to the states, which only acquired supervising functions.

Paradoxical was the fact that the states entrusted the sultan “to secure Armenians’ safety from Kurds and Circassians”, whereas the sultan himself was the major instigator of all the anti-Armenian activities of the Kurds and Circassians. A perfect example for it is that, right after the Congress of Berlin, in 1891, by order of Abdulhamid II, a cavalry, named after the sultan “Hamidie”, in which exceptionally Kurds were enlisted, was set up and kept at the sultan’s expense. It consisted of 30 regiments, which were not integrated in the system of the Ottoman army. They were kept as a separate military unit, and were located in the Armenian town of Erzinkan. The foremost goal of Hamidie was to organize slaughters of Armenians on the entire territory of the Ottoman Empire, in which they succeeded ‘brilliantly’, particularly at the time of 1894-1896 and subsequent massacres.

A very important expression *territories of Armenia* mentioned in the Treaty of San Stefano was excluded from the Treaty of Berlin, there was left only *the provinces inhabited by Armenians*.

It is necessary to note that the bloody sultan Abdulhamid II banned the use of the country-name “Ermenistan” - Armenia by a special order.

If we also take into account the fact, that among the Great Powers there had always existed controversies and contradictions, it would be understandable that the sultan could benefit from these controversies, as he basically did, in order to stop the reforms and to carry on his aggressive anti-Armenian policy.

In other words, the mechanisms for reforms in Western Armenia, created by the Treaty of San Stefano were destroyed by the Treaty of Berlin. As noted by Moussa Prince, the Armenian Question fell victim of the resolutions adopted by the Congress of Berlin, for the “British-German competition and the Machiavellianism of Bismarck did not allow that Paragraph 16 of the Treaty of San Stefano be fulfilled”\(^{20}\).

After the Congress of Berlin, the Ottoman sultan and the ruling clique were reinforced in their conviction that the “only solution” of the Armenian Question was the extermination of Armenians. It was sadistically viewed by them as a “realistic way” to free themselves from the interference of the European Powers into the internal affairs of

\(^{19}\) Сборник договоров России с другими государствами, 1856–1917, Москва, 1952, с. 205.

the Ottoman Empire by using the Armenian Question, particularly, the demand of the reforms’ implementation in the Armenian regions.

The adoption of the genocidal policy was encouraged by the fact that sultan Abdulhamid II and his political surroundings were well aware that the Great Powers were insincere in their numerous statements in defense of the Armenians, that none of them would take any definitive steps against the Ottoman Empire, and in support of the Armenians and their just claims. In their turn, the Great Powers strove to exert pressure on the Ottoman sultan, to incline him to concessions, and to still deepen his dependence on them.

In 1880-1890 the first political parties - Armenakan, Hnchak and Dashnaktsutyun, and, later, Ramkavar - emerged on the political arena. They attached more orderliness to the Armenian liberation and self-defense struggle. Armenian self-defense, or hayduk detachments were formed. They set forth the goal to defend the Homland - honor and dignity, villages and townships, houses and households, property of their Armenian compatriots, from the tyranny, encroachments and raids of the Turkish and Kurdish bandit groups instigated and supported by the Turkish authorities.

Whatever it was, it sufficed for the Ottoman clique to interpret the self-defense activity of the Armenian hayduks, or the demands of Armenians for reforms, as a manifestation of unrest, or even an attempt of a rebellion, and to use it as grounds for organizing carnages. The apex of the Armenian massacres, organized by the Ottoman Empire at the end of the 19th century, were the slaughters of 1894-1896, perpetrated against unarmed people in peacetime.

The first blow was hit to Sasun, a province in the vilayet of Bitlis (Baghesh), which had long been known for its steadfast will to withstand the Turkish tyranny. The sultan decided that it was high time to get even with the freedom-loving Armenians of Sasun. The Kurdish bands began the assault on Sasun in 1893. They, however, were defeated and ran away. In August of 1894, the fourth Turkish Army under the command of Zeqi pasha, marched on Sasun. The Sasuntsi Armenians resisted stubbornly, and the severe battle continued for about a week. Yet, the forces were not equal, and the regular Turkish army eventually won. Sasun was demolished, 40 villages were leveled, ten thousand people killed.

The brutal actions of the bloody sultan Abdulhamid II caused serious concern in many of the European states. England, France and Russia intervened. An ad hoc committee was founded to investigate the issue. In May of 1895, in Constantinople the ambassadors of the three above mentioned state submitted to the sultan proposals regarding the would-be reforms in the Armenian provinces. Having formally promised to carry out the reforms, the sultan in reality delayed and never meant to undertake a single step. Moreover, he was waiting for an opportune occasion to resume and expand the slaughters.

The occasion turned out to be the rally, organized by Hnchak party on September
30, 1895 which gathered four thousand participants in Constantinople. It was in support of the project, put forward by England, France and Russia in May. The Turkish police and the infuriated mob attacked the gathering and began killing the unarmed people; casualties amounted to thousands. Massacres occurred in various localities of the Ottoman Empire, in which the military units of the Turkish army took their part, too. In September, 1895, slaughters were committed in Trabzon; in October - in Erzinkan, Marash, in the following months - in Sebastia, Erzrum, Diyarbekir, Bayazet, Kharberd, and other places.

The sultan’s authorities attempted a massacre in Zeytun, too, but the local community had taken timely and pertinent steps to withstand the Turkish troops. Hence, when in December 1895, the military units of the Turkish army assaulted Zeytun, they met a serious resistance. The combat lasted for 4 months and the Turks failed to break the heroic struggle of the Armenians of Zeytun. At last, the European ambassadors and the Armenian Patriarchate intervened, and in 1896 an agreement of armistice was reached. By the agreement, the sultan forgave all the rebels and committed to assign a Christian ruler in Zeytun.21

The massacres resumed in 1896. Mass murders were perpetrated in Constantinople. Despite the stubborn and long struggle, the defenders of Van had to stop fighting. They trusted in the British Consul's intercession, and accepted the proposal of the Turks to stop the armed struggle and to leave for Persia. The Turkish side, however, did not keep to its promise and brutally attacked the Armenians, leaving Van, and killed a great many of them.

Massacres of Armenians were perpetrated in Urha (Edessa-Urfa), Shapin-Karahisar, Amasya, Mush, Marzvan and other regions, towns and villages of Western Armenia and other parts of the Ottoman Empire.

In the massacres of 1894-1896, more than 300,000 Armenians were killed. But the losses of Armenians were not confined to this. Under the existing extremely desperate conditions near 100 thousand Armenians were compulsorily converted into Islam, and about the same number forcibly left their Homeland. It was not a local massacre, but a total one, genocidal by nature.

The Great Powers, certainly, could not miss the opportunity to intervene. In December 1896 - February 1897 the Conference of the accredited to the Ottoman Empire ambassadors of England, Germany, France, Russia, Italy and Austria-Hungary was convened in Constantinople to discuss the status quo. Nothing concrete was suggested, and day after day, over and over again they kept talking about the reforms. Finally, the ambassadors passed a non-binding draft resolution on the reforms in six Armenian provinces (vilayets) - Karin (Erzrum), Kharberd, Sebastia (Svaz), Baghesh

(Bitlis), Van and Tigranakert (Diyarbekir). It was recommended to establish a Supreme Council for reforms, a Supervising Committee etc. Similar to all the previous and subsequent formulas, this, too, remained on paper.

On July 23, 1908, the Party of Union and Progress organized a revolt and seized the power. In 1909 sultan Abdulhamid II was dethroned. The Young Turks came into the arena under the motto of the French Revolution, “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity”. All the nations in the Empire, Moslem or Christian, vigorously welcomed the overthrow of the “red sultan”. But, as appeared shortly after, the Young Turks were well disguised ardent chauvinists, who continued the policy of oppressions and slaughters, carried out prior to them by the sultans. They were the advocates of the idea of assimilation of all the nations of the Ottoman Empire to create a “pure” Turkish “entity”, never stopping even before mass slaughters in order to execute that idea. Once again, the first victims to fall were Western Armenians. In 1909, the Young Turks organized Armenian massacres in Adana and regions in Cilicia, killing 30,000 Armenians.

***

The period between the last decades of the 19th century and the first decade of the 20th century was marked by periodical activization of the Turkish genocidal policy against Armenians, while the Great Powers were announcing about the “reforms” for the solution of the Armenian Question. In 1878-1914 some options of a solution to the Armenian Question were put forward by various states and political forces. The most common model of the Armenian Question was that of “reforms”, which officially was set forth in the Treaties of San Stefano and the Congress of Berlin, then reiterated on various occasions with various modifications. It was planned to carry out the reforms in six Armenian provinces (vilayets): Karin (Erzrum), Kharberd, Sebastia (Svaz), Baghesh (Bitlis), Van and Diyarbekir (Amid), or in seven vilayets, adding to these the seventh vilayet of Trabzon (Trapezunt).

It was also presumed that some of the provisions of the reforms, particularly, those ensuring security of person and property, securing Armenians’ safety from the raids of Kurds and Circassians, etc., would be effected beyond these vilayets, too, among all the Armenians throughout the Ottoman Empire.

This model had some advantages. To begin with, by putting forward this model the sultan had to acknowledg that in the Ottoman Empire, the conditions of Armenians were really hard, and that there existed the Armenian Question, seeking to be solved. Second, this model, basically covering the key regions of Western Armenia, as an initial step was acceptable for Western Armenians, and, formally, for the European Powers - England, Austria-Hungary, Germany, Russia, France.

The model of reforms had also some essential flaws in terms of the mechanisms of implementation. It had never had realistic and influential leverages, it never created
an appropriate mechanism to make the implementation of the resolutions, verified by the international documents, obligatory, inevitable and irreversible. The European Powers contented themselves merely with passing resolutions and making statements, and did not think it necessary to undertake any actual and efficient steps to facilitate the realization of the resolutions. As regards Turkey, its rulers had always adhered to the policy of hypocrisy and massacres. On the one hand, they admitted publicly the need for reforms in the Armenian regions, signed under the appropriate international documents, while on the other, they energetically and industriously perpetrated slaughters of Armenians. As a result, instead of the model of reforms, the model of mass slaughters of the Armenians was put in action.

Another option for the solution of the Armenian Question was the model of decentralization of the Ottoman empire, which became popular at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Among the adherents of the idea of decentralization of the empire was prince Sabaheddin, a nephew of Abdulhamid. In contrast to the Young Turks' doctrine of the Pan-Turkism, the non-Turkish elements “tended to group themselves behind prince Sabaheddin”, who “through his League for Private Initiative and Decentralization called for an Empire in which ethnic and religious groups would govern their own provinces on a decentralized basis. Much of the political strife which racked the Ottoman Empire after the Revolution can be traced to the struggle between these two conflicting points of view”.

The principle of decentralization found ardent supporters among the Arab countries, which saw in it the key to the solution of their political, economic, national and cultural problems. The position of the Arabs was very important, as they made up the majority among the peoples in the Ottoman Empire. In 1912, in Cairo, the Arabs founded “Lamarqazia” (“Decentralization”) - the party for administrative decentralization of the Ottoman Empire, with branches in Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Iraq and elsewhere. The leader of the Party was a famous Arab philosopher, social scientist and publicist Rafik al-Azm. The keynote claim of ‘Lamarqazia’ was to transform the Arab and other non-Turkish vilayets of the Ottoman Empire into autonomous provinces with their local administration and provincial legislative assemblies. Such a status was designed for the Armenian provinces, too, as the best option and way to settle the Armenian Question.

22 Propagating the monstrous idea of “a strong unified empire” in which “the non-Turkish elements would be fused with the Turks” (see: Neville J. Mandel, The Arabs and Zionism before World War I, London, 1976, p. 59) they cynically added: “Our Christian compatriots shall be Ottomanised citizens. We shall no longer be conquerors and slaves, but a new nation of freemen” (J. Macdonald, Turkey and the Eastern Question, London, 1913, p. 55).
23 Neville J. Mandel, op. cit., p. 59. Ruben Sahakyan, Commenting on the documents from the archive of the Armenian public-political and state figure Yakov Zavriev [Hakob Christophori Zavryan (1866-1920)] about Turks, the Turkish chauvinism and Pan-Turkism [Zavriev wrote: “Sabaheddin vainly appealed to Turks warning them to use the pattern of France or Germany (the states with predominant homogeneous national composition), in vain he urged them to renounce the centralized governance which aroused intensification of anti-state feelings. The ruling party accused him of the plot against the political system, and the Prince had to leave for abroad”] noted that Sabaheddin (1877-1948) was a political figure, opposing the Young Turks (Թ. Ամանուն, Փաստաթղթեր Յակով Զավրիևի անտիպ արխիվից, Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես, 2011, 2, էջ 263).
Armenians also supported the idea of decentralization of the Ottoman Empire, backing up both the options: the models suggested by Sabaheddin and ‘Lamarqazia’. Close relations, based on the understanding of one another's views, were established between Armenians and Arabs. The best manifestation of it was the First Arabic Congress, convened on the initiative of ‘Lamarqazia’ on June 18-23, 1913, in Paris. In the Congress, along with the representatives of the patriotic organizations and national-political figures of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Palestine, the Western Armenian delegate participated. The Congress once again reconfirmed the position of the Arabs in the issue of the decentralization of the Ottoman Empire.

The First Arabic Congress in the discussions specifically addressed the Armenian Question and the ways of the solution. Paragraph 8 in the adopted Resolution was dedicated to the Armenian Question, where it said, “The Congress approves of and supports the demands of the Ottoman Armenians, which are based on the principles of decentralization, and extends greetings to them with their delegate”24.

The Ottoman rulers, who were advocates of the strictly centralized state structure and carried out the policy of slaughters and forcible conversion into Turks of the non-Turkish peoples, were definitively against decentralization, considering it totally destructive for the existence of the Empire. They did not only reject decentralization, but applied oppressions against the upholders of the idea. Even prince Sabaheddin did not feel safe. To escape imminent assassination, he fled out of Constantinople and settled in Switzerland.

One more option of the solution of the Armenian Question circulated. It was the so-called ‘model of Mountainous (Mt.) Lebanon’. The essence of the model was as follows: in Mt. Lebanon, in the mid 19th century, in the wake of the long-lasting bloody clashes, instigated through the complicity of the Sublime Porte and the European Powers, primarily by England and France, an original way of ruling was established in 1861. The sultan, under the pressure of the mentioned European Powers, approved the Organic Statute of Mt. Lebanon, which gave that region administrative autonomy, the status of a mutasarrifiyah. The sultan appointed governor, mutasarrif, whose being Christian was obligatory, and the nominee should be approved by the European Powers which also acted as guarantors for the autonomy of Mt. Lebanon25.

Karapet Artin Daudian of Armenian descent was appointed the first mutasarrif in Mt. Lebanon. After the 1877-1878 Russo-Turkish war, an identical, slightly modified principle was applied to Bulgaria. As was mentioned, the Treaty of Berlin of 1878 divided Bulgaria into two parts. An autonomous Bulgarian polity was created in one of

24 See: Ն. Հովհաննիսյան, Արաբական առաջին կոնգրեսը 1913 թ., Հայկական հարցը: Հանրագիտարան, էջ 51; Documents of the First Arab Congress, 1913, Beirut, 1985, p.117.
them with the right to elect a prince, who, however, should be approved by the sultan with the consent of the European Powers. Bulgaria was granted the Organic Statute, that is, the right to have a constitution. The other part of Bulgaria, Eastern Rumelia, although under the sultan’s immediate domination, yet received administrative autonomy. The governor, necessarily Christian, was appointed by the sultan, and the nominee should be approved by the European Powers. 

As is seen, this model of administration - creation of an administrative autonomous unit in any region of the Ottoman Empire, with the sultan-appointed Christian governor by the consent of the European Powers, acting simultaneously as guarantors for autonomy - had had precedents. This is a most significant factor in international law. This model was, in principle, acceptable for the sultan, and was employed in the Arab and Balkan domains of the Ottoman Empire.

Western Armenians did not mind to be granted administrative autonomy, anchored on the same principles. “Inspired by the Lebanese precedence, - writes Moussa Prince, an expert in the given issue- Armenians wished to receive a modest administrative autonomy, less ambitious, than the international Statute of Mt. Lebanon”27. This option of the solution of the Armenian Question was backed up by various political and clerical figures; among them was Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople Nerses Varjhapetyan, enjoying wide popularity among various Armenian circles. The Memorandum, presented at the Congress of Berlin in 1878 by the Armenian delegation, contained the principal provisions of the model of Mt. Lebanon. Yet, as was mentioned, it was not even addressed to during the discussions at the Congress.

The parties addressed this option once again in 1912-1914, related with the new favorable situation set in after the 1912-1913 Balkan wars and the Turkish defeats. Taking advantage of the situation, Catholikos of All Armenians Gevorg V applied to the Russian government with a request to once again put forward the issue of the Armenian reforms. Meeting the request of the spiritual leader of Armenians, the government of the Russian Empire developed the draft proposal, which was founded on the provisions of the autonomy of Mt. Lebanon. The draft was presented to the European Powers, and on July 3-24 of the same year, it became a subject for discussions at the meeting of the accredited to Constantinople ambassadors of the Great Powers.

The Russian proposal largely considered the main provisions of the draft submitted by the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople. It was proposed, that six Armenian provinces (vilayets) - Erzrum, Bitlis, Kharberd, Svaz, Van and Diyarbekir, be united and one Armenian province created, with the governor at the head. The latter - Christian of the Ottoman citizenship, or European – was appointed by the sultan for a term of five years with the consent of the European Powers. The executive power was

27 Moussa Prince, Un genocide impuni. L’Armenocide, p. 28.
all focused in the hands of the governor. Affiliated to him, an Administrative Council was founded, and six advisors, three Christians and three Moslems, were elected to the provincial council, where Christians and Moslems were represented by equal numbers, etc. The draft contained several other important proposals, of which the most worthwhile are those regarding the elimination of the notorious ‘Hamidie’ bands, restitution or indemnity for the appropriated Armenian lands, prohibition of settling the Moslems who had migrated from the Balkans in the Armenian province, etc. This draft proposal was the best ever put forward for the solution of the Armenian Question.

The European Powers took different attitudes towards the Russian proposal. England and France principally accepted the proposals. As regards the Triple Alliance - Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey, they were against it. In particular, they were decidedly against the unification of the vilayets and creation of a united Armenian province; appointment of a governor with the consent of the Powers; parity of Christians and Moslems in the so-called provincial and local assemblies and among government officials, etc. Germany and her allies suggested taking as a basis for the discussions the Turkish version of the draft, where there was nothing said about the creation of the Armenian province. Instead, it was suggested to restore the status of the six vilayets. Turkey was also principally against the European supervision of the appointment of the officials and implementation of the draft. The diplomatic battle around the two proposed drafts lasted for about a year. England and France were not so active, as opposed to Germany and its allies, which exerted pressure on Russia and forced it to make concessions. Nevertheless, Russia was able to compel Turkey to sign the Agreement on the Armenian reforms on January 26, 1914. The Agreement, having rejected the proposals regarding the fundamental issues of administration and management, that is, the creation of the Armenian united province, as well as the preservation of the former statuses of the vilayets, chose a new variant. Western Armenia was divided into two zones. The first zone included the vilayets of Erzrum, S vaz (Sebastia) and Trabzon, while the second took in the vilayets of Bitlis, Van, Kharberd and Diyarbekir (Amid). In each zone was appointed a General Inspector (or Governor), who should be a foreigner, i.e. could not be a Turkish citizen. He was appointed by the Ottoman government, on the recommendation of the European Powers. The General Inspector, as the governor of the zone, was given certain authority to fulfill the executive power, such as to hire and fire officials, to solve land-related controversies, etc. The members of the local councils were elected from Christians and Moslems, on the principle of maintaining the numerical equality. On that same principle, the officials were appointed. The parties agreed to abolish “Hamidie”, to replace it by a reserve cavalry, etc28. The Agreement, albeit a step back in a number of issues as compared with the Russian

draft, was still acceptable for Armenians. It gave them a status and a system of administration, which - in spite of all the flaws, was more preferable than tyranny and anarchy, which dominated in the Ottoman Empire and, particularly in Western Armenia.

The Turkish government, with the consent of the European Powers, nominated Hoff, a Norwegian citizen, the General Inspector in the First Zone. The General Inspector in the Second Zone appointed was Westenenk, a Dutch citizen. Yet, none of them managed to assume the post. Shortly, World War I broke out, and Turkey and Russia, England and France found themselves in opposite, hostile factions. Turkey took the occasion to cancel the Russo-Turkish Agreement (January, 1914) on the Armenian reforms.

None of these options had ever been put into effect. Effected was only one - the option of mass slaughters. And, under the toll of the carnages, the Armenian Question entered the third and the most tragic stage - the Armenian Genocide.
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Genocide is not only a historical phenomenon or a scientific abstraction, but a severe reality of our days, the gravest crime against humanity, which prevention can save millions of human lives. From this perspective, all scientific research, examining the regularities of the genesis of genocide or genocidal programs, can contribute to the choice and application of more effective means of prevention. One of the most important and, perhaps, least researched aspects of genocide is the conceptual explication of realization of the role of a state power. Among these problems, the study of the process of preparation of genocide by the supreme state bodies stands out. This process results in a state program, stating the criminal intent to commit genocide, and the means to realize it.

The process of genesis of a genocidal program in the Ottoman Empire started back in 1876 as an attempt of radical reaction to the pro-Western reforms in conditions of abrupt intensification of anti-Christian sentiments among the ruling Turkish elite and the Muslim population of the empire. The policy of the Ottoman authorities, oriented to attaining that goal was expressed in concrete forms of transition from a social reality, where genocide does not exist as a fully shaped phenomenon, to a novel reality, where genocide does exist as its manifestation. This governmental program was directed against Bulgarians\(^1\).

The first anti-Armenian program of a genocidal nature appeared in the mid-90s of the XIX century. Its implementation resulted in mass killings of the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire, where victims totaled about 300,000.

Let us examine the state program of genocide during the Young Turks' rule, who also targeted Armenians. The program comprised three documents. In all three, both the intent to commit genocide and the means to commit it are present. The analysis of these three documents reveals the fact that they are nothing but a program for committing Armenian Genocide - a program, adopted by the Ottoman government and ratified by the sultan, thus appearing in law.

\(^1\) On this program see our paper: Սաֆրաստյան Ռ., Օսմանյան կայսրությունում ցեղասպանության քաղաքականության ակունքների հարցի շուրջ. հակազդեցություն 1876 թ. բուլղարական ապստամբությանը, Հայոց ցեղասպանության պատմության և պատմագրության հարցեր, 10-11, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Հայոց ցեղասպանության թանգարան-ինստիտուտ, Երևան, 2005, էջ 65-77.
The first of these documents is the record of the resolutions, passed at the secret meeting of a group of leading figures of the Ottoman Empire, headed by Talât, during World War One. The document is known as “10 Commandments”. It became known to the general public in 1919 from the Armenian and Turkish newspapers of Constantinople.

Prof. Dadrian scrutinized thoroughly the British archives and discovered a number of important facts, related with the origination of said document and the circumstances of finding it, and published it². In particular, it became known that at the meeting present were Interior Minister and leader of the Central Committee of the Young Turk party Mehmet Talât, members of the Central Committee, leaders of the “Special Organization” Bahattin Şakir and Nâzım, Chief of the Interior Ministry's Directorate General of Public Security Ismail Canpolad, and Chief of Division of the Intelligence of the General Headquarters of the Ottoman Army Major Şevket Seyfi. Chief of the Intelligence Service of the Interior Ministry Colonel Esad, the secretary of the meeting, documented the resolutions.

The document is not dated. The English officer, to whom Esad had handed it, set an approximate date between December 1914 and January 1915. In the light of the facts, known today, these dates are acceptable, since in February, signs of implementation of some points of the program were already observed. Thus, well-informed German Lieutenant-Colonel Stange³ reported that on February 10, deputy director of the Ottoman Bank of Armenian origin was killed for “political reasons”, and a few days before or after - the Armenian bishop of Erzincan⁴ (Yerznka in Western Armenia). Then dismissals of Armenian-born officials from public service began, then - disarmament of Armenian-born soldiers of the Ottoman army, then - arrests of officers⁵. Some scholars assert that the final decision about mass killings of Armenians was made by the Young Turk Central Committee in the middle of the same month of 1915⁶.

This is indirectly confirmed by the letter published by Aram Antonyan from the Central Committee of the Young Turk party to the responsible representative of the Central Committee in the vilayet of Adana Kemal, written on February 18, where it said that a decision had already been made to ruthlessly extirpate all Armenians, and that requisite

---

³ He was one of the leaders of the “Special organization”. See: Dadrian V.N., Documentation of the Armenian genocide in German and Austrian sources. New Brunswick, 1994, p. 110. The military rank of Stange is mistaken here for colonel.
⁶ Ibid.
orders from the government would be shortly sent to governor-generals and army commanders⁷. So, we may infer that in the frame of preparatory work for making the final decision on the Armenian Genocide, the “10 Commandments” represent the phase when an integrated and coordinated program of acts and measures towards fulfilling concrete tasks was completed.

The guilt of Talât, Bahattin Şakir⁸ and Nâzım in organizing and perpetrating the Armenian Genocide has long been known and documented. Canpolad's murderous activity against the Armenians is also well-known. In particular, he was the chief responsible figure for arrests and exiles of the Armenian intelligentsia and the representatives of other social strata in Constantinople. He was noted for his inhuman cruelty and blood thirsty inclinations even among his own party members, and thus had earned the epithet “murderous soldier”. English officer Andrew Ryan, who interrogated the arrested Young Turk leaders, admitted that he felt the least empathy for him compared with the others. Mustafa Kemal, instead, not only sympathized with the “murderous soldier”, but spoke highly of him as a “statesman”. The fifth member of that criminal group - Major Seyfi of General Headquarters, also belonged among those who were responsible for the Armenian Genocide.

In May of 1915 the Ottoman authorities passed a Law that was to serve as a “legal” disguise for the premeditated mass extermination of the Armenian people, or genocide. It appeared to be one of the bloodiest and most brutal laws in human history. In special literature, devoted to the history of the Armenian Genocide, it is often referred to as the “Law on Deportation”.

On May 24, 1915 the three powers of the Entente - Russia, Great Britain and France - came forth with a Joint Declaration, in which the mass slaughters of Armenians were severely condemned and qualified as “new crimes of Turkey against humanity and civilization”. They underscored that the members of the Ottoman government would be recognized as personally amenable to law for that crime⁹. On the same day, the French text was submitted to the “Havas” Telegraph Agency on behalf of the Foreign Ministry of France, and was immediately dispatched to Constantinople and Berlin. The official presentation of the note to the Ottoman government took place not long after, via a third party, as between the Entente countries and Turkey diplomatic relations did not exist.

The published documents allow us to retrace the entangled progress of that procedure. At first, the copy of the note was handed via US Ambassador to Paris

---

⁷ See in the text of the letter: Անտոնյան Ա., Մեծ ոճիրը: Հայկական վերջին կոտորածները և Թալեաթ փաշա, Երևան, 1990, էջ 130:
⁸ Talât and Bahattin Şakir were shot by Armenian avengers.
William Sharp to State Secretary William Bryan in Washington, at the request of French Foreign Minister Théophile Delcassé. It happened on May 28. A day later, on May 29, the latter telegraphed it to US Ambassador to Constantinople Henry Morgenthau, who eventually submitted the note to Sadrazam Said Halim Paşa. The response of the members of the Ottoman government to the note was quite hot. Ambassador of Austria-Hungary to Ottoman Empire Johann von Pallavicini reported to Vienna that it drove Sadrazam Said Halim Paşa furious. US Ambassador H. Morgenthau described in his diary Said Halim Paşa’s state after he had become familiarized with the note as “very much annoyed”.

Turkish historians in their turn gave the name of Minister of Interior Talâtı, one of those threatened with the Declaration, as by his orders deportations and massacres had started and were in progress. The latter obviously feared lest the whole burden of guilt should be laid onto his and only his shoulders. In an attempt to avoid it, he initiated a process aimed to disperse the guilt for the crime among the government members, making it a matter of collective amenability, rather than his personal. Worth noticing is that the criminal realized very well the measure of his responsibility. Talât’s unique confession on that subject has been preserved in the memoirs of his close friend Halil, a leading figure in the Ottoman Empire and in the “Committee of Union and Progress”. According to him, Talât once acknowledged that he was the one to make the decision about the deportation of Armenians.

The authorities were in such a panic that they even violated the regular procedure of passing laws. Without convening a session of the government and without the requisite resolution of the government, the “Law on Deportation” was hastily passed on May 27; on June 1 it was published and enforced immediately under the title “Temporary Law on Measures to Be Taken from Military Point of View Against Those Who Act in Opposition to the Government’s Activity in Wartime”. It was signed by the sultan and Minister of War Enver.

Following Talât’s initiative, on May 30, prior to the promulgation of the “Law on
Deportation”, a session of the government was convened. It adopted a resolution to begin the deportation. The text of the resolution is published. It is entitled “Protocol on Discussions of the Council of Ministers” and consists of two parts: “Brief Description” and “Resolution”. The document is signed by members of the Ottoman government. The segment “Resolution” also contains a statement which reveals the genocidal intent of the Ottoman government - the “necessity to completely destroy and put an end” to the Armenian movement (“imhâ ve izâlesi kat’iyyen muktezî”)\(^\text{15}\).

Let’s turn to the “Law on Deportation”.

Investigation of the Turkish materials enabled us to find out the source of the “tradition” of falsification, adopted by contemporary Turkish historians. It began back in 1916, at the time when the Armenian Genocide was still in progress. The Ottoman government, seeking to mislead the world community and avoid the potential responsibility, at first in Turkish, then in the European languages published a massive reference book, in which the reality is impertinently falsified and an attempt is made to shift the responsibility for the Armenian Genocide onto Armenians. The distorted text of the “Law on Deportation” with only three Articles is brought there; Article 4 is missing, as well as the last paragraph. The names of those who signed the Law are not brought either. It should be noted that the Ottoman government did attain its goal. Many of the contemporary and future historians based their works on the version of the “Law on Deportation”, placed in the governmental reference book, not the one in the official newspaper.

A question arises, what was such an approach of the authorities of the Ottoman Empire conditioned by? The Ottoman official documents, presently in circulation, do not give a clear answer. We may only presume that it is because the then ruling Turkish elite, namely Enver Paşa, strived to shake off the responsibility for the deportation of Armenians, cost what it might. The mass deportation of the Armenian people had started long before passing and publishing the Law, and it was carried out by the initiative and under the guidance of the Minister of Interior and the factual leader of the Young Turk party Talât. The fact is that not a single governmental official document, related to the Law in question, has come out to date. Turkish historians have put into circulation the photocopy of the first page of the “Takvim-i Vekayi”, dated June 1, 1915, where the Law (“Temporary Law on Measures to Be Taken from Military Point of View Against Those Who Act in Opposition to the Government’s Activity in Wartime”) is printed. It only proved feasible after the photocopy of the official “Takvim-i Vekayi”, dated June 1, 1915, became available. The official version of the “Law on Deportation” documents that the Law consists of four Articles, was passed on May 27, 1915, enacted

on June 1, 1915, and Enver was personally made responsible for the enactment. The Law is signed by Sultan Mehmed Reşad V, Sadrazam Said Halim Paşa, as well as War Minister and Deputy Commander in Chief Ismail Enver Paşa. The translation of the text of the Law is given below:

Article 1. In the wartime, army, troop and division commanders and their deputies, commanders of individual positions, upon seeing any manifestation of opposition by the population against the governmental orders, actions and measures towards ensuring the defense and calm in the country, as well as any attempt of armed assault and resistance, are authorized and obligated to immediately, by force of arms and most rigorously, bring them back to mind and destroy the assault and the resistance.

Article 2. Commanders of armies and individual troops and divisions, based on special military laws, at suspecting espionage or betrayal, may send the residents of villages or townships, singly or massively, to other settlements and resettle them.

Article 3. The Law is enacted as of the date of publishing.

Article 4. The responsible person for implementation of the provisions of this Law is Deputy Commander in Chief, War Minister16.

I deigned to order that, in order to ensure lawfulness, the text of this Law be presented at the session of the General Assembly17, be enacted temporarily and added to the laws of the state power. 13 Recep 1333, May 14, 133118

Reşad19,
Sadrazam Mehmet Said20
Deputy Commander in Chief, War Minister Enver”21.

The Law, according to its authors, was to disguise the genocide. Yet the provision of Article 2 reveals their striving to employ the army in committing genocide against Armenians. This Article is consistent with the fact of large-scale involvement of the Turkish military in the genocide22.

The Kemalists decided to accomplish the cause initiated by the Young Turks - this time enslaving the Republic of Armenia and subjecting to genocide Armenians in Eastern Armenia. Evidence for this is the official document created in November, 1920. Its prehistory is as follows: November 1920 proved fatal for the Republic of Armenia. On

---

16 These posts were occupied by Enver Paşa.
17 The joint session of the upper and lower houses of the Ottoman Parliament is meant.
18 Corresponds to May 27, 1915.
19 Sultan Mehmed Reşad V.
20 Grand Vizier Mehmet Said Halim Paşa.
21 Takvim-i Vekâyî, 18 Receb 1333 /19 Mayıs 1331, 7. sene, nr. 2189.
October 30 the Turkish army captured Kars and continued its aggression. The weight of the struggle moved to the sphere of diplomacy. As a result of intense multilateral negotiations of nearly one month’s duration, the Treaty of Aleksandropol was signed on December 2.

The Turkish documents of that period provide information about the real goals of the policy towards Armenia, pursued by the “founding fathers” of republican Turkey taking shape on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire. In particular, the documents irrefutably show that Turkey’s foremost goal in the last phase of the war was to destroy Armenia. According to the statement in the encryption (dated November 8, 1920) sent by Ahmet Muhtar (Acting Foreign Minister of Grand National Assembly of Turkey) to Commander of the Eastern Front Musa Kâzım Karabekir Paşa: “It is an absolute necessity that Armenia be politically and materially removed from the arena”\(^{23}\). This is an unconcealed statement of the genocidal intent: by destroying Armenia as a state, both “politically and materially”, the Turkish nationalists prepared the ground for physical extirpation of the surviving Armenians in Eastern Armenia.

Karabekir was entrusted by the Kemalist leaders to continue the genocide of the Armenian people and destroy Armenia. But this time, the plans of the Turks remained unaccomplished. True, Armenia had sustained incredible losses, yet was not “removed from the arena”; it was integrated into the Soviet Union, owing to which part of the Armenian people avoided physical extermination.

In modern Genocide Studies, comparative analysis of genocides has become a marked tendency. As a result, a special attention is devoted to the methodology of comparative studies. In particular, a “matrix for comparing and studying different cases of genocides”\(^{24}\) has been proposed. At the same time, we proposed the so-called comparative-structural method, which includes both elements of comparative analysis and analysis of concrete texts. This provides an opportunity to consider the three basic components of the analysis of genocide - definition, factual material, interpretation - suggested by the American sociologist Steven Katz\(^{25}\). Comparing the program of 1915 with the document of 1876 from that perspective, we may conclude that, during the four decades in between, the Turkish elite had refined its skills in preparing genocide and drafting requisite programs to commit it.

In the documents of 1915, the destruction of a whole nation was programmed to


be carried out, employing diverse well-coordinated activities of respective state bodies, guided from one center. Among these activities was forcible deportation, meant to disguise physical extirpation, mass destruction or forcible Islamization of previously selected groups of Armenians, etc. Also specified was, which particular power structure was to carry out extermination of which particular segment of the population. The factor of time was taken into account too - accentuated was the necessity to act simultaneously.

Special attention was devoted to measures of disguise and top secrecy of the plan. The mentioned genocidal acts were to be perpetrated not only in Western Armenia, but all over the empire. The first of the three documents, constituting the 1915 program, is a result of a secret meeting, details of which remain completely unknown to date. The document was not disclosed not only to the public at large, but even to some members of the government; at the beginning it was put into practice in conditions of secrecy, as stipulated by the last paragraph. This notwithstanding, the incredibly brutal massacre of the peaceful Armenian population all through the empire was impossible to keep secret long as follows from the fact of the abovementioned note of Russia, Great Britain and France to the Ottoman government, making the members of the latter personally responsible for the crimes perpetrated by Turkey against “humanity and civilization”.

The leadership of Turkey - the actual authors of the genocidal program - to disguise their crimes and avoid responsibility, represented the slaughter of Armenians as deportation from war zones. On Talât’s initiative, from the next day after the note had been published, the Turkish authorities began undertaking actions that would make the forcible displacement post factum appear “legal”. Thus, the principal organizers of the Armenian Genocide, fully conscious of their own guilt, in the first phase of carnages were already exerting themselves to avoid responsibility. From the analysis of the presently known documents, reflecting the last phase of making a decision on the Armenian Genocide, it follows that, unlike the year 1876, now the Young Turk perpetrators were contemplating falsification of the reality and concealment of their actions at the very start. The programs contain some apparently identical provisions. For instance, both in the 1876 and 1915 programs, the necessity of total extermination of a definite social-professional stratum - Bulgarian and Armenian teachers, is emphasized. In both documents, forcible Islamization is viewed as an additional instrument to eradicate a nation. Generally, the 1876 program is an intermediate phase between the policy of massacres, widely applied in the Ottoman Empire against Christians as a means of punishment, and the policy of large-scale genocide. That is why it is “incomplete” as a document determining concrete genocidal actions. Whereas the paragraphs of the 1915 program clearly determine the goals and the thoroughly elaborated in conditions of secrecy actions towards their attainment.
The state program of 1915 makes apparent that the Turkish elite “mastered” the “skills” in organizing mass slaughters of representatives of other ethnicities and confessions, and in that aspect that document can be only juxtaposed with the documents, planning the genocide of Jews in Nazi Germany. In any case, it is one of the most atrocious documents of the last century, a condensed manifestation of absolute evil. Between the documents of a genocidal nature, analyzed by us, there is yet another principal difference. The one from 1876 offered radical means to react to the ongoing Bulgarian armed rebellion, while that from 1915 is a result of preparatory work of long years, launched back in 1910; no armed rebellion of Armenians was underway at that time in the Ottoman Empire. Besides, from the 1890s, the Turkish powers had been practicing the severest means of perpetrating Armenian massacres, so in 1915 they certainly took advantage of their “experience”. With Bulgarians such experience was but limited.

The program of 1876 was not fully realized. Despite the fact that the April insurgence was severely suppressed, Bulgarians still resided in their own territory, and shortly were able to build up prerequisites for becoming independent. The 1915 program had been fully realized, since the Armenian people were totally eradicated from its Homeland’s bigger part - Western Armenia and Cilician Armenia.

The year 1920 stands apart because the target was not a subject people, but an independent state, which factual destruction would lead to physical annihilation of the remaining Armenians, and establish a through access to artificially formed Azerbaijan - part of the “Muslim world”. That would continue and accomplish the policy of Armenian Genocide. In the abovementioned document Armenia’s “removal from the arena” was “grounded” as follows: “It is impossible that Armenia, being located in the center of the great Muslim circle…. decline at its own convictions the obligation of a severe gendarme and decide to fully relate its fate with Turkey and Islamism”26. In another place of the same document it said that “keeping in our hands all the roads, connecting Turkey with Azerbaijan”, was essential. These statements explicate the motivation of the Kemalists’ genocidal program.

Described are also the means to attain the goal: force and diplomacy. Thus, the encryption underlined, “At present, it is an absolute necessity to demobilize the Armenian army and confiscate the arms, thereby making impossible the restoration of its military structure. Under the pretext of keeping the railways under control and defending the rights of the Muslim population, it is necessary to establish military control over the entire territory of Armenia”. In another passage we read: “You may temporarily accept the Brest-Litovsk borderline, since the goal set is first of all, to receive a written proposal from Armenians concerning the border, and thus to avoid reaching a cul-de-

sac at the talks. Yet, it is necessary to pave the way for never-ending interference under the pretext of defending the rights of the Muslim minority, remaining on the other side of the border.”

The encryption also reveals the ideological background of the Kemalist policy. Having adopted the political preferences of the Young Turks, they relied on the ideological-political teaching of pan-Turkism: “Special efforts should be exerted towards deliberate arming of Turkic peoples of the region and creating national armed forces. They will connect the East and the West and make Azerbaijan an independent Turkic state.” Some statements in the document evince that the authors paid special attention to disguising their criminal actions. In the encryption we read: “The goal mentioned above shall be attained covertly and softly, meaning both the text of the Treaty and the actions proceeding from it - to appear ever peaceful in the eyes of Armenians.” In another passage of the document the striving to disguise the reality is more open: “The provisions of the armistice to be submitted to Armenians shall be oriented towards deluding Armenians and appearing peaceful before Europe, rather than withdrawing from Armenia. In reality, they shall be aimed at stepwise preparation and maturation of preconditions for attaining our true goal.”

The program drawn up by the Kemalists bespeaks that they had done their best to learn the “genocide” lessons, delivered by the Young Turks. Furthermore, they demonstrated even greater “skills”, ready to export the genocidal policy and to implement it beyond their borders, against an independent state. The latter circumstance compelled them to be more resourceful in disguising the crime.

The existence of genocidal programs against two different nations, programs, separated by a time period of over four decades, proves that the ruling circles in the Ottoman Empire regarded the policy of genocide - deportation being a version of it - as a radical means of transformation of the multi-ethnic and multi-confessional empire into a homogeneous state, and maintaining its territorial integrity, whereas they were guided by Mustafa Kemal Turkish nationalists, who had rebelled against the sultan’s imperial government, were ready to also apply the genocidal policy against an independent state.

In essence, preparation and implementation of the crime of genocide became an integral part of state functions. According to some scholars, in cases like that in question we may even speak about certain persistence in pursuing genocidal goals, shown by the governing elite of the given state power for years, even if said goals were
not always formulated properly\textsuperscript{31}. This conclusion reinforces the position of those researchers, who suggest characterizing the Ottoman Empire during the last half-century of its history as a “genocidal” and “criminal” state\textsuperscript{32}.

Preparation and implementation of the crime of genocide constituted a significant segment of the functions of state power in the Ottoman Empire. Certain elements of such modus operandi passed via the Kemalists to republican Turkey.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE: FROM INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION AND CONDEMNATION TO REPARATIONS AND RESTITUTION

Melkonyan A. A.
Academician of NAS RA
Director of the Institute of History of NAS RA

During the last decades recognition and condemnation of the gravest crime of the 20th century, the Armenian Genocide by different states and international, religious and non-governmental organizations have become a continuous process.

For all Armenians\(^1\) the Armenian Genocide continues to be the cause of recognition, condemnation and the demand\(^2\) for return of Western Armenia - the western part of the Armenian Motherland to Armenians\(^3\).

After restoring Armenian statehood on the 28th of May, 1918, the Armenian Question included the issue of security of the newly-declared Republic of Armenia. At the end of May, 1918, in its Declaration of Independence the Armenian National Council declared itself the only and supreme power of all the Armenian provinces. It means that the problem of Western Armenia was so important for the Armenianhood that the Araratian Republic (as the Republic of Armenia was often called at that time) expressed its intentions in regard to the Armenian Question, even in extremely grave circumstances conditioned by the genocide committed by the Ottoman Empire against Western Armenians and its planned continuation by the Turkish invasion into Eastern

---

\(^1\) See: Pan-Armenian Declaration on the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide
http://www.genocide-museum.am/arm/29.01.2015-hrchakagir.php

\(^2\) Hay Dat (The Armenian Cause) is demanding the acknowledgement of the fact of Armenian Genocide and struggles for the return of Armenian historical lands to Armenians, http://news.am/eng/news/233948.html

\(^3\) About the issue of the return of Western Armenia to Armenians Harut Sassounian noted: “The recently announced demand for lands from Turkey by the Prosecutor General of Armenia attracted much attention from Armenians worldwide and harsh criticism from the Turkish government. While this was the first time that an Armenian official had raised this issue since the country’s independence in 1991, the demand itself is not new. Armenians have been seeking the return of their historic territories from Turkey for decades. A confidential 1943 document, declassified by the Central Intelligence Agency, reveals that the US government was well aware of the Armenian demands for recognition of the atrocities and return of Turkish occupied (Armenian-A.M.) provinces” (Harut Sassounian, 1943 US Intelligence Report: All Armenians Demand Return of Lands from Turkey. - The Armenian Weekly, July 30, 2013)
http://armenianweekly.com/2013/07/30/1943-us-intelligence-report-all-armenians-demand-return-of-lands-from-turkey/; “It is noteworthy that the Pan-Armenian Declaration counters the persistent Turkish lie that claims against Turkey are being advanced by the Diaspora and not the Republic of Armenia. The unanimously adopted declaration clearly reflects that Armenians worldwide, both in the Homeland and Diaspora, are firmly committed to pursuing their just demands from the Republic of Turkey!” (Sassounian: Pan-Armenian Declaration Reveals Plans for Legal Claims against Turkey http://armenianweekly.com/2015/02/05/pan-armenian/)
Armenia, the Treaty of Batumi, etc. The Prime Minister Hovh. Kajaznuni said the following in the Parliament: “Yes, our Republic is small with narrow boundaries. It has been bereaved of its most valuable territories and cannot contain all its population within its boundaries… But I think that the boundaries of the country cannot remain unchanged forever: I believe that the boundaries of our country will expand due to the iron power of life”.

After the defeat of Turkey in World War, the Armenian government, taking into consideration the will of thousands of Armenian Genocide survivors from Western Armenia (who found refuge in the Republic of Armenia), and, particularly, in realization of the resolutions made in February at the Second Congress of Western Armenians, on May 28, 1919 - the anniversary of the Independence, passed the Declaration of “Free, Independent and United Armenia” by which the authorities of the Republic of Armenia annunciated themselves also the government of Western Armenia, aiming to start to realize that vital issue with the support of the Entente Powers. As is well-known the solution of the Armenian Question found its documentary formulation in the San Remo Resolution (April 25, 1920), the Sèvres Peace Treaty of August 10, 1920 and US President Woodrow Wilson’s Arbitral Award of November 22, 1920.

But, as a result of the Turkish aggression and unleashing of the war against the Republic of Armenia in the autumn of 1920, the Kemalist-Bolshevik cooperation and predatory treaties (1921), and the double-faced policy of the Western European states, the Armenian Question was removed from the agenda of international diplomacy, particularly, after the conference of Lausanne (1922-1923).

---

4 At this stage of its aggression the Turkish army was fully defeated by the Armenian regular troops and volunteer detachments in several battles (Sardarapat, Aparan, Vanadzor). The May heroic fights were crowned by the victory of the Armenian forces at the Battle of Sardarapat (21-28, May, 1918).

5 Վրացյան Ս., Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն, Երևան, 1998, էջ 194:

6 Soon the Armenian army liberated and restored some Armenian territories (Kars, Iğdır and its surrounding territory, Mount Ararat, Nakhijevan, etc.) within the boundaries of the Republic of Armenia.

7 Alexander Khatisian read the Declaration: “To restore the integrity of Armenia and to secure the complete freedom and prosperity of its people, the Government of Armenia, abiding by the solid will and desire of the entire Armenian people, declares that from this day forward the separated parts of Armenia are everlasting united as an independent political entity. Now in promulgating this act of unification and independence of the ancestral Armenian lands (Eastern and Western parts of the Armenian Highland-A.M.) located in Transcaucasia and the Ottoman Empire, the Government of Armenia declares that the political system of United Armenia is a Democratic Republic and that it has become the Government of the United Republic of Armenia. Thus, the people of Armenia are henceforth the supreme lord and master of their unified Fatherland, and the Parliament and Government of Armenia stand as the supreme legislative and executive authority conjoining the free people of United Armenia” (Խատիսյան Ա., Հայաստանի Հանրապետության ծագումն ու զարգացումը, Աթենք, 1930, էջ 129-130).

8 http://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/cgi-bin/paperspast?a=d&d=DOM19200427.2.44

During the following decades the Armenian Diaspora remained the main promoter of the Hay Dat (Armenian Cause) in the international arena. In fact, the question of the Armenian Cause in the Soviet state was an extremely dangerous and closed topic. We can probably remember only the mid-1940s when in the context of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union the issue of the return of historical Armenian lands was put forward in the international arena. But it met the strong resistance of the Anglo-American side and it was soon consigned to oblivion by the USSR too. Moreover, on May 30, 1953 Khrushchev’s government renounced its territorial claims on Turkey.

In 1965 after commemorating the 50th Year of the Armenian Genocide, Soviet Armenia indirectly became a part of the realization of the Armenian Cause. Several patriotic leaders of Soviet Armenia, particularly Yakov (Hakob) Zarobyan, played a key role in it. Under conditions of the Armenian national awakening in the Diaspora and the Motherland, faraway Uruguay was the first to recognize and condemn the Armenian Genocide.

Meanwhile, on the one hand the Soviet leaders did not openly recognize the Armenian Genocide in order not to strain relations with Turkey (a member of NATO), and on the other hand it was officially allowed in Armenia to respect the memory of the Genocide victims and build a special memorial in Yerevan, etc.

On June 18, 1987 in order to impose pressure on Turkey, the European Parliament remembered the Armenian Question. It required the Turkish government to recognize and condemn the Armenian Genocide, among other questions, in order to become a member of the European Union. In particular, it noted: “Turkish state rejects the charge of genocide as unfounded, whereas, to date, the Turkish government, by refusing to recognize the genocide of 1915, continues to deprive the Armenian people of the right to their own history; whereas, the historically proven Armenian genocide has so far neither been the object of political condemnation nor received due compensation”\(^{10}\).

The next year (February, 1988) the mighty Artsakh (Karabakh) movement began, during which, particularly because of the Sumgait genocidal actions sanctioned by the Azerbaijani criminal leadership, simultaneously the question of the Genocide became an issue of public discussions. In conditions of stormy public activity the problem reached the Supreme Council of the Armenian SSR. On November 22, 1988, the Supreme Council of the Armenian SSR, under the pressure of deputies elected by democratic forces and representing patriotic ideas, signed into law the legislative act regarding the Armenian Genocide: “The Armenian SSR Supreme Council’s Law Condemning the Armenian Genocide in Ottoman Turkey in 1915”. April 24 was declared

\(^{10}\) Resolution on a Political Solution to the Armenian Question. - Official Journal of the European Communities, No C 190/119.

as the Day of the official Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide, as one of the most heinous crimes against humanity.

In the Armenian Declaration of Independence adopted by the Supreme Council on August 23, 1990 it is said: “The Armenian SSR is renamed the Republic of Armenia (Armenia). The Republic of Armenia shall have its flag, coat of arms, and anthem... The Republic of Armenia stands in support of the task of achieving international recognition of the 1915 Genocide in Ottoman Turkey and Western Armenia”.

Since 1965 until the end of the 20th century the Armenian Genocide had been recognized and condemned by six countries: Uruguay, Cyprus, Argentina, Armenia, Russia and Greece.

The President of the Republic of Armenia R. Kocharyan raised the issue of the Armenian Genocide in September 1998 at the UN General Assembly session and a year later, in October 1999, at the OSCE Summit. Then the issue of the Armenian Genocide several times was raised in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. The question was also touched on in different speeches of the RA Minister of Foreign Affairs and other officials. The activation of the official approach of the Republic of Armenia contributed to the condemnation of the Genocide at the highest state level in the world.

From 1998 until the present the Armenian Genocide has been recognized and condemned by Belgium, France, Canada, Italy, Vatican, Lebanon, Switzerland, Netherlands, Slovakia, Germany, Poland, Lithuania, Venezuela, Chile, Sweden, Bolivia. Regions or provinces recognizing the Armenian Genocide include: parliaments of several regions of Spain (Basque Country, Catalonia, Balearic Islands, Navarre, and the city of Burjassot), United Kingdom (Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland) and Australia (New South Wales, South Australia); the city councils of Aleppo and Deir ez-Zor of the Syrian Arab Republic; the Tehran regional government; the State Assembly of São Paulo, the Legislative Councils of States of Ceará and Paraná (Brazil); Quindío department (Colombia); 43 U.S. states; 5 provinces of Bulgaria (Plovdiv, Burgas, Ruse, Stara Zagora, Pazardzhik), etc.

---

11 http://gov.am/en/independence/
12 The President denoted in his speech: “The fact that some of the parliaments have recognized that the Armenians were subjected to genocide and condemned it is a sign of the growing realization that this evil should be fought against” (http://www.ca-c.org/journal/2000/journal_eng/eng06_2000/14.shah.shtml).
13 “Pope Francis, during a meeting Monday with a delegation led by Nerses Bedros XIX, Catholicos Patriarch of Cilicia of the Armenian Catholics at the Vatican reiterated his earlier recognition of the Armenian Genocide... This recognition of the Armenian Genocide as the first genocide of the twentieth century reaffirms the statements of John Paul II [which were made] upon his arrival in Armenia on September 25, 2001, demonstrating that more and more states, parliaments and international organizations are adopting this position against the denial of history perpetrated by the Turkish State” (http://asbarez.com/110442/in-vatican-pope-recognizes-genocide/)
15 Its current capital city formerly was named “Vila Holguín” (at its foundation act in 1889). It has been renamed Armenia as tribute to the genocide victims (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Armenia,_Colombia).
Among the resolutions adopted by more than twenty countries, the document passed by the State Duma of the Russian Federation in April 1995 mentions the historical Homeland of Armenians - Western Armenia: “Resolution by the State Duma of Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, April 14, 1995.

Based on irrefutable historic facts which attest to the extermination of Armenians on the territory of Western Armenia from 1915 to 1922, and, in accordance with the following Conventions adopted by the United Nations: Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, December 9, 1948 and Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity (November 26, 1968); aspiring to restore the humanitarian traditions of the Russian State and, emphasizing that through the initiative of Russia, the Great European Powers already in 1915 characterized the actions of the Turkish Empire against the Armenian people as a "crime against humanity" and, noting that the physical extermination of the fraternal Armenian people in its historic Homeland aimed at destroying Russia, The State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation: Condemns the perpetrators of the extermination of Armenians from 1915 to 1922, expresses its deep sympathy to the Armenian people and recognizes April 24 as a day of remembrance for the victims of the Genocide”17.

Thus, it is evident that the existence of independent Armenian statehood and its activities in foreign policy along with the organizational activities of Hay Dat (the Armenian Cause) have had a paramount importance in international recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide. As follows from the “Pan-Armenian Declaration on the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide” the State Commission on the Coordination of Events Dedicated to the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide, in consultation with its regional committees in the Diaspora, “Considers the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide an important milestone in the ongoing struggle for historical justice under the motto “I remember and demand”18.

The following tactics and strategy are important in regard to the issue of the Armenian Genocide:
1. It is necessary to continue to take steps for international recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide, up to the recognition by the USA, UN and Turkey.
2. Territorial and property reparations and restitution from Turkey for the Armenian Genocide will in perspective ensure the Armenian national system’s security.
3. While realizing the Armenian Cause, the unification of all Armenian national potential becomes imperative.

17 http://www.armenian-genocide.org/Affirmation.151/current_category.7/affirmation_detail.html
http://www.genocide-museum.am/rus/Russia_Duma_Resolution.php
18 http://www.genocide-museum.am/eng/29.01.2015-hrchakagir.php
4. The Armenian Cause is an important factor that will ensure convincing international security guarantees for the Republic of Armenia and the Republic of Artsakh.

5. The realization of the Armenian Cause, as the all Armenian national concept, is in the intensification process determined by the Armenian state level coordinated activities of the Motherland and Armenian Diaspora.

Translated from Armenian
by S.E. Chraghyan
The entry of the Ottoman Empire into the First World War and committing the Armenian Genocide that had been cogitated by the Young Turks since the Adana massacres in 1909, was also a devastating blow to the Armenian press published in Constantinople, Smyrna (Izmir) and several centers of Western Armenia. The tragic fate faced by Western Armenians was to be shared by its press as well.

The Young Turks activating their genocidal policy against the Armenians of Constantinople, first began total recruitment of men whose fate had already been predetermined. Since the declaration of war the ambassadors of the Entente countries had left Constantinople and this provided the Young Turks with the freedom to realize their insane program of exterminating Armenians. In the Spring of 1915 a mixed assemblage of the Armenians of Constantinople visited the Grand Vizier Said Halim pasha and expressed their deep concern and trepidation in regard to the applied extermination policy, but there had been no adequate response and the genocidal actions against Armenians continued. In fact the Western Armenians had been declared outlaws.

On April 24 1915, hundreds prominent public figures of the Armenian community in Constantinople were arrested, sent into exile and killed. The entire Armenian community of Constantinople were to be the next, as the American missionary Jacks noted. In this respect J. Lepsius wrote that after some serious applications from ambassadors in Constantinople the Young Turks “abandoned the idea of imposing the general deportation methods on the Armenian population of Constantinople and Izmir. But they silently continued the deportation of the Armenians of Constantinople. A total of 10 thousand people have been deported and there is no information on their new place of residence.”

---

1 Զաւէն արքեպ., Պատրիարքական յուշերս, վաւերագիրներ և վկայութիւններ, Գահիրէ, 1947, էջ 98-100:
2 In 1921 Said Halim was assassinated in Rome by the Armenian avenger Arshavir Shirakian.
3 These atrocities continued in the following months and the number of persecuted intellectuals increased.
5 Լեփսիուս Յո., Գաղտնի տեղեկագիր, հայ ժողովրդի ջարդերը, Երևան, 2003, էջ 134:
In October 1915 Prof. H. Hakobyan wrote from Constantinople: “There is no one left in Constantinople. We see no Armenian in the streets. “Indigence and anti-living conditions are terrible. Most of the provincials have been deported from Constantinoplev6. He referred to the Armenian natives7 from Western Armenia living in Constantinople whose deportation had begun earlier in August 1915.

On December 7, 1915 the German ambassador in Constantinople Count Paul Wolff-Metternich reported to the Reichskanzler, that lately about 4000 Armenians also from Constantinople had been deported to Anatolia (Asia Minor-A.Kh.) and that “the remaining 80.000 Armenians still living in Constantinople” are to be gradually deported, “30.000 having already been deported during the summer and a further 30.000 having fled. Should a stop be put to this, then more severe means are necessary”8.

6 Մալէզեան Վ., Ճամբուս ծայրը, հ. Բ, Փարիզ, 1955, էջ 92:
7 “Ernst von Nahmer, a reporter for the Kölnische Zeitung, stated in a confidential report dated 5–6 September 1915 that the targets of the first deportations were natives of the provinces, followed by unmarried men and married men with their families” (see: Kevorkian R., The Armenian Genocide: A complete history, London-New York, 2011, p. 543).

In its efforts to deny the Declaration (May 24, 1915) of the Allies condemning Turkey in new crimes (the genocide against Armenians) against humanity and civilization, the Turkish agency “Havas” was greatly decreasing the number of the Armenians of Constantinople bringing down it from 200 thousand to 77.836 people (Զաւէն արքեպ., նշվ. աշխ., էջ 148). Such a manipulation was determined by the goal of impending deportation of the Armenians of Constantinople. There remained last remnants of the national institutions of Armenians: already nonliving “National Constitution” (adopted in 1863 with many shortcomings as a result of the Ottoman authorities violent dictate and interference) and religious traditional centers, which became the target of the Young Turks vicious actions. In 1916 Young Turks directed their actions against the Armenian Patriarchate. By a note (July 28) addressed to the Patriarch of Constantinople the Young Turks’ government announced that according to the “Regulations” of “the Armenian Catholicosate and Patriarchate” published in the same-day official newspaper “Takvim-i Vekayi”, the Catholicosate of Sis and the See of Aghtamar were to be united and the patriarchates of Constantinople and Jerusalem were to be attached to them. The residence of the catholicos-patriarch would be St. Hakob monastery of Jerusalem. This religious body would be completely independent from the Catholicate of Echmiatsin (Echmiatzin) (Տե՛ս Կանոնագիր Հայոց կաթողիկոսութեան եւ պատրիարքութեան, Երուսաղէմ, 1917, էջ 3, 14, cf. Kouymjian D., Cilicia and Its Catholicosate from the Fall of the Armenian Kingdom in 1375 to 1915, p. 12. http://armenianstudies.csufresno.edu/faculty/kouymjian/articles/2008%20DK%20Hist.%20of%20Cilicia%20to%201915.pdf). S. Jevahirchyan was appointed Catholicos-Patriarchal Vicar. S. arch. Khapayan was appointed Catholicos-Patriarch of Jerusalem (Քեղանաց պատրիարք, Երուսաղէմ, 1916-1920, էջ 179). Zaven patriarch was banished to Baghdad, then to Mosul. “Regulations” actually confirmed the fact of the genocide against Armenians in the Ottoman Turkey, defining that “The Dioceses were to be rearranged anew on condition that they would be at least comprised of 15.000 Armenians”. Such a “regulation” was a falsehood because the genocide programme excluded the rearrangement of dioceses in Western Armenia where Armenians had been massacred or deported (Տե՛ս Գերմանիան և Հայաստանը 1914-1918, դիվանագիտական փաստաթղթերի ժողովածու, տեղեկագրության փաստաթղթեր, Երևան, 2006):
There is only scarce information from the years 1915-1918 about the Western Armenian press, its contents and relationships with the authorities. The Armenian newspapers of Constantinople and Smyrna of those years almost have not been preserved. As far as it concerns Western Armenia there neither remained a reader, nor a newspaper.

The existing data (about the Armenian newspapers of Constantinople and Smyrna) for which nowadays we mainly owe to Teodik’s “Calendar for Everyone” and T. Azatyan’s famous work dedicated to the newspaper “Zhamanak” («Ժամանակ» - “Time”) allow us to form some opinion about this problem.

Teodik’s “Calendar for Everyone” conveys irreplaceable information about the Armenian press, editors, censorship pressure and Constantinople literary and journalistic reality of the first decades of the century. He referred to four newspapers that survived during the years of World War I, namely “Byzandion” («Բիւզանդիոն»), “Zhamanak”, “Verjin Lur” («Վերջին լուր» “The Latest News”) and “Jeride-i-sharkie” (“Eastern Herald”) which was published using Armenian letters. They were in a half-dead state, enervated under the censorship whip and survived only nominally, which was planned for them by the Young Turks government. They tolerated the existence of those newspapers only for the purpose of propaganda, in order to show the seeming security and complete cultural life of Armenians in Constantinople. This press was obliged not to react to the military defeats of Turkey and its allies, to the deportations of Armenians from Western Armenia, to the mass slaughters and other realities.

With bibliographic scrupulousness Teodik enumerates the Armenian newspapers published during the decade before the Armistice, including party editions too, and he adds interesting details about their editors. Teodik also gives information, having the source value, about several newspapers published in Constantinople during the years of the Genocide, as well as much more completely about the periodicals published from 1918 till the beginning of 1920.

From the viewpoint of the Armenian press history, Teodik’s information about the exiled editors (also not exiled) from Constantinople during the years of the war and concerning the few that returned from exile is very valuable. It is mentioned that E. Otyan, A. Antonyan, A. Shamantchyan, B. Kechyan, E. Tolayan and A. Myubahatchyan returned from exile.

In their memoirs published later the renowned representatives of journalism convey reliable information about the press of that period. Of cognitive value are the memoirs of E. Otyan, E. Tolayan, H. Aramyan, H. Siruni and others and the reflections on them: though they are incoherent and fragmental, they contain factually accurate details. E. Otyan’s peculiar narration leaves no doubt that the Young Turks had

---

9 Թէոդիկ, Ամենուն տարեցոյցը, 1916-1920, էջ 115-117:
launched the monstrous plan of genocide with mass arrests of intellectuals as well, including the press figures. E. Otyan starts his narration by giving the gradually increasing number of names of editor-journalists and other representatives of the intelligentsia arrested on April 24, 1915 (Barsegh Shahpaz, N. Taghavaryan, V. Torgomyan, E. Tolayan, A. Antonyan and many more). “Then we understood that it was the first monstrous episode of the hellish plan to exterminate the Armenian nation, that was taking place”, - E. Otyan writes11. E. Otyan himself hid for some time but then he was arrested and banished, but by chance joined those few intellectuals who survived the Genocide.

During those years the Western Armenian press of Constantinople and Smyrna, because of the Turkish censorship, could not touch upon topics evoking national feelings or have serious content interesting for the reader. The volume of the newspapers already testifies to the fact of their non-existence. This is apparent in the volume changes of “Zhamanak” that survived together with a few newspapers. Since September 2, 1914 the newspaper was published in two pages which were filled with a satirical column “Morning Tickets” by E. Otyan, and of course with political news imposed by censorship. In January, 1915 “Zhamanak” returned to its previous 4-page volume, but “Morning Tickets” by E. Otyan, as well as his satirical novel “Parish councilor’s wife” ceased to exist. Since February 21, 1916 “Zhamanak” was again confined to two pages12, probably returning to its 4-page volume after the Armistice, in the autumn of 1918.

During the war years the misleading, misinformed propaganda of the Young Turks came to replace the press in the form of newspaper appendixes. “During those four years”, - writes Teodik, - “the delivery boys in the streets had only wet newspapers and ilave (appendix - A. Kh.) without a leading article, without literature and concept; colorless and deformed pieces of paper, which were everything but a newspaper”13. The newspapers remained silent about news like the failures of Ottoman Turkey at the front, massacres and extermination of Armenians in Western Armenia, displacement and deportation of wanderers (emigrants from Western Armenia) and intelligentsia from Constantinople, etc. It was not allowed to write about events that even indirectly could somehow be favorable for the Entente Powers. Such efforts of the newspapers were strictly prohibited by German-Turkish censors. H. Aramyan, an employee of the newspaper “Verjin Lur” that survived through 1914-1918, wrote that since the first days of the war “a strict censorship was established” and that during those days the whole Armenian press “was very reserved, cautious and discreet”. In autumn 1914 “Verjin Lur”

11 Օտեան Ե., «Իրիկուան տոմսակ», «Վերջին լուր», 1921, 25 ապրիլի:
12 Ազատեան Թ., «Ժամանակ» քառասնամեայ յիշատակարան, 1908-1948, Կ.Պոլիս, 1948:
13 Թէոդիկ, Ամէնուն տարեցոյցը, Կ.Պոլիս, 1920, էջ 271:
had published an anti-war article translated by H. Aramyan from the German social-democratic newspaper “Vorwärts”. The Young Turks’ military censorship had not been satisfied with just threatening to close the newspaper. The Armenian censors of the newspaper were dismissed, and the police started chasing H. Aramyan. “Tigran Zaven [a well-known publicist-journalist, editor of the newspapers “Yerkri Dzayne” («Երկրի ձայնը» - “The Voice of the Country”), “Yerkir” («Երկիր» - “Country”), “Zhogovurd” («Ժողովուրդ» - “People”), etc. - A. Kh.] saved me, I hardly escaped. Two policemen were chasing after me” - H. Aramyan writes14.

The Young Turks’ military censorship had indeed become a punitive institution for reporters. On this matter Av. Papazyan noted: “From that moment on exile became an ordinary phenomenon”15.

The same censorship supported in every possible way the unsubstantiated and false information of the Turkish press on the “constant victories” of Turkey and its allies in the war.

Instead, the Turkish press was full of cheap and vulgar attacks against any information that contradicted the internal and external genocidal policy of Turkey and called for revenge addressed to the internal enemies: Armenians and Greeks.

The Young Turks almost completely liquidated the Armenian press. In 1914, 25 of more than 30 newspapers and magazines published in Constantinople stopped being published, which was nothing else but the massacre of media16. In the years, before the war several morning [“Zhamanak”, “Azatamart” («Ազատամարտ» - “War for Freedom”), “Nor Ashkharh” («Նոր աշխարհ» - “New World”), “Hayrenik” («Հայրենիք» - “Motherland”), “Aravot” («Առավօտ» - “Morning”), “Arevelk” («Արեւելք» - “East”)] and evening [“Byzandion” and “Banber” («Բանբեր» - “Messenger”) (later - “Verjin Lur”)], as well as shortly issued daily “Lusardzak” («Լուսարձակ» - “Spotlight”)17 newspapers were published in Constantinople. Before the war and during its initial period those newspapers were mainly closed due to administrative and censorship brutal sanctions. Through 1915-1918 only four [Byzandion”, “Zhamanak”, “Verjin Lur” and “Jeride-i-sharkie” in Turkish using Armenian letters]18 of Armenian newspapers (being completely deprived of informational and content features of press) were preserved in

14 Արամեան Հ., Մեծ Եղեռնի պատգամ. էջ 60-62: The censorship was performed by a newly created Martial law office (Divan-I harbi orfie), which immediately stood out for its terroristic tactics towards the Armenian press. Under its harsh control all the newspapers were bereaved of their informational independence. During 1914 were closed the majority of Armenian newspapers published in Constantinople.
15 Փափազյան Ավ., Հայերի ցեղասպանությունը ըստ երիտթուրքերի դատավարության փաստաթղթերի, Երևան, 1988, էջ 13-14:
16 See Հայոց պարբերական մամուլը. լիակատար ցանկ հայ լրագրության (1794-1934), կազմ. Լևոնյան Գ., Երևան, 1934, էջ 34-81:
17 Թէոդիկ, op. cit., p. 271: Through 1915-1918 “Byzandion” was edited by B. Kechyan’s sons, Ashot and Paruyr. the editor-in chief of “Zamanak” was S. Gochunyan (died in 1913); that newspaper for its survival owed to his untiring efforts while he was alive. “Verjin Lur” was published since 1914 and V. Toshikyan was its editor.
Constantinople. First of all, the first two - “Byzandion” and “Zhamanak” were among the most reputable and popular Western Armenian newspapers. Together with “Verjin Lur” their preservation was necessary for the Ittihad falsified propaganda to show as if the untroubled life of Armenians in Constantinople, but contrary to such a falsehood, as a brutal reality, massacres and deportations had been raging all over the Ottoman Empire. Certainly the fact that those newspapers were non-party was taken into consideration. But such an approach was not an obstacle for the authorities to persecute the newspaper employees that were detestable for them, e.g. editors Ashot and Paruyr Kechyan (“Byzandion”) and E. Otyan - a member of the editorial board of “Zhamanak”. As to “Jeride-i-sharkie”, it was the only newspaper in Turkish using Armenian letters that was published in Constantinople, which could serve as an argument for the Young Turks’ hypocritical claims.

Naturally the picture was the same in Smyrna, with a much smaller number of newspapers. In 1914 the three periodicals published here [“Ashkhatank” (“Ախատանք” - “Labour”), “Knar” (“Քնար” - “Lyre”) biweekly, and “Hay Grakanutyun” (“Հայ գրականութիւն” - “Armenian Literature”) magazine were closed. In 1914 the daily “Dashinq” («Դաշինք» - “Alliance”) was also closed. As S. Partevyan testifies: “After about a five-year interval, after the Armistice he (the editor of that newspaper H. Mamuryan - A. Kh.) resumed his newspaper “Dashink” the name of which was changed into “Arevelyan Mamul” («Արեւելեան մամուլ» “Eastern Press”) in June of 1919”19. Through 1915-1918 no Armenian newspaper was published in Smyrna. It should be added that “Dashink” had an apparent Ramkavar or reorganized Hnchak orientation that could not be tolerated by the Young Turk authorities filled with extreme hatred towards the Armenian parties and their press. Besides, in 1915 the Young Turk authorities were going to deport and massacre the whole Armenian population of Smyrna and its outskirts20. The final genocide against the whole Armenian population of Smyrna and its outskirts was committed by the Turkish slaughterers in 192221.

The annihilating policy of the Young Turks against the Armenian press was much more drastic and severe in Western Armenia proper and other Armenian populated areas of the Ottoman Empire. In 1914, the year immediately preceding the Genocide of 1915, all the 18 newspapers and magazines published in those territories (Van, Kharberd, Sebastia, Tokat, Erzurum, Khotorjour, Yerznka, Nikomedia, Trapezunt, Partizak, etc.) were closed.

The Turkish censorship and the military authorities first of all directed their attacks against the party and satirical publications. The Young Turks violently turned the religious paper “Tatchar” («Տաճար» “Temple”) into an hand-reared unreligious

19 Պարթեվեան Ս., Զմիւռնահայ տարեցոյցը, Ա տարի, Իզմիր, 1920, էջ 90:
20 Գերմանիան և Հայաստանը. 1914-1918, h. 1, էջ 70:
publication. Just shortly before the Armistice only a small number of newspapers were published under the severe pressure of the Young Turks’ regime.

In April 1915 was forbidden the publication of the official newspaper of Dashnaktsutyun party “Tchakatamart” (“Ճակատամարտ” - “Battle”) [the continuation of “Azatamart” (“War for Freedom”, which resumed its publication in November 1918 under the name “Ardaramart” (“Արդարամարտ” - “War for Justice”)] in Constantinople. The reorganized Hnchak newspaper “Aravot” and all the satirical publications, including E. Tolayan’s “Kavrosh” (“Կավռօշ”) were closed. Some remaining newspapers were subjected to strict censorship that the authorities started immediately before the war as a result of hardening of their discriminating attitude towards the Armenian press. “Any expression that was divergent from the government’s point of view... any bewildered information or alternative reaction to current events often resulted in temporary suspension of a newspaper”, - T. Azatyan writes.

Before the war “Zhamanak” was suspended by the military censorship four times. On June 11, 1913 “Zhamanak” was closed because it had printed the photos of Grand Vizier Mahmud Shevket’s assassins, hanged. According to censorship rules the newspaper had to change its name, thus M. Gochunyan renamed the newspaper edited by him to “Heradzayn” (“Հեռաձայն” - “Telephone”) (before that he had purchased license for the newspaper with that name). Some time later the editor paid the guarantee amount, 500 gold, established by the same censorship rules and the newspaper once again started to be published with its previous name “Zhamanak” (“Time”). It should be added that in Constantinople through 1915-1918 German military officers also performed a censorship function along with Young Turk censors as a result of which the press of those years fell under double “Turkish and German censorship clutches”.

The Armenian press in Constantinople remained in the above-depicted condition till the Armistice of Mudros (October 30, 1918) and during the subsequent months it seemed that the situation would be changed, but all illusions came to an end after the Kemalists came totally to power.

Translated from Armenian by
S. E. Chraghyan

22 Գերմանիան և Հայաստանը. 1914-1918, հ. 1, էջ 272:
23 Ազատեան Թ., op. cit., p. 141.
24 Նույն տեղում, էջ 141, 153-154, 157:
25 Թէոդիկ, op. cit., p. 271.
ARMIN T. WEGNER’S LETTERS AND DIARY OF 1915-1916
AND STRUGGLE FOR CONDEMNATION OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Musheghyan A. V.
Doctor of Sciences (Philology)

Armin T. Wegner (1886-1978), who served as a sanitary soldier in the German military headquarters of the Turkish 6th Army Corps, located in Mesopotamia in 1915-1916, was one of the most exclusive eyewitnesses of the Armenian Genocide, who could not stay indifferent to the horrible annihilation scenes of the Armenian nation. By means of sending secret letters to his relatives residing in Germany and renowned German writers, from the death camps stretching along the Euphrates River, he announced to the whole world about the Genocide against the Armenian nation.

During his leave of absence in December 1916, Armin T. Wegner completed the editing of his two books in Breslau, which reflected his experiences and impressions in Turkey1. Although Armin T. Wegner was just a sanitary soldier, then second-lieutenant in the German Sanitary Corps in Mesopotamia, he already had a doctoral degree in law and was the author of a number of poetry booklets. Hence, his story and the Genocide photos2 taken by him in the death camps of Mesopotamia, were gaining serious legal significance from the perspective of condemning the forced deportation and extermination of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire and under the tolerance of Imperial Germany. This explains why present day Turkey considers it extremely important to discredit Armin T. Wegner, a lawyer, a passionate public speaker and a talented expressionist-poet, and dismiss his pro-Armenian activities and eyewitness accounts of the Armenian Genocide3.

2 On October 19, 1916 Armin Wegner wrote from Aleppo: "I have taken numerous photographs during the past few days. I was told that Jemal Pasha, the hangman of Syria, imposed the death penalty on anyone violating the prohibition on photography inside the [Armenian] refugee camps. I carried these images of horror and accusation rolled into a bundle against my stomach … I have no doubt that I am committing high treason, but I am conscious that perhaps I have been able to assist these poor people even a little" (See: Sybil Milton, Armin T. Wegner, Polemicist for Armenian and Jewish Human Rights, Journal of Armenian Studies, 1992, vol. IV, p. 168).
3 Following the Turkish falsifiers, Martin Tamcke in a number of articles and his dissertation (Dr. Martin Tamcke: Armin T. Wegner und die Armenier. Anspruch und Wirklichkeit eines Augenzeugen. Habilitationsschrift, eingereicht beim Fachbereich "Evangelische Theologie" der Philipps - Universität Marburg (Cuvillier Verlag Gottingen 1993) put under doubt the role of Armin T. Wegner in elucidating the history of the Armenian Genocide (a detailed criticism of Tamcke’s ungrounded accusation against Armin T. Wegner see: Մուշեղյան Ա.Վ., Արմին Վեգների հիշատակն անարգելու փորձ, "ՎԷՄ" համահայկական հանդես, 2010, 2, էջ 25-44).
The first of Wegner’s letters, a very emotional one, was written on his way from Constantinople to Baghdad, to Marga von Bonin, a nurse at the so-called “Giulhane” military hospital in Constantinople. Wegner had become friends with this German nurse while in Constantinople, during the days when he was familiarizing himself with the sanitary work at that hospital. In the letter, sent from Raas-el-Ain on November 26, 1915, he describes the horrors of the forced deportation of Armenians. He had just passed through the devastated settlements of Armenians in Asia Minor where not a single Armenian survived. Driving in a truck going downhill in Cilicia, Wegner observed the densely crowded procession of Armenians walking through the Taurus and Amanos mountain passes heading toward the burning deserts of Syria: “Today we passed over Amanos, while two days ago over Taurus…. an enormous flood of a displaced nation, those thousands of misfortune people, flows through the Taurus and Amanos canyons. It whirlpools in the foothill of the mountains, getting weaker and weaker, in order to rush into the plains with its endless tail, to get lost in the desert, seeping into it. Where? whereto? That is the road of no return home?”

Armin T. Wegner was an eyewitness of the premeditated extermination of Armenians and he was not just an ordinary eyewitness, but the eyewitness with a law degree who wrote: “…all the roads are lined with famished and suffering Armenian deportees. Our tortured souls proceed through a sobbing and screaming live fence, from which extend thousands of begging hands”.

“I just came back from a walk around the camp. Now, I am writing these lines. From all sides I was besieged by screaming hunger, death, disease and despair.

4 Վեգներ Ա., Ճանապարհ առանց տունդարձի, էջ 41:
Overall filth and foul smell. The grievance of a dying woman came from a tent. A mother, noticing the dark purple cuffs of my uniform, a token of sanitary corps, rushed towards me with her arms stretched. Confusing me with a doctor, she made her last attempt to stick to me. Miserable me. I had no bandage, no medication. It was prohibited to help her anyway”.

“Nevertheless, all this was dwarfed when compared with the horrible scene representing the crowd of orphan children, whose number was growing day by day. There were rows of ditches in the ground, dug for them at the end of the tent city, which were covered with tattered mats. They were hiding under them, head to head, boys and girls of every age, without refuge, undomesticated, suffering from hunger, deprived of food and bread, longing for a bit of human help, and shivering from night cold, clinging to one another, each holding in their frozen fingers a tiny coal stick trying in vain to warm up. Some of them were crying endlessly. Their uncut hair had turned yellowish and was hanging on their foreheads. Dirt and tears were smeared on their faces. Some lay half dead. Their juvenile eyes were immense and popped out from pain, and although they quietly looked ahead, their faces seemed to reflect bitter condemnation of the world. Yes, it seemed as if the destiny had piled up all the calamities of the world at the edge of this desert, to show once again what was going to happen to us. With a pounding heart and plagued with horror, I rushed out of the camp and although walking on the flat ground, I felt dizzy, and it seemed like the earth tore in two parts and an abyss opened under my feet”\(^5\).

Wegner revealed, for the first time, the top secret order, already in force in the German military mission of Mesopotamia in 1915, by which it was categorically prohibited to show any humanitarian approach towards the Armenian nation. Eleven

months later, returning from Germany, Wegner was again passing through those areas. Only bones had remained from the displaced Armenian nation: “While approaching the riverbank, I notice many graveyards, numerous traces of old bonfires. Is this the ending of that horrible and awful forced deportation? In front of my eyes, anew visualizes the procession of the displaced people in the camps of anguish, where I was wandering last year with a horrified soul. Soon we meet with the first deportees. All the roadsides are covered with their bones, which shine dazzling white under the sun”6 (October 11, 1916).

Two letters that were later sent by Wegner from Germany to the above-mentioned nurse Marga von Bonin verify the fact that Wegner had described the horrors seen only with his own eyes7. The first of those letters Wegner had written in December 16, 1916, one week after arriving in Breslau. “It was more of a chance and a miracle, that I was able to get out alive once more from the hell of those horrifying ghosts”, Wegner writes, adding that the publication of his books failed because of censure. In his second letter to Marga on January 10, 19178, Wegner was reminding her: “What we experienced together is mostly summed up in the book “At the Home of Happiness”. Of course, I have seen all that with my own eyes - the eyes that view the home of happiness from their viewpoint, since that wonderful piece of land of the country is the most misfortunate house that you could ever imagine”.

Nature has “endowed” the Young Turks with an open-air and widespread furnace - a waterless desert, burning sun, and scorching south wind mixed with suffocating sand - to kill millions of people with thirst and intense heat. The Nazis did not have all those “goodies”. However, they not only copied from Young Turks the idea of death camps, but also gas chambers instead of the Turkish open air furnace. But the Young Turks were not satisfied with only this measure of extermination. Johannes Lepsius reported that in the Deir-ez-Zor desert “the Armenian deportees were continuously separated in groups, consisting of a few hundred people each, and were dragged to the South-East to the disease-infested swamps, where they were exposed to the seemingly surprise ambushes of Cherkez groups and were slaughtered savagely”9.

---

7 M. Tamcke cannot convince (as he tries in his published dissertation) anyone, who already has read this description, that Wegner has not personally witnessed the premeditated extermination of the displaced Armenian nation.
8 See Brief an Marga [Marga von Bonin] vom 10 Januar 1917. The letter is addressed to Marga, who must be identified with the nurse Margavon Bonin, because no other women is mentioned by the name of “Marga” in the literary heritage of Wegner.
9 Lepsius J., Deutschland und Armenien 1914-1918, Sammlung diplomatischer Aktenstücke, Potsdam, 1919, S. 290.
T. Wegner’s diary “40 Days and Nights of Coming Home”\textsuperscript{10} contains exclusive details about the deportation camps of Armenians that he encountered when returning from Baghdad to Constantinople during September-October, 1916. They stretched along the Euphrates; however, from hundreds of thousands of deportees, only a small number of shabby living skeletons remained. Human bones were scattered all over the desert. During his trip, when passing through the camps of Tibni, Maden, Rakka, Abu Herera and Meskene (camps continued down to Aleppo), Wegner eye-witnessed the shocking scenes of extermination of Armenian deportees and reflected the details, that were important to him, in the form of abbreviated and brief notes in his original diary.

Although “The Collection of Diplomatic Documents”\textsuperscript{11} of Lepsius’s and Wegner’s “The Road of No Return” were both published in 1919, Wegner’s book was ready for publication earlier than that, since its preface was written after the book was finished and carried the date “January, 1919”, which means Lepsius’s collection had not been published yet. It was published in June 1919. The collection of works by Lord Bryce, which was published even earlier, in 1916 in London, has as well supplied many facts to Wegner and Lepsius about the brutalities organized by the Young Turks.

As mentioned, Wegner’s two books were already edited in December, 1916. Besides, while working at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany from 1917 to 1920, Wegner had access to the current political-diplomatic documents. Therefore, as an authorized person responsible for the propaganda and anti-propaganda campaign, he was also involved in preparing the collection of Lepsius and was active in acquiring the necessary facts and documents from the Foreign Ministry files and British news agencies and making them available to Lepsius. This explains that Wegner was familiar with those facts of the collection already before its publication, since in his letter written to the US President Woodrow Wilson in January, 1919, he emphasizes Lord Bryce’s\textsuperscript{12} and Lepsius’s collections about the sufferings and extermination of Armenians in the camps of Mesopotamia: “Mr. President, if you browse through the reliable records of this horror amassed by Lord Bryce in England and Johannes Lepsius in Germany, you will see that I am not exaggerating. [...] On my clandestine visits to the refugee camps for the deported in the desert I sat on their mats in their tents with the starving and dying, and their pleading hands grasped mine. The voice of their priests [...] beseeched me to entreat for them on my return to Europe. [...] This document is a legacy. It is the mouth of a thousand of the dead, speaking through me”.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{11} See Lepsius J., Deutschland und Armenien 1914-1918, Sammlung diplomatischer Aktenstükke, Potsdam, 1919.
\textsuperscript{12} See Bryce J., The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire 1915-16, Documents presented to Viscount Grey of Fallodon, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Miscellaneous No.31, London, 1916.
\textsuperscript{13} Wegner A.T., Bildniseiner Stimme, Redaktion: Ulrich Klan und Christoph Haacker, Wuppertal, 2008, S. 70.
\end{flushleft}
This means that in January 1919, when Wegner was writing his open letter, he already had the unpublished collection of Lepsius in his hand, while Johannes Lepsius himself was stationed in the Netherlands and had not returned yet. Thus, it speaks about Wegner’s certain role in compiling that collection of works.

Some initially memorized diary notes have remained unpublished in Wegner’s literary archive. He noted: “when we entered the empty inn, we found the desiccated corps of a 12-year-old boy inside the open door at the side wall … most likely, he had died of starvation …”.

After the detailed description of the 12-year-old boy’s corpse, Wegner examines the surroundings.

“When I approached the river, (I saw) many graveyards, half-way submerged (in water), traces of countless old bonfires in front of the barrier.” Then Wegner discovers the mass grave: “In the nearby canyon and in the caves, partly man-made, hanging over the river bank, under the cover of which, the corpses and the dead were apparently concealed with numerous stale human bones, especially skulls. (I saw) children’s skulls, skulls with women’s brUNETTE locks, with almost all the chest bones tenderly bent, as clasps. “Smell of corpse” - “rags and old items near the river”.

According to the published version of the diary: “Abu Herrera” (October 11, 1916)14 - “Is this the last corpse? When we entered the vacant inn, which was full of filth and stink, he was lying in front of the open door. The starved body of a 12-year-old Armenian boy with red hair; the body was melted to the bones, the hands and feet looked like sticks. Only the left hand was covered with a rag. Approaching the riverbank

---

14 According to the initial diary, Wegner had been in Abu-Herera on October 14, therefore, the date October 16, printed here, is wrong and needs to be changed to October 14.
I notice a number of graves, many traces of stale bonfires. Is this the end of that horrible and awful forced deportation?15.

According to the edited version (unpublished): “On the road from Sabkha to Hamam” -near one of the curves of the Euphrates River, below the high cliffs, which at this location get closer to the bank, and are covered with the eagle nests, we come across the first Armenian camp at dawn - we run into the same misery as we saw last year”.

“They were much scared now. We didn’t see anymore those miserable and starving faces that may have died and vanished during this time. To my question they answered that most of them were from Adana and have been on this road for one and half years now, the last four months of which were in this area. Supposedly “each one received a tiny portion of bread from the Turkish government but then they were used as workers on the street jobs... There were many whitish shining human skeletons on the road, right next to the camp- they must have gotten used to it”16.

The reader notices that based on the incoherent notes, jotted down on the road, Wegner, has reproduced a coherently composed and well developed version, which is truly consistent with the preliminary notes, and hence they have the legitimate validity of the documentary evidence observed by the eyewitness. Wegner did not use the above-mentioned edited version in his diary published in 1919, but instead he used a more summarized description of the same first camp, omitting some details, either for literary preference, or just to fit the text in the designated space.

According to the published version of the diary: “Soon we meet the first deportees. All the roadsides are covered with their bone fragments glaring white under the sun. We came across the first camp in Maden. Children and women surround our cab. They break their heads for a piece of bread or a shallow slice of a melon peel”\textsuperscript{17}.

It is worth mentioning that the secret league agent von Radovich of the German Embassy in Constantinople had calculated the number of Armenian victims reaching 1,175,000 as of August 1916\textsuperscript{18} (this calculation was certainly made for internal intelligence purposes).

When Wegner says that all the roadsides were covered with glaring white bones, the eyewitness means the roadsides from Maden to Hamam. Armenian camps were located in uncharted and nameless territories in the desert and were referred to by the name of the nearest settlement, depending on which side the wanderer was approaching them, and Wegner is right, when in the published text he calls the first camp by the name of Maden. When coming from Baghdad the first settlement before reaching Hamam is Maden (Matan)\textsuperscript{19}. The existence of this same camp near Maden is confirmed by Beatrice Roner, the nurse of the Armenian orphanage in Aleppo, in April, 1916. She mentions the name of Hamam settlement as a reference to the location of “a camp on the road to Hamam”\textsuperscript{20}, because the settlement close to the camp from Aleppo was the village of Hamam.

\textsuperscript{17} Wegner A.T., Der Wegohne Heimkehr, S. 162.
\textsuperscript{18} See Tamcke M., S. 121.
\textsuperscript{19} The camp was located near Maden.
\textsuperscript{20} See Lepsius J., Deutschland und Armenien 1914-1918, Sammlung diplomatischer Aktenstücke, Potsdam 1919, S. 261.
According to preliminary diary notes: “Hamam (October 13/14, 1916), a larger camp - many workers - market - in tents tightly next to each other - many children - they don’t get anything - living on the money brought with them and with relatives - a meeting and conversation with the priest – refusal of taking his daughter with me”21.

On the basis of these jotted notes, in the next days (October 17-18), Wegner had composed his conversation with the priest Reverend Tachat Arslan[yan] and his compatriot Hakob [Y]aghub[yan].

According to the edited version (unpublished): “Under the moonlight, I followed Priest Reverend Tachat Arslan and the Armenian man Hakob Aghub into his tent through the opening”. From the conversation we had in the tent, it turned out that the priest and his friend were both from the same neighborhood in Constantinople. They were almost one and a half years on the way. “From the 800 deported families from that city, only 25 families are still alive.” The priest had lost his wife and son, only the daughter is alive. His friend Hakob, is the only survivor in his family. Although the priest does not wear his church mantle, he still continues to perform his spiritual duties, wearing just an ordinary hat. “In a single day he had buried 300 Armenians, who had died from spotted fever”. …during the conversation Reverend Tachat asked Wegner to take his daughter away with him to save her from certain death. “A 15-year-old beautiful human being, and very orderly. Her fiancé serves in the Turkish navy: they have written letters to him, but it has been one and a half years that they have no news from him. The priest keeps asking me to take his daughter with me to Constantinople, but what can I do, I feel so miserable”. The priest is convinced, that they all will be dragged to Deir-ez-Zor and they all will be killed there22.

The rest of the conversation, which I skip, has been published in Wegner’s “40 Days and Nights of Coming Home”. Wegner, in this publication leaves out only the request of the priest to rescue his daughter, and his own helplessness to fulfill the priest’s wish.

It is necessary to note that the fiancé of the daughter of the priest was one of the young men “lost with no traces”. The Young Turks drafted young Armenians in the beginning of the war in the Turkish army and navy, treacherously annihilating everyone, depriving the Armenian nation of the vital self-defense forces before the displacement.

According to the published version: “Meskene, October 15 - In the evening, priest Reverend Tachat Arslanyan, his friend and I sit together in front of the tent. They tell me about the sufferings that they went through, about those 800 families of the city, with whom they started their wandering, about those thousands of people, whom he had buried in the desert, including twenty-three priests and one bishop….In a totally abandoned dirty camp near Rakka, I met a thirteen-year-old boy. He had lost his mother

and brother, only his father had stayed alive. His name was Manvel. In order to protect his head from the sun, he had wrapped a white rag around it. He was blowing a cow’s horn, joyfully running through the piles of starving, sick and dying people, who laid motionless or, having reached the degree of insanity, were picking at garbage… I wanted to take him to our car, and take him to Germany with me… I asked him to take me to his father, who was an Alexandrian merchant. And since he could read and write, they had appointed him as the camp’s guard. …So, I went to the Arab supervisor myself. Sitting on his straw-mat for two hours I kept trying to convince him, offering him all the money I had with me, but they did not want to set the boy free. I promised to mediate for him in Aleppo, before Hakky Bey, who was the superintendent for resettlements…

The last facts contained in the same fragment of the preliminary notes about the Armenians that were tied to one another with ropes, is also reflected in Wegner’s poem “The Expulsion of Mankind”.

*Here they are crawling wildly in the plain
Tied to one another, women and men
The desert has immensely opened its jaws
To furiously swallow humans and beasts*

In summary, we conclude that Wegner jotted down, on the spot, the initial disconnected ideas, as preliminary notes, and later, during the next days, when more time was available, he completed the notes by memory, refining the rough draft into a stylized format, according to what he had seen and experienced in Mesopotamia. Thus far, it can be verified that the unpublished edited diary notes, preserved in Wegner’s literary archive, as well as the diary “40 Days and Nights of Coming Home” published in 1919, find their sources in the preliminary diary notes taken on the way home. All of them have equally authoritative value of an original source, since they belong to the pen of the same author and do reciprocally clarify one another.

In his preliminary diary notes, Wegner is an eyewitness and a lawyer, who documents the events as accurately as he sees them. On his way in the deserts of Syria he uses shorthand writing to record in detail the horrors seen in the death camps of Armenians. But in the published diary, as well as in the letters from Mesopotamia, next to Wegner-the-eyewitness stands the expressionist writer as well. This is why Wegner’s published diary stands out as a literary work. The author tries, successfully, to deliver to his readership the reality of the horrendous scenes of hell, which he has witnessed, to its possible extent through verbal expression. During the next days

---

24 Վեգներ Ա., Ճանապարհ առանց տունդարձի, էջ 69:
following the initial diary notes, when he had free time in new places, Wegner refined and stylized the jotted down initial notes, and titled his edited version by the name of the new place of settlement and with the respective date.

Returning to Germany from Constantinople, Armin T. Wegner set foot in Breslau on December 8, 1916. However, after ten days he complains about suffering from appendicitis, a result of the military exercises. Once Wegner set foot in Breslau he became target in the trap of double stalking by both the German secret service and military superintendence. First, instead of the 4 months, his rightful leave of absence and vacation granted by the German headquarters in Mesopotamia, he was given 8 weeks only (56 days) in the city of Breslau. Then (probably from February 2, 1917) he was drafted as a recruit (new draftee) in the 42nd battalion. The fact of being recruited as a new draftee itself reveals that the military superintendence had nullified Wegner’s two years of military service in Mesopotamia, as a soldier and medic. They also revoked his rank of second lieutenant, a title awarded to him, not by himself, but by Field Marshall von der Goltz, as Wegner testifies in his letter addressed to his parents on August 21, 1916.

Thus, the exhausted second lieutenant, fatigue from infectious diseases, is again recruited as a “new draftee” as retaliation for his pro-Armenian letters sent from Mesopotamia. He was supposed to be sent to the front. However, Wegner’s mother, Mary Wegner, who was one of the popular figures of the women’s pacifist movement, protests against cutting her son’s allotted 4 months vacation by two months, and she complains against ignoring of his suffering from serious diseases that he had endured in Mesopotamia.

After that, Wegner, cannoneer, exhausted from long-lasting infectious illnesses, is discharged from the barracks of the new draftees of the 42nd regiment of the field artillery. Then, he is sent to Breslau, under the supervision of the deputy commander-in-chief of the 4th army, to work in the media propaganda department.

The war still continued and it was necessary to elucidate the military actions of Germany against the British “deceitful propaganda”. During his eight-week vacation in Breslau, Wegner, who was extremely fatigued, came to grips with the realization of his long-time dream: the publishing of his poems, which was hindered due to war and his recruitment to Mesopotamia. In the spring of 1917, he published the collection of his poems under the title “Face of the Cities”. Soon after, his publisher was sued in Berlin for including a poem in the book, which allegedly was of an immoral character.

26 Wegner A.T., Der Wegohne Heimkehr, S. 118.
Wegner’s immediate supervisor went even further and threatened that: “A person, who authored such an immoral book, could not work under him and he had to be sent back to the front”\textsuperscript{29}. Wegner himself attributed the lawsuit to an act of revenge (Racheakt) by the German-Turkish Society in Breslau, for a public speech Wegner had held dealing with Turkish atrocities against Armenians in Mesopotamia as well as the massacres of Armenians. In defense of that particular poem and the entire collection in general, positive opinions were expressed by such renowned writers like Thomas Mann and his brother Heinrich Mann, Karl Hauptman (the brother of popular playwright Gerhard Hauptman), Richard Dehmel and others.

But eventually, the Berlin Court fined Wegner 200 Reichsmarks and confiscated the rest of the copies. This was Wegner’s first serious confrontation with the German-Turkish alliance, which was going to worsen in the near future, after returning to the Fatherland. Anyway, the publishing of his book led Wegner to start working in the publishing office of “Der Neue Orient”, a semiofficial periodical of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and to be released from military service. During 1917-1920 Wegner was in active relationship with Armenian intellectuals such as Karapet Melik-Ohanjanyan, Hakob Zoryan, Avetik Isahakyan, Libarit Nazaryan and others. Melik-Ohanjanyan had come to Germany for obtaining higher education and for a while he couldn’t leave Germany due to war. Hakob Zoryan was executed in 1937 [during Stalinist repressions]. Avetic Isahakyan was already a famous poet. Liparit Nazaryan was an active member of the Dashnak party.

It was during this period in 1919, when the German translation of “Abu-Lala Mahari”, a masterpiece poem of the Armenian poet Avetik Isahakyan, was published, with Wegner’s help, in “Der Neue Orient” (1919, issue 2, page 77-83). The translation was realized by the lively participation of Karapet Melik-Ohanjanyan\textsuperscript{30}, in those years residing in Germany, jointly with Liparit Nazaryan and the German poet Heinrich Noeren.

Armin T. Wegner actually presented to the world the raging condemnation of Armenians who were being annihilated in the deserts of Mesopotamia, who heavily criticized the Germans for the alliance with the Turks and extermination of Armenians.

Here is such evidence: “Their gazes were screaming at me: “You are German yourself”, they were saying, “and you are allied with Turks… so it is true, that you too wanted it.” I am lowering my eyes. What can I answer to disperse their doubts?”\textsuperscript{31}.

A courageous request presented by Wegner to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany in 1918 is extremely worthy of attention: “Germany may be released from its

\textsuperscript{30} Karapet Melik-Ohanjanyan later became a well known philologist and a member of the NAS of Armenia.
\textsuperscript{31} Wegner A.T., Der Weg ohne Heimkehr, S. 165
accomplice only in case of sincere and unconditional support for the rights and freedom of Armenia.\textsuperscript{32}

In the beginning of 1919, the legal-adviser for the secret service of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany, Dr. O. Göpert, who was in the meantime one of the leaders of the German-Turkish union, furiously summoned Wegner to his office and strictly ordered: "Do not intervene in the Armenian matters, not even at the personal level."\textsuperscript{33} He reasoned that the German-Turkish union was under the threat of failure. During and after the First World War, the Armenian Question was harshly confronted by the German-Turkish alliance.

But nothing could stop Wegner any longer. After Otto Goeppert’s threat in January 1919, Wegner wrote his remarkable open letter to the President of the United States of America, Woodrow Wilson. It was published on February 1, in the newspaper "Frau der Gegenwart". The reputable newsletter “Berliner Tageblatt” published it under the title “A Testament in Desert” on February 23. In this message, as well, Wegner was not hiding Germany's complicity in the extermination atrocities of Armenians by the Ottoman Turkey: “Mr. President, you will believe in my impartiality, if I speak to you on this subject, as a German, belonging to a nation, which has become close friends with Turkey. That is why; we have been blamed for the accomplice participation in the forced deportation of the people."\textsuperscript{34}

On the other hand, while already in Germany, Wegner wrote in mid-1917 stories about the massacre of Armenians and about the sufferings they had undergone in Ottoman Turkey “Der Sturm auf das Frauenbad” (“Assault on the Women's Bath”) and “Der Bankier” (“The Banker”), and on March 19, 1919, he presented a lecture along with his own slide show “Die Austreibung der Armenier in die Wüste” (“The Expulsion of the Armenians in the Desert”) at the “Urania” hall in Berlin.

In the preface of “The trial of Talaat Pasha”\textsuperscript{35} Doctor of Law Armin T. Wegner strictly condemned the Young Turks' false excuse that the deportation of Armenians was a necessary “military measure”. He emphasized: “As a rule the false necessity of military measures is just an excuse, and the "resettlement in the desert"- just a worthless prate to veil the bloodiest crime of the present century the purpose of which is nothing but an assiduous and complete annihilation of a superior race.”\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., p. 184.
\textsuperscript{34} The translation from original German into Armenian made by Albert Musheghyan: Published in the book “Armin T. Wegner: Bildnis einer Stimme”, Edited by Ulrich Klan und Christoph Haacker, Wuppertal, 2008, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{36} Վեգներ Ա., Ճանապարհ առանց տունդարձի, էջ 82-83:
first time with the expression, “Vernichtung einer Rasse”, Wegner gives the juridical definition of the crime of genocide as the extermination of the human species of Armenian as the bloodiest crime of the 20th century against humanity.

Years ago I wrote that lawyer Raphael Lemkin, a Polish Jew, got his first impressions of the Armenian Genocide at the beginning of the 20th century from Armin Wegner’s publications, especially from the Berlin trial acquitting Soghomon Tehlirian’s revenge on Talaat Pasha and from Wegner’s publication of the preface of that stenography. In his dissertation of 1926 Lemkin discusses Soghomon Tehlirian’s feat, presents the prehistory of the Genocide, the origin of the Armenian nation since the heathen times, etc.

In 1939, when Nazi Germany invaded Poland, Lemkin found refuge in the US and was involved in the anti-Nazi struggle serving in governmental and military departments. In that period members of his family became victims of the Holocaust. In November 1943 Lemkin coined the Latin term genocide in fact taking as a basis the expression Vernichtung einer Rasse (extermination of race) used by Armin T. Wegner in 1921, in the preface of “The trial of Talaat Pasha”. Lemkin replaced those two German words by two Latin roots genus+cid (caedere=exterminate). Thus, three terms - German expression Vernichtung einer Rasse used by Wegner, Lemkin’s Latin genocide, and Armenian ցեղասպանություն (killing race) by their composition and criminal-juridical meaning are quite identical and characterize the same crime - initially, in the case of Armenians meaning the genocide (annihilation) of the Armenian ethnos - the same race.

According to the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 9, 1948, along with the newly-coined international term genocide the identical meaning is expressed by the German term Völkermord (slaughter of people). The point is that at Lemkin’s suggestion on December 10, 1948 the Latin neologism “genocide” was included only in the English, French and Russian originals of the UN Convention, and the German original included the German term Völkermord which had already been officially used in international forums in the 20-30s in connection with the Armenian Genocide. The German term was necessary to show that the convention also spread on the genocides of the Armenians, Jews, Poles and Assyrians. From the beginning of the independence of the Republic of Armenia our diplomats using the internationally recognized German term could have succeeded in the recognition of the Armenian Genocide not only in German speaking countries, but also through the Hague Court they could have made Turkey recognize the Armenian Genocide.

37 Lemkin for the first time officially used the term genocide in 1944 in the book “Axis rule in occupied Europe” written to order of the Polish government in exile. He described mass extermination of Poles and Jews.

AGAINST FALSIFICATIONS

Eduard Danielyan

TURKISH–AZERBAIJANI FALSIFICATIONS OF THE ARMENIAN TOponyms AS AN INDICATION OF THE GENOCIDAL POLICY

Armenia’s more than ten-millenia old historical resources as cognitive factors have an important significance in the national security system. Their essential part is constituted by the Armenian Highland's toponyms symbolizing the indigenous Armenian Nation’s cultural creation – the backbone of the Armenian statehood having millennia-old ethno-spiritual and civilizational roots as attested by archaeological monuments and architectural relics, petroglyphs and cuneiform inscriptions, anthropological data and other historical sources, as well as results of linguistics.

1 In antique sources the natural environment of Armenia is mentioned as the Armenian mountains (…τῶν ἀρμενίων ὄρων…) (Herod., I, 72, Strabo, 2. 15, Jos. Flav., Contra Apionem I, 19 et al.), which in spiritual history are known as the mountains of Ararat (τὰ ἀρατηνα τὰ ἀραράτ) (Gen. 8.4.). Researching geomorphological and geological features of the orography of Armenia (Western and Eastern Armenia) Herman von Abich (1806-1886) introduced historically grounded geographic term Das Armenische Hochland or Bergland (the Armenian Highland) (Герман Абих, Геология Армянского нагорья. Западная часть, Орографическое и геологическое описание. – "Записки Кавказского отдела Императорского географического общества", кн. 21, 1899, Восточная часть, кн.23, 1902).


3 Since the 19th century the term Armenoid has been introduced in anthropology based on the study of the anthropological type of the Armenians and considering Armenia to be a focal area of its distribution from ancient times (F. Luschan, The Early Inhabitants of Western Asia, Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, vol. 41, London,1911, pp. 228, 240-244, В. В. Бунак, Становление Европейской научной антропологии, Становление науки о народе в древности, в средние века и в н. э., 1989, c. 25, A. A. Movsesyan, Crania Armenia: A Study of Genetic Variability from Bronze Age until Present Based on Non-metric Data // 12th Congress of the European anthropological association. Program abstracts, University of Cambridge, 2000, p. 11, A.A. Movsesyan, Фенетический анализ...
research making use of historical comparative\(^1\) and glottochronological methods\(^2\).

Investigation of the ancient and medieval history of Armenia brought D. M. Lang to the following conclusion in his book *Armenia: Cradle of Civilization*: “The ancient land of Armenia is situated in the high mountains... Although Mesopotamia with its ancient civilizations of Sumeria and Babylon, is usually considered together with Egypt as the main source of civilized life in the modern sense, Armenia too has a claim to rank as one of the cradles of human culture. To begin with, Noah’s Ark is stated in the Book of Genesis to have landed on the summit of Mount Ararat, in the very centre of Armenia... Armenia has a claim on our attention as one of the principal homes of ancient metallurgy, beginning at least five thousand years ago. Later on, Armenia became the first extensive kingdom to adopt Christianity as a state religion pioneering a style of Church architecture which anticipates our own Western Gothic”\(^3\).

Contrary to the historical reality, the Turkish hostile propaganda wages information warfare against the history and place names of Armenia and historical memory. Turkish alterations and eradication of the Armenian place names were implemented in several stages. After the Turkish-Persian wars and partitions of Armenia in the 16\(^{th}\) and 17\(^{th}\) cc, the Ottoman Empire undertook distortion of the toponyms of Western Armenia\(^4\) and Cilician Armenia (Kilikia), as a result of expansionist policy, which was based on the bestial pan-Turkism ideology and over the course of time turned into the program of annihilation of the indigenous Armenian nation\(^5\) resulting also in distortion of the western Armenian place names, which intensified since the emergence of the Armenian Question followed by the prohibition of using the name *Armenia* and the massacres of

---

\(^1\) Th. Gamkrelidze and V. Ivanov proposed that “the Proto-Indo-European homeland of the 5\(^{th}\) to 4\(^{th}\) millennia B.C.” could be “within eastern Anatolia, the southern Caucasus, and northern Mesopotamia...” and after the Indo-European linguistic community’s disintegration into dialect groups “the Greek-Armenian-Aryan dialect grouping began to crystallize”, and “subsequently divided into Greek, Armenian, and Indo-Iranian...” (Th. V. Gamkrelidze, V. V. Ivanov, Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-language and a Proto-culture, Berlin, Part Two 1995, pp. 761, 791, 794). But “eastern Anatolia” corresponds to *eastern Asia Minor*, “southern Caucasus” – to the *southern mountain ranges of the Caucasus* (to the north and east of the Kura River), so the authors ought to denote the Armenian Highland.

\(^2\) According to another opinion, based on the glottochronological analysis, Hittite lineage diverged from Proto-Indo-European around 8,700 years BP, “perhaps reflecting the initial migration out of Anatolia. Tocharian and the Greco-Armenian lineages are shown as distinct by 7,000 years BP” (R. D. Gray, Q. D. Atkinson, Language-tree Divergence Times Support the Anatolian Theory of Indo-European Origin. – Nature, vol. 426, 2003, pp. 435-438, cf. R. Bouckaert, Ph. Lemey, M. Dunn et al., Mapping the Origins and Expansion of the Indo-European Language Family. – SCIENCE, vol. 337, 2012, pp. 957-960). As is seen from the texts and sketch maps’ inscriptions of these publications, the term “Anatolia” was applied not only to Asia Minor, but also incorrectly used instead of the term *Armenian Highland*.


\(^4\) Western part of Great Armenia, Armenia Minor and Armenian (Northern) Mesopotamia.

\(^5\) In 1725 the invading Turkish troops were totally defeated by the Armenian forces in Artsakh. Two Turkish pashas were killed and the third one was taken prisoner. During interrogation the captive Turkish pasha said that the Ottoman rulers, considering Armenia and the Armenian people as an obstacle to the Turkish expansion towards the Caspian Sea and beyond, planned to exterminate the Armenians (Г. А. Ярон, Сношения Петра Великого с армянским народом, СПб, 1898, c. 422). The Turkish defeat in Artsakh was the Armenians’ resolute answer to pan-Turanic aggressive ambitions.
the Armenians in Western Armenia (1894-1896) and Kilikia (1909). Turkish genocidal policy intensifying since the late 19th and early 20th centuries in the Ottoman Empire resulted in the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923 committed by the Young Turk and Kemalist regimes in Western Armenia, Kilikia and the Armenian-populated areas of Asia Minor. The May 24, 1915 Joint Declaration ("... crimes of Turkey against humanity and civilization...") officially issued by the governments of France, Great Britain and Russia is the first international recognition and condemnation of the Armenian Genocide committed by Turkey.

The Kemalist and successive governments of the Republic of Turkey have continued obliteration of the Armenian place names in Western Armenia and Kilikia, forging the political-administrative map of the occupied territories by eliminating the native names, translating the indigenous place names into Turkish or inventing Turkish names, alien to the indigenous Armenian environment.

In both the Soviet and post-Soviet periods falsifications of the history of Armenia and its place names have also been perpetrated by the artificially introduced unit of "Azerbaijan". After the Artsakh Liberation War (1991-1994) the defeated aggressive

2 35,000 Armenians were massacred in Adana and the areas of Kilikia (Hrachik Simonyan, The Destruction of Armenians in Cilicia, April 1909, London, 2012, pp. 5-6).
7 "Cartographic war" (E. Danielyan, "Cartographic War" and the problem of protecting Armenian place-names. - http://blog.ararat-center.org/?p=166, bolanjaln, визуализация международного права, журнал "Наследие", 2009, №1(26), с. 9-25, A. Ayvazyan, Western Armenia vs. Eastern Anatolia. Europe and Orient. - Journal of the Institute Tchobanian, Paris, 2007, N 4, pp. 57-58) is waged also against history and historical geography of the lands far away from Armenia. Commenting on the militaristic pan-Turanic policy during WWII A.A. Chichkin notes: “Indeed, along with military preparations of Turkey at the borders of the USSR, since the autumn of 1941 in Turkish media were published geographic maps of the future state” and Turkish aggressors stated: “The border of Turkey is far away beyond the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea... Volga - the River in which our ancestors watered their horses” (Алексей Чичкин. Синдром Османской империи, - см. СТОЛЕТИЕ. Информационно-аналитическое издание фонда ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЙ ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ, 22.05.2013 http://www.stoletie.ru/territoriya_istorii/sindrom_osmanskoj_imperii_253.htm).
8 This name has been stolen from Iranian Adarbaigan/Azerbaijan (derived from the ancient geographic name Atropatene). At the end of May 1918 appeared “Eastern-Caucasian Muslim Republic” (see: Արևելյան Ղազանիա, Հայաստան, 1918 pp. 1, 1997, No 285) or “the Tartar Republic of Azerbaijan” (“Christian Science Monitor”, 05.08.1919, Haykaram Nahapetyan, Publications in American Periodicals Concerning Nagorno-Karabakh in 1918-20, http://www.noravank.am/eng/articles/detail.php?ELEMENT_ID=3534) and so on, as a result of pan-Turkic projects. The publications in American periodicals mention
Republic of Azerbaijan has been using these falsifications in the militaristic propaganda against the Republic of Armenia and the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic (the NKR) (Artsakh).

Falsifications of history and historical geography of Armenia, especially, toponymy of Western Armenia and Kilikia\(^1\) are put into service of the genocide denial by the Turkish government, which spends millions for it.\(^3\) Currently Turkey and Azerbaijan\(^2\) are going through a new spate of falsifications and distortions.\(^4\) There are solid academic publications criticizing the baseless denial of the Armenian Genocide.\(^5\) Gregory H. Stanton, particularly, notes: “Denial, the final stage of genocide is best overcome by public trials and truth commissions, followed by years of education about the facts of the genocide, particularly for the children of the group or nation that committed the crime.”

---

\(^{1}\) Turkey committing the Armenian Genocide, continues occupation of Western Armenia and Kilikia. It occupied also western areas of Eastern Armenia [Ardahan, Kars region, Sarikamish, Uzun (Olyt), Kaygzvan, the ruins of Ani, Mount Ararat, Surmalu, Igdir and Koghb, et al.] by the illegal and anti-Armenian treaties signed in Moscow (March 16) and Kars (October 13) between the Bolsheviks and Kemalists in 1921.


\(^{3}\) It still occupies some eastern Armenian territories [Nakhijevan region with Goghtan, as a result of the above mentioned anti-Armenian treaties of 1921, the most part of Utik (with Gardman, Gandzak et al) and Artsakh’s some northern (mountainous) and eastern (plain) areas – the remaining parts of the annexation as a consequence of the unlawful Kavburo (Bolshevik Caucasian Bureau) forcible decision of 1921 (July 5), and occupation (Shahumyan Region’s Getashen Subregion, Gulistan et al) in consequence of the aggression against the NKR in 1991-1992]. During the Artsakh Liberation War Armenian freedom-fighters and the NKR Armenian Defence Army have liberated the greater part of Artsakh, defeating aggressive Azerbaijan.

\(^{4}\) The Republic of Turkey relies both on the genocidal experience of the Ottoman and the Young Turk regimes, and pseudo-scientific surrogate – “the Turkish History Thesis” of pan-Turkic trend [its fundamental criticism see: Արմենական պատմության հավաքածու, Երևան, 1967, №1, с. 177-190; Գ. Х. Սարյասյան, Պ. Մ. Մուրադյան, «Բանագրիթուն» արտահայտությունը. – Մ., 2003 с. 158-162, 202-211, 221-222].

The black hole of forgetting is the negative force that results in future genocides…”.

Touching on the subject of the state-regulated discrimination in archaeology, it is worth paying attention to the general methodological remarks expressed in the article “Archaeology in the service of the state: theoretical considerations” by Philip L. Kohl and Clare Fawcett (in a collection of articles “Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology”): “…We particularly regret lack of coverage on the nationalist practices of archaeology in Israel, Turkey and other Middle Eastern countries… The articles collected here, however, are principally concerned with the abuses of the relationship between nationalist politics and archaeology… The case studies presented in this volume clearly show that archaeologists in the service of the state frequently have manipulated archaeological evidence to validate the ownership of land claimed to have been held “from time immemorial” or to support politics of domination and control over neighboring peoples…”.

If the authors took into account the state of affairs in the republics of Turkey and Azerbaijan, they would be convinced that Turkey - the perpetrator and denier of the Armenian Genocide, as well as its ally Azerbaijan, share the top falsifiers and distortors in the fields of archaeology, history and toponyms. The criminal acts of appropriation of the indigenous archaeological monuments with the purpose to “create” non-existent “Turkey’s ancient history and civilization” have been perpetrated by genocide of culture: destruction of Armenian architectural monuments and obliteration of the native place names of archaeological and other historical sites in western part of the Armenian Homeland occupied by genocidal Turkey. Year after year Turkish pseudo-archaeologists increase the number of falsified, antiscientific publications with the support of their foreign accomplices, polluting the scientific and informational spheres with anti-archaeological politicized rubbish.

Since the invention of “the Turkish History Thesis” till the present times the Turkish state’s ideological machine has been spreading disinformation in the world information arena using political, financial and propaganda means. At present it is continued through the criminal practices of the Turkish authorities which eradicate the names of

1 The 8 Stages of Genocide by Gregory H. Stanton, This article was originally written in 1996 and was presented as the first Working Paper (GS 01) of the Yale Program in Genocide Studies in 1998. http://www.genocidewatch.org/images/8StagesBriefingpaper.pdf.


3 Turkish and Azerbaijani falsifications in archaeology may be exemplified by the following spurious publication: “Azerbaijan - Land between East and West. Transfer of knowledge and technology during the „First Globalization“ of the VIIth- IVth millennium BC International Symposium Baku, April 1-3 2009, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, EURASIEN-ABTEILUNG, Baku, 2009”. Archaeological sites of Armenia are falsely presented as if located in “Eastern Anatolia” and “Azerbaijan” by the Turkish and Azerbaijani forgers, appropriating abominably the cultural heritage of Western and Eastern Armenia. But, in reality, on the one hand, the term “Eastern Anatolia” has nothing to do with the territory of the Armenian Highland, which is to the east of Asia Minor, and, on the other hand, the name of “Azerbaijan” historically corresponds only to Iranian province of Adarbaigan - ancient Atropatene, to the south-east of the Kingdom of Great Armenia (Strabo, XI, 13, 1).


5 For example see, Turgut Özal’s pseudo-politological book with very ambitiously falsified title “Turkey in Europe and Europe in Turkey” and totally distorted “historical” context (revised English edition, 1991), which has been completely criticized by Jr. Speros Vryonis (The Turkish State and History: Clio Meets the Grey Wolf, 2nd ed., Thessalonike and New Rochelle, New York, 1993).
the Armenian Highland, Western Armenia and many other Armenian place names, hydronyms and mountain names.

The complete system of the Armenian ethno-geographic names characterizes the natural-historic environment and cultural and social-political history of Armenia-Haiastan - the cradle and the Homeland of the Armenian Nation. Armenia and the Armenian statehood have been attested in ancient (the 3rd millennium BC-3rd c. AD) and medieval historical sources under the names of Aratta1, Armanum2, Haiasa3, Nairi, Ararat (Urartu)-Van (Biaina), Armin4, Great Armenia and Armenia Minor (‘Արմենիա Մեգալէ and ’Արմենիա Միջահայ’), Cilician Armenia (Kilikia)5 et al. In this respect it is worth mentioning the Babylonian map of the world (7th-6th cc. BC) and the maps of the world by Hecataeus of Miletus (550 BC – 476 BC), Herodotus (484-425 BC), Eratosthenes (276 BC – 195 BC)6 and the maps of Great Armenia and Armenia Minor by Claudius Ptolemy (83-161 AD), “Geography” of Strabo (64 BC – 24 AD) and other antique and medieval authors’ works, particularly, “Askharhatsyots”7 by Movses Khorenatsi (5th c.) and Anania Shirakatsi (7th c.), as valuable ancient and early medieval geographic and cartographic sources about the history and geography of Armenia.


toward the west through Armenia the Great, as it is called, to Armenia Minor\(^1\) … it leaves this and Commagene on the right hand; on the left Acilisene and Sophene, belonging to Great Armenia\(^2\). According to Claudius Ptolemy, Great Armenia “is terminated in the north by a part of Colchis, by Iberia, and Albania on the line which we have indicated as running along the Cyrus (Kura) river; on the west by Cappadocia along the accessible part of the Euphrates and the part of Pontus Cappadocia … on the east by a part of the Hyrcanian (Caspian) sea from the mouth of the Cyrus river … and by Media on the line leading to the Caspian mountains … on the south it is terminated by Mesopotamia … then by Assyria … The part of Armenia Minor farthest north is called Orbalisene, below this Aetulane, then Haeretica and below this Orsene and further south after Orsene is Orbisene\(^3\).

Great Armenia, Armenia Minor and Kilikia included correspondingly the whole territory of the Armenian Highland, adjacent Armenian (Northern) Mesopotamia, as well as the coastal zones of the Black, Caspian and Mediterranean Seas.

A research on the Ottoman documents and publications revealed that “the government of Sultan Abdul Hamid II fallaciously substituted for the name Armenia such terms as Kurdistan\(^4\) or Anatolia\(^5\)” and Turkish forgers started to use wrongly “Eastern Anatolia\(^6\)” (instead of Western Armenia) in Turkish official documents and pseudo-scientific literature. They falsify even former Ottoman publications and maps in which Armenia had been mentioned\(^7\). Contrary to such a fraud the truth is that the word stem of the term “Anatolia” is the Greek word ἀνατολή (“east”\(^8\)) and “Anatolia” relates only to Asia.

---

\(^1\) Strabo XI. 12. 3. Cf. “… τῇ μεγάλῃ καλομενή Ἀρμενίᾳ…” (Proc., De aedificiis, III. i. 17; v. 1).

\(^2\) Strabo, op.cit.; cf. “… ἐν Ἀρμενίᾳ τῇ Σοφανητῇ καλομενη…” (Proc., De aedificiis, III. ii. 2; iii. 1).

\(^3\) Ptol., V.12.1; cf. Strabo, XII. 3.29.

\(^4\) The present-day Kurds sometimes are mistakenly confused with the inhabitants of ancient Korduk (Corduene) (see: William Smith, A Smaller Classical Dictionary of Biography, Mythology and Geography, New York, 1883, p. 177). But Korduk was an Armenian region in Korchayk, the 6th Province of Great Armenia (Ս.Երեմյան, նշվ. աշխ., էջ 108). As noted by N. Adonts, “immigration of Kurd tribes into Armenia” started only since XVI c., as a result of Selim I’s expansionist policy (N Adonz, Towards the Solution of the Armenian Question, (London, 1920), Yerevan, 2007, pp. 51-52).

\(^5\) L. Sahakyan, Turkification of the Toponyms in the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey, Montreal, 2011, p. 12.

\(^6\) Continuing genocidal occupation and re-divisions of Western Armenia and Kilikia, the present-day administrative division of the Republic of Turkey had been established by the state-sponsored First Geography Congress, which was held in Ankara in 1941. Thus, the Turkish government continued the implementation of the plan to cover up the Armenian Genocide, at the same time, moving its military divisions to the borders of the Armenian SSR for purposes of aggression. Western Armenia was divided into the so-called “Eastern Anatolia” (with “Upper Euphrates”, “Erzurum-Kars”, “Upper Murat-Van”, “Hakkari” Subregions), “Southeastern Anatolia” (with “Middle Euphrates”, “Tigris” Subregions) Regions, “Eastern Black Sea Subregion”, and Kilikia was divided into “Adana” and “Antalya” Subregions of the “Mediterranean Region” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regions_of_Turkey). An example of genocidal “territorial appropriation” propagandized in the Republic of Turkey is the program of “Turkish Geographical Society. Activity Report, 2010”, where a “three years plan” (2010-2013) includes activities “in homeland (Internal and East Anatolian Fieldwork….)”, i.e. occupied Western Armenia is presented falsely as an “homeland” of Turkic nomadic invaders and their descendants - the genocide perpetrators.

\(^7\) L. Sahakyan, op. cit., p. 21-22.

Minor.

G. Ripley and Ch. A. Dana noted: “Asia Minor, a peninsula at the western extremity of Asia... between lat. 36° and 42° N. and lon. 26° and 41° E., and bounded N. W. by the Dardanelles (the Hellespont of the ancients), N. by the sea of Marmora (Propontis), the Bosphorus, and the Black sea (Pontus Euxinus), E. by the Armenian mountains... S. by the Mediterranean, and W. by the Archipelago (the Aegean Sea)...”. With the same correct methodology Great Armenia and Armenia Minor are depicted to the east of Asia Minor on the map entitled “Ancient Asia Minor”.

Henry Lynch (1862–1913) also correctly wrote: “I have invited attention to the characteristics which Armenia shares in common with her neighbours in the series of the Asiatic tablelands, Persia on the east and Asia Minor on the west”. An adequate geographic perception is present also in “The Encyclopedia of World History”: “Asia Minor, or Anatolia, is a peninsula stretching westward from the Armenian mountains to the Aegean Sea, with the Black Sea to the north and the Mediterranean to the south ... Armenia is a mountainous region lying between the Black and Caspian Seas” and at the time of King Menua (810–786 BC) the Urartian (Araratian-E.D.) Kingdom included “the entire Armenian Highland area”.

Thus, according to the historic sources and historiographical and geographical literature, Anatolia with all its parts (northern, southern, eastern and western) corresponds to Asia Minor situated to the west of the Armenian Highland.

The Turkish official circles’ anti-Armenian policy of distortion and falsification of the Armenian geographic names is targeted at deleting from the historical memory the indigenous place names of the western part of the Armenian Homeland – Western Armenia and Kilikia which suffered the genocidal devastation. D. M. Lang noted with distress: “It is difficult to convey the horror of events of 1915, as the Ottoman government set into action its design for genocide. In April 1915, the Armenian intellectual and community leaders in Istanbul (Constantinople-E.D.) were rounded up and transported in ships to their doom; among the victims were a number of priests, poets, doctors, and the great composer Komitas”.

Toponymic destruction was also planned by the criminal organizers and perpetrators of the Armenian Genocide. On January 5, 1916, during the genocide Enver Pasha (Deputy Commander-in-Chief) sent a “Decree” to the Turkish military-political authorities with the following misanthropic demand:

“1. It is important to change into Turkish all the names of provinces, regions, villages, mountains and rivers belonging to Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian and other non-Muslim

---


5 D. M. Lang, op. cit., 288.
peoples. Making use swiftly of this favourable moment, we beseech your help in carrying out this order.

2. Cooperating with military commanders and administrative personnel within the boundaries of your jurisdiction, respective lists of name changes should be formed of provinces, regions, villages, etc. and be forwarded to military headquarters as soon as possible...

3. It is imperative that the new names reflect the history of our hard-working, exemplary and praiseworthy military… It should be borne in mind that any sudden change of a conventional name into an inconvenient or improper one may bring about the continuation of using the old name by the population. Therefore, new names should be chosen taking all this into consideration...

Clive Foss notes that the Turkish government “has been systematically changing the names of villages to make them more Turkish. Any name which does not have a meaning in Turkish, or does not sound Turkish, whatever its origin, is replaced by a banal name assigned by a bureau in Ankara, with no respect to local conditions or traditions”.

From the very beginning of their rule the Kemalist leaders and their accomplices in the Republic of Turkey used the former Turkish regimes’ genocidal experience and the methods of falsification of the history of Armenia and toponymical distortions for the criminal denial of the Armenian Genocide. With regard to falsification of the history of Armenia by Esat Uras, Christopher Walker in his book-review unveiling the fallaciousness of Esat’s book, noted: “Uras shows no understanding of the history or even the reality of Armenia”. Uras denies the Armenian Genocide by falsifying the Armenian history and historical geography.

In some studies (with methodological manipulations) the obliteration and distortion of toponyms in Turkey were erroneously attributed to the so-called “nation-building projects”, instead of unveiling their real criminal background. For example, Asli Gür writes: “If we examine the relationship between the archaeological practices and the nation-building projects in Turkey since the early twentieth century, we see that dominant ideologies of nationalism influenced the way the names and images of archaeological sites and artifacts were appropriated and circulated publicly through icons, images, slogans, and stories...”. Asli Gür describes Atatürk’s sponsored forgery as an act influenced by “dominant ideologies of nationalism”, instead of defining it as a part of genocidal policy, because all the actions of “the Turkish state-building” have been motivated and led by discriminative, violent and illegal actions based on the criminal denial of the Armenian Genocide. The pseudo-scientific rhetoric of the author

---

4 Asli Gür, Political Excavations of the Anatolian Past: Nationalism and Archaeology in Turkey. – Controlling the Past, Owning the Future: The Political Uses of Archaeology in the Middle East, Tuscon, 2010, p. 73.
disguises the fact of the Turkish predatory policy, primarily with regard to the occupied Armenian territories and cultural heritage. Asli Gür had to remember that the heritages of other ethnic groups [Assyrians, Greeks (against whom the crime of genocide was also committed)], as well as of those who passed away long ago (in the 2nd-1st millennia BC: Hittites, Lydians, Phrygians and others] have also been systematically plundered by the orders of Turkish authorities.

World history is fundamentally falsified in “the Turkish History Thesis”. Concerning its absurdity Clive Foss critically writes: “… This might seem to be manifest nonsense, especially as it was obvious that Chinese and Indians were not Turks. There was an easy explanation: the Turks arrived, brought civilization, then were absorbed by the local population”. Clive Foss reveals the “essence” and goal of Kemal’s fraud: “Far more important for the future were developments in the Near East, which the migrating Turks entered by a route south of the Caspian. They brought irrigation and drainage to a land of swamps and established the first organized Turkish states and cities in Sumer and Elam. The Sumerians developed the world’s first writing system... using it to express their Turkish language. Archaeology reveals the grandeur of their civilization. From there, around 5000 BC, Turks entered their holy land of Anatolia and a millennium later had established the Turkish Hittite (Eti) civilization; all this confirmed by excavations in Asia Minor. The language of the Hittites was Turkish, not Semitic or Indo-European...”. 

Unmasking the pan-Turkist background of Kemal’s fraud, Clive Foss, writes: “Atatürk’s accomplishments... owe much to the previous discredited regime, the CUP, the “Young Turks” who ran the country from 1908 until the end of the First World War... They had ideas that find resonance in the Thesis. Their great nationalist ideologue, Ziya Gökalp (1876–1924), wrote an immensely popular poem describing how the five sons of the ancestral Türk Han rode out from Central Asia to establish the Sumerian, Hittite, Chinese, Indian and Scythian civilizations. Schoolbooks in use in these years presented the Turks... as one of the most ancient nations, originators of agriculture, textiles, and metal tools and weapons. Radiating from Central Asia, they founded states and supported the arts and sciences...”. Clive Foss concludes: “The Thesis exercised an influence that has not completely disappeared”.

Even some archaeologists of other countries have followed Turkish pseudo-scientific “interpretations” of history and falsifications of geographical names, feeding grist to the mill of Turkish forgers of history. Such politicized “research” activities resulted, for example, in publication of pseudo-archaeological books entitled “Ancient Turkey: a Traveller’s History” (1989, 1999) by Seton Lloyd3 and “Ancient Turkey” by Antonio Alfred de Zayas, op. cit., p.25.


Seton Lloyd, “Ancient Turkey: a Traveller’s History”. Published by arrangement with British Museum Press, London, 1999. In the British Museum the exhibit of “Room 54” was entitled falsely “Ancient Turkey” (see: E. L. Danielyan, Progressive British Figures’ Appreciation of Armenia’s Civilizational Significance Versus the Falsified “Ancient Turkey” Exhibit in the British Museum, Yerevan, 2013). It has been recently changed into “Anatolia and Urartu 7000-300 BC” (http://www.britishmuseum.org/explore/galleries/middle_east/room_54_anatolia_and_urartu.aspx). But, on the one hand, Anatolia historically corresponds only to Asia Minor, on the other hand, the Armenian Araratian (Ararat-Urartu) Kingdom was in the Armenian Highland, including the whole territory of Armenia (Eastern and Western Armenia), thus it is necessary to exhibit the archaeological materials presented in “Room 54” in two separate galleries under the titles: “Ancient Armenia” and “Ancient Asia Minor” with correct chronological, historical and geographical data and interpretations.
Sagona and Paul E. Zimansky. Archaeological materials are politicized by falsified terminology, and the ancient cultural heritage of Western Armenia is lootingly ascribed to non-existent “ancient Turkey”.

In contrast to the falsified concept of “ancient Turkey”, the progressive British, French and Russian figures in the 17th–20th cc. associated cultural-spiritual perception of Armenia with the Biblical Paradise and the cradle of mankind and civilization expressing their inspiration for Armenia and its spiritual roots in history.

A spiritual concept concerning Ararat and Armenia was observed in British and French literature (e.g.: “L’Arménie revendique pour elle l’honneur d’avoir été le pays choisi par Dieu pour y créer l’Eden; aux sources de ces quatre fleuves... Noé sortit de l’arche et descendit jusqu’au pied du mont Ararat... L’Arménie doit être considérée comme le berceau du monde”). Lord Byron wrote about the Armenians and Armenia: “Whatever may have been their destiny - and it has been bitter - whatever it may be in future, their country must ever be one of the most interesting on the globe; and perhaps their language only requires to be more studied…. It is a rich language... If the Scriptures are rightly understood, it was in Armenia that Paradise was placed... It was in Armenia

---


2 A. Sagona, The Asvan Sites 3: Keban Rescue Excavations, Eastern Anatolia. The Early Bronze Age. - British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, Monograph no. 18, London and Ankara, 1994; A. Sagona and C. Sagona, Archaeology at the North-East Anatolian Frontier. Vol. 1. An Historical Geography and a Survey of the Bayburt Province, Louvain, 2004; A. Sagona, The Heritage of Eastern Turkey: From the Earliest Settlements to Islam. New York & Melbourne, 2006, etc. In these publications the terms “Eastern Turkey” and “Eastern Anatolia” are applied incorrectly with regard to the western part of the Armenian Highland, and the ancient and medieval Armenian historic heritage of Western Armenia is falsely presented as “the heritage of Eastern Turkey”; instead of the indigenous Armenian place names, modern Turkish ones are wrongfully used.

3 The British spiritual and cognitive interest towards Armenia was earlier reflected in the Hereford Mapa Mundi (“unique in Britain’s heritage, an outstanding treasure of the medieval world, it records how thirteenth-century scholars interpreted the world in spiritual as well as geographical terms…” (http://www.herefordcathedral.org/visit-us/mappa-mundi-1). The Hereford Mapa Mundi - World map reflects the Biblical perceptions of Armenia: Noah’s Ark in the mountains of Armenia, Armenia Superior (Great), Armenia Minor. In contrast to the falsified concept of “ancient Turkey”, the progressive British


that the flood first abated, and the dove alighted”.

British Assyriologist and linguist A.H. Sayce used the names of Armenia, Ararat, Van, Vannic Kingdom and Kings with great accuracy. He wrote: “It is now more than half a century ago that the existence of inscriptions written in the Cuneiform character, and found in different parts of Armenia, first became known. The French Professor, Saint-Martin, in 1823, gave an account in the Journal Asiatique of the antiquities of Van, and drew attention to the fact that the Armenian historian, Moses [Movses] of Khorene, had described them in such detail as to make it probable he had seen them with his own eyes”.

Unlike A. Sayce who defined the period of the Kingdom of Van as “the forgotten early history of Armenia”, S. Lloyd entitled his book’s Chapter 10: “Urartu: a Long-Forgotten Nation” S.Lloyd wrote: “In addition to all the Anatolian provinces north or east of the upper Tigris and Euphrates, it occupied large parts of what are now Soviet Armenia and Iranian Azerbaijan”. He baselessly considered the name “Urartu”, as if “wrongly spelt as Ararat”. S.Lloyd used many Armenian geographic names of Western Armenia - Mt.Sipan, Mt.Nemrut, Eriza, Eraskh/Arax, Aratsani, Archesh, Manazkert in distorted Turkish forms: Süpan, Nemrut Dag, Erzincan, the Aras, the Murat Su, Ercis, Malazgirt, etc. S. Lloyd also applied wrongly the term “Anatolia” to western part of the territory of Armenia, writing: “… this highland of eastern Turkey” or “eastern Anatolia”. Another example of the reflection of the Turkish expansionist falsified “geographical nomenclature” is A.Khurt’s book, where the western part of the Armenian Highland is...
wrongly called “eastern Anatolia”

Falsifications are obvious, because “Anatolia” never covered territory out of Asia Minor.

The most overwhelming contradictions in abortive attempts of the Turkish falsifiers and their accomplices to “revise history” in accordance with their maniacal “visions” are determined by the fact that their ancestors Seljuk and Oghuz Turkic nomadic tribes1 (from the trans-Altai and trans-Aral regions) had violently invaded Armenia, the Byzantine Empire and the adjacent lands from the second half of the 60s of the 11th c., and the Ottomans – from the late 13th c. 2, thus they had no association with the ancient and medieval history or original toponymy of Armenia, Asia Minor, the territories on the left bank of the Kura3 and so on. Since the beginning of their invasions till the present time, devastations, plunder and annihilation of Armenian historical relics have been carried out on the lands occupied by those nomads and their savage descendants.

After the Artsakh Liberation War the defeated Azerbaijani aggressors and their henchmen cling to falsifications using them for the resumption of war propaganda4.


\footnote{2 Alan Palmer noted: “Originally the Turks were nomadic horsemen from Central Asia…” (A. Palmer, The Decline and Fall of the Ottoman Empire, New York, 1994, p. 2).}

\footnote{Their “eponym, ‘Osman, was the son of a certain Ertoghrul who had led into Anatolia (Asia Minor - E.D.) a nameless band of Turkish refugees: an insignificant fragment of the human wreckage…” (Arnold J. Toynbee, A Study of History, vol. II, London, New York, Toronto, 1955, p. 151). Some expressions from this extract were wrongly changed by D.C. Somervell, so the meaning of this passage unjustifiably underwent a change in the abridged version of the book (“…of one Ertoghrul the leader of a nameless band of refugees …”) (D. C. Somervell, A Study of History by Arnold J. Toynbee, Abridgement of Volumes I-VI, New York, Oxford, 1987, p. 113).}

\footnote{The boundary between Great Armenia and proper Aluank (in Armenian sources) (“Albania” in antique sources) was along the Kura (Strabo, XII, 3.29). Paytakaran (the eleventh of the 15 provinces of Great Armenia, see: U.Charub, հիշ. տվեր., թգ 109) was to the south of the Eraskh (Arax) river and from its confluence with the Kura, bordered on the south-east by the Caspian Sea and on the south by Atropatene.}

\footnote{The American journalist R. D. Kaplan witnessed the destruction of the Armenian civilization in Western Armenia, where he traveled, reaching Tracezunt. He wrote that except for an occasional ruin “every trace of Armenian civilization has been erased…” (R.Kaplan, Eastward to Tartyr, New York, 2000, p.318). At the dawn of the 21st century, after innumerable assaults of the previous decades, the surviving clusters of many thousand Armenian cross-stones (khachkars) in the Armenian Cemetery of Old Jugha (modern Julfa) (in the ancient Armenian gavar Goghtan to the south-east of the Nakhijevan gavar) were destroyed, by the sanctions of the criminal Azerbaijani authorities (see: Julfa. The Annihilation of the Armenian Cemetery by Nakhijevan’s Azerbaijani Authorities, Beirut, 2006). New evidences of the programmed annihilation of the Armenian cultural heritage (by the sanctions of the criminal Turkish authorities) in Western Armenia are the destruction of the old Armenian houses in Mush (in Taron gavar) in 2013 (http://armenpress.am/news/724842/) et al.}

\footnote{Anti-Armenian harangues by I. Aliev, the president of the Republic of Azerbaijan, are a manifestation of the state-sanctioned official policies intended to counterfeit history. At the annual general meeting of the NAS of Azerbaijan (26/04/2011) he ordered his “academician-historians” to increase the number of “solid scientific works that Nagorno Karabakh is an ancient and indigenous Azerbaijani land” (http://news.mail.ru/inworld/azerbaijan/politics/5792292/). Criticizing falsification mania that Azerbaijan’s president is possessed with, V. Zakharov wrote: “In the heat of the moment, Ilham Aliev resorts to anti-historical statements… for him, a graduate of Moscow State Institute of International Relations, it is a shame not to know history… The Azerbaijani leader on November 20, 2009 cynically declared: “… Irevan khanate, Zangezur makhal are Azerbaijani lands… The Armenian state was created on Azerbaijani soil. Now they want to create the second one. It defies all logic, the Azerbaijani people, the Azerbaijani state will never agree with it”. Condemning anti-historic fever of I. Aliev, V.Zakharov noted: “It is a shame to read this historical nonsense… The underlying meaning is evident in this speech: Aliev tries to substantiate the Azerbaijani side’s claims not only to Karabakh, but also to the territory of the Republic of Armenia” (“Нагорно-Карабахской Республике 20 лет”, ред., проф.}
Armenian hostility and aggressive practice are characteristic to Azerbaijani “history” inventors fabricating a forged “history” in complete disregard of historical sources\(^1\), at the same time falsifying history of Armenia, Russia, Iran and other countries\(^2\).

Completely falsified Azerbaijani school “history” textbooks are full of hostile aggressiveness and hatred against Armenia, as evidenced in one of such obscurantist “productions”: “Modern Armenia emerged on the territory of ancient Western Azerbaijan”\(^3\). But the fact is that only since the middle of 1918 the name “Azerbaijan” has been illegally and falsely applied to a territory (eastward from the Kura to the Caspian Sea shore) out of Iranian Azerbaijan. Thus, all the delirious stuff that the present-day Azerbaijani pseudo-historians fabricate about the so-called “Western” or “Northern Azerbaijan” is a complete gibberish\(^3\).

Thus, Turkish falsification of the Armenian history, demolition and appropriation

\(^1\)Azerbaijani aggressive leadership and pseudo-historians, following their Turkish “brethren”, also distort the history and geography of Armenia, fabricating the term “Western Azerbaijan”, as is seen, for example, from the antiscientific book “Monuments of Western Azerbaijan” published in Baku (A. Alakbarli. Les Monuments d’Azerbaijan d’Ouest, Baku, 2007) with a fabricated “The map of western Azerbaijan (actually the ‘Republic of Armenia’) the homeland of the ancient Oguz Turks”. This bellicose ignorance is a complete falsification of the Armenian history. As noted R. Galichyan, “the editors of this megalomaniac fantasy are Azerbaijani academicians… who, contrary to their academic calling have carried deceit and fabrication to the extreme” (R. Galichian, op. cit., p. 12).

\(^2\)Azerbaijani fakers try to ascribe to artificial “Azerbaijan” the history of neighbouring countries, particularly, stealing the history of Armenia. In this sphere very active is the head of the president I. Aliev’s administration R. Mekhtiev. Paying attention to the absurdity of his notorious article “Goris-2010 the season of the theatre of the absurd” (it was republished from the newspaper «Бакинский рабочий» in: «От майдандорфа до Астаны: принципиальные аспекты армяно-азербайджанского нагорно-карабахского конфликта», М., 2010) V. Zakharov noted: “Such literature is not read in any respectable western academic centre. The Baku publication samples handed to participants of any forum, remain in hotel rooms or turn to be in dustbins” (“Нагорно-Карабахской Республике 20 лет”, с. 130-150). The criticism of Mekhtiev’s absurd concoction see: Э.Л.Даниелян, Историческая справедливость против воинствующего мракобесия. – “21-й век”, 3, 2011, с. 90-110 et al.

\(^3\)Artificial “Azerbaijan” had a heterogeneous population a part of which consisted of alien Turkic speaking Muslims. They were mentioned as “Caucasian” or “Transcaucasian Tatars” in the statistical materials (the late 19\(^{th}\) c. – early 20\(^{th}\) c.) of the former Russian Empire (see: G. Stepanyan, Armenians of Baku province in the second half of the 19th century (historical-demographic study, Yerevan, 2013, p. 14)). In the 1920s the Turkic-speaking part of the Azerbaijan SSR’s population was called “Turks” in official materials of the population census of the USSR (see: Большая советская энциклопедия, т. I., 1926, с. 641). Only since the end of the 1930s appeared the term “Azerbaijanis” in the Azerbaijan SSR, according to the population census of the USSR (большая советская энциклопедия, т.I, изд. 2, Москва, 1949, с.440), and a fabrication of “history” was intensified.

Azerbaijani pseudo-historians falsify the history and geography of Armenia with unbridled ignorance, distorting the Armenian name of Erebuini-Erevan and many other geographic names, and fabricate “history” for non-existent in ancient, medieval and modern times and artificially shaped “Azerbaijan”. For example, in her pseudo-scientific book F. Mamedova distorts history and geography, artificially narrowing the territory of Armenia and the Armenian Highland, thus applying falsely the term “Albania” to the territory of Eastern Armenia, etc. Such manipulations with geographic names demonstrate her complete ignorance in history and historical geography. She falsifies the geographic position of Armenia, writing: “Armenia is on the territory of Asia Minor”; “…Armenian principalities on the territory of Eastern Anatolia” (Ф. Мамедова, “Кавказская Албания и албаны”, Баку, 2005, с. 15, 118, 195-196, 646). F. Mamedova’s book is a total mess, where history and geography are completely falsified.
of the historical relics have gone in parallel with erasing Armenian place names, as an indication of the genocidal policy. The uprooting millennia-old original toponyms of Western Armenia and Kilikia has been carried out with the purpose to redraw western Armenian lands’ political-demographic mapping and to cover up the Armenian Genocide. The Turkish occupants are horrified of the Armenian place names of Western Armenia and Kilikia, which are the reminders of genocide and living evidence for reparations. The governments of Turkey and Azerbaijan spend enormous financial resources for falsifications of the history and historic geography of Armenia. It shows the supreme power of authentic reality of the Armenian history, toponymy and the historic memory as overwhelming resources of national security.

The historical and geographical terminology of the Armenian Highland, constituting the essential system of the Armenian place names, belongs to the pivotal layer of the Armenian ethnolinguistic mentality. Toponyms represent the Armenian natural historic environment and cultural heritage’s significance, possessing fundamental importance. The guarantors of the Armenian toponyms’ protection are the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic (the NKR).

Հայաստանի պատմության և տեղանունների խոսակցությունները օգտագործվում են Հայաստանի (Արևմտյան և Արևելյան Հայաստան)՝ հայ ժողովրդի Հայրենիքի բնապատմական միջավայրը և սոցիալ-քաղաքական պատմությունը: XVI-XVII դդ. թուրք-պարսկական պատերազմներից ու Հայաստանի բաժանումներից հետո Օսմանյան կայսրությունը կատարում էր Արևմտյան Հայաստանի [Մեծ Հայքի արևմտյան մաս, Փոքր Հայք և Հայոց (Հյուսիսիսային) Միջագետք] և Կիլիկիայի տեղանունների աղճատումներ և փոփոխություններ, որոնք պատմականության վերջինս կարողում էին հանդիպել թագավորության բարձր կարգապատմական հրամանագրական գրավորական գրքերում: Հայաստանի պատմության ու տեղանունների խոսակցության առաջին շարժումները սկսվեցին առաջին հայ գրականության հիմք՝ արձանագրական աստվածության տեսակի գրքերի փոփոխման ընթացքում։ Հայաստանի պատմության և տեղանունների խոսակցությունը ԱխՍՀ-ում և Երևանի պատմաբարեկամությունների տան մեջ բերվեց, թեև Թուրքիայի և Ադրբեջանի Հանրապետություններ ։ Նրանց հետևում էին ադրբեջանական կեղծարարները, որոնք պատմական եւ տեղանունների ժամանակակից կարգանակացման տեսակի փոփոխություններով ուղարկում էին առաջին հայ ընկերությաններին։ Օսմանյան կայսրության պատմության և տեղանունների խոսակցությունից հետո որոշ թուրքական գրքեր փոփոխվեցին և շատ որոշ նորաձևություններ աջակցեցին նրանց հետ։ Պրոֆեսոր Քլեյն Fos նշում է, որ թուրքական կառավարությունը «Անկախ ձեր պահանջից, սովորական անունն ստացնել է Անկախ գտնվող բյուրոյի կողմից նպատակային շարժության է»: Բացի դեռևս համարվում է, որ թուրքական կառավարությունը համարվում է սոցիալ-քաղաքական պատմության ինստիտուտի գրականության և տեղանունների հասցենացումների գծով, որոնք մասնակցեցին նրանց հետ։
6. Սույն կենսագրությունը Սբորյանի Հայաստանի հատկացության վերաբերյալ պատմական տեսանելու համար թողարկում է ներկայացնում, թե ադրբեջանական կեղծագույն Սբորյանի Հայաստանի հատկացության վերաբերյալ հիշատակում է ներկայացնում ՊՎՀ` ՊԱՀ` տերմինում: Սակայն, բացի պատմական նահագրերի և պատմականության նյութերից, տեսանելու համար կենսագրություններ, աշխարհագրական և պատմական հատկացությունները կարելի է որոշել (հունիսյան, հարավային, արևելյան և արևմտյան) հատկացությունները և Ադրբեջանի Հասարակական կառավարության և քաղաքական կառավարության պատմության այսպիսի նպատակները: Փոքր Պարսկական զոհարարը կեղծագույն ավանդույթներով հիմնված էր հայկական և ադրբեջանական կառավարությանը և Պլանային Հայրապետությանը: Փոքր Պարսկական կառավարության և Քաղաքական կառավարության պատմական սկզբնագիրը ուղղակիորեն առաջացնում է հայկական տեսանելու և պատմության կեղծարարությանը: Սակայն, ադրբեջանները արաբական կեղծարարի պատմական և քաղաքական ավանդույթները ուղղակիորեն առաջացնում են հայկական տեսանելագրական և քաղաքական կեղծարարությանը. Սակայն, ադրբեջանները արաբական կեղծաբանությունը ուղղակիորեն առաջացնում են հայկական տեսանելագրական և քաղաքական կեղծարարությանը:

7. Արևմտյան Հայաստանում, Կիլիկիայում և Արևմտյան Հայաստանի Նախիջևան, Գողթան, Ուտիք շրջաններում հայկական պատմական հիշատակությունը հրապարակվում էր Պերսական թուրք, և արաբական կեղծարարությունը հրապարակվում էր Պերսական Պարսկական թուրքության և Ադրբեջանի Հանրապետության և 2013թ. հանցավոր թուրքական իշխանությունների հրահանգում: Պերսական Պարսկական թուրքության և Ադրբեջանի Հանրապետության պատմության կեղծարարություններն ուղղակիորեն առաջացնում են հայկական տեսանելագրական և քաղաքական կեղծարարությանը:

8. Հակահայկական թշնամանքն և ագրեսիվությունը բնորոշ են նաև ադրբեջանական կրթական համակարգին և «պատմագրությանը», որոնք անտեսելով պատմության կեղծագույն աչքերով: Ադրբեջանի Հանրապետության նախագահ Իլհամ Ալիևի ճառերը: Ադրբեջանի ԳԱԱ
AGAINST FALSIFICATIONS

(26/04/2011 թ.) տարեկան ընդհանուր ժողովի ժամանակ «պատմաբանի ակադեմիկոսների» ասի հետևում պատմաբանի ակադեմիկոսների բերդ այս մասից, որ Ներսես Պարոսյանը հեռաց ու տարածքային տերությունների հոլով է։

1. «Հայկական տեղանունները կարևոր վկայություն են, ինչպիսիք Հայոց ցեղասպանության դատապարտությունը, այնպիսի էլ տարածքային փոխհատուցման` հատկապես Արևմտյան Հայաստանի և Կիլիկիայի վերադարձի` Հայոց հայրենի հողերի պահանջավորության առումով, միջազգային իրավական նորմերին համապատասխան։

Հայկական տեղանունները պատմաաշխարհագրական տերմիններից, ներառելով Հայաստանի տեղանունների ամբողջականությունը, պատկանում են հայ ազնվակերպության ծնունդին։ Հայկական տեղանուններն ապարտազրկվածն են մարդաբանական տերմիններից, որպես հայկական անվանական ազգական գրանցարկ։

10. Պրոֆ. Վ.Ա.Զախարովը Ադրբեջանում տիրող կեղծարարության հոգեվարքի վերաբերյալ վկայություն է դիտարկում 2009 թ. նոյեմբերի 20-ին Ի.Ալիևի հայտարարությունը, թե. «Բոլորին լավ հայտնի է, որ այժմյան Հայաստանը ստեղծվել է բուն ադրբեջանական հողերի վրա։ Իրևանի խանությունը, Զանգեզուրի մախալը՝ ադրբեջանական հողեր են…»: Պրոֆ. Վ.Ա.Զախարովը Ադրբեջանի հարցբանավորի կազմում նշել է: «Աստիճանաբար նման գրականությունը ցանկացած ֆորումի մասնակիցներին հանձնված Բաքվի հրատարակությունները մնում են հյուրանոցային համարներում, կամ էլ հայտնվում են աղբարկղներում» ("Արցախի Հանրապետությունից "Հայոց ցեղասպանություն" երկրորդ հատուկ համագործակցության համակարգում").
Э. Даниелян

ТУРЕЦКО-АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСКАЯ ФАЛЬСИФИКАЦИЯ АРМЯНСКИХ ТОПОНИМОВ КАК ПРОЯВЛЕНИЕ ПОЛИТИКИ ГЕНОЦИДА

1. Более чем десятилетие исторические ресурсы Армении имеют важное значение в системе национальной безопасности, как познавательные факторы. Их существенную часть составляют армянские топонимы, символизирующие исконность и культурно-созидательную деятельность коренного армянского народа на Армянском нагорье, являющегося стержнем истории Армянской государственности, ее этино-духовными и цивилизационными корнями, засвидетельствованными археологическими памятниками и результатами лингвистических исследований сравнительно-историческим и глоттохронологическим методами.

2. Целостная система армянских этно-географических названий характеризует естественно-историческую среду и социально-политическую историю Армении (Западной и Восточной Армении) – родины армянского народа. В древности и средневековье Армения и Армянская государственность (в качестве царств и системы княжеств) засвидетельствованы в исторических источниках под названиями Аратта, Арманум, Хайаса, Наири, Арарат (Урарту) – Биайна (Ван), Армина, Великая Армения и Малая Армения, Киликийская Армения и др.

После турецко-персидских войн и разделов Армении (XVI–XVII вв.) Османская империя совершала искажения топонимов Западной Армении (западная часть Великой Армении, Малая Армения и Армянская (Северная) Месопотамия) и Киликии, как проявление захватнической политики, основанной на дикой идеологии пантуркизма, которая со временем приняла характер программы геноцида против коренного армянского населения, проявляясь и в дальнейшем насильственном изменении и уничтожении армянских топонимов, запрете (с последних десятилетий XIX в.) использования названия Армения и резне армян в Западной Армении. Результатом антитармской экспансионистской политики Османской империи, младотурок и кемалистов стал Геноцид армян (1915 – 1923 гг.).

3. Фальсификация истории Армении и топонимов достигла огромных масштабов в Аз.ССР и в постсоветской Республике Азербайджан. После поражения в Арцахской освободительной войне агрессивный Азербайджан использует эти фальсификации в милитаристской пропаганде против Республики Армения и Нагорно-Карабахской Республики (НКР- Республика Арцах).

4. В настоящее время турецкие власти, продолжая экспансионистскую политику, реализуют программу уничтожения западноармянских топонимов в Западной Армении и Закавказье, уничтожают старинные киликийские городища и монастыри, которые имеют огромное значение для истории и культуры армянского народа. Эти факты подтверждают политику геноцида, совершенную Османской империей против коренного армянского населения Западной Армении в XIX–XX вв.
топонимов с целью отрицания Геноцида армян.

5. Сообщения источников свидетельствуют о цивилизационном значении истории Армении и ее топонимов, и это еще наглядно выявляет преступность тех, кто искажает и уничтожает их наряду с историческими памятниками. Профессор Джорджтаунского университета Клайв Фосс отмечает, что турецкое правительство “систематически изменяет названия сел… Любое название, которое не имеет турецкого значения или не звучит по-турецки, независимо от его происхождения, заменяется банальным названием, предписаным со стороны бюро в Анкаре, без уважения к местным условиям или традициям”.

6. Турецкие фальсификаторы вместо понятия Западная Армения, фальсифицируя, используют термин “Восточная Анатолия”, а азербайджанские фальсификаторы вместо понятия Восточная Армения фабрикуют “Западный Азербайджан” и неверно применяют термин “Албания”. Однако, согласно данным исторических источников и историографической и географической литературы, Анатolia со всеми своими частями (северная, южная, восточная и западная) соответствует Малой Азии, лежащей к западу от Армянского нагорья. Понятия же “Азербайджан” вообще не существовало вне пределов территории современного Иранского Азербайджана (Адарбаган, от древнего географического названия Атропатена – Атрпатакан средневековых армянских источников). Название “Азербайджан” с середины 1918г. было увorable у Иранского Азербайджана и дано, с пантюркистскими целями искусственно созданной, административно-политической единице.

7. Упоминаемое в античных греко-римских источниках название “Албания” соответствовало упоминаемому в армянских источниках собственно Алуванку, на левом берегу Куры, находящемуся к востоку от Великой Армении. Граница между Великой Арменией и собственно Алуванку проходила по р. Кура. К югу от нижних течений р. Ерасх (Аракс) и р. Куры находился Пайтакаран – юго-восточная провинция Великой Армении, окаймленная на востоке Каспийским морем, а на юге граничащая с Атропатеной.

8. Продолжается уничтожение, грабеж и разрушение армянских исторических памятников, а также топонимов в Западной Армении и некоторых восточных областях Армении (Нахиджеван, Гохтан, Утик). В начале ХХI в. была разрушена последняя группа (из десятка тысяч уничтоженных в течение предыдущих десятилетий) армянских хачкаров на армянском кладбище Старой Джуги (в древнем армянском гаваре Гохтан, к юго-востоку от гавара Нахиджеван) с преступной санкции азербайджанских властей. Новыми фактами запрограммированного уничтожения армянского культурного наследия в Западной Армении преступными турецкими властями являются превращение церкви Св. Апостолов (Карс) в
мечеть, разрушение старых армянских домов в Муше (в гаваре Тарон,) в 2013 г. и т.д.

9. Антиармянская вражда и агрессивность характерны также для азербайджанской системы образования и “историографии”, которые пренебрегают историческими источниками занятия фальсификацией истории. Проявлением “госзаказа” на фальсификацию истории являются речи Президента Республики Азербайджан Ильхама Алиева. На ежегодном общем собрании Национальной Академии Наук Азербайджана (26/04/2011) он дал директиву “академикам-историкам” увеличить число “солидных научных произведений о том, что Нагорный Карабах является древней и исконной азербайджанской землей”. Таким же образом ведется обучение учеников на основе полностью сфальсифицированных учебников “истории” в Азербайджане. Агрессивный Азербайджан после поражения в Арцахской освободительной войне цепляется за фальсификации, используя их в пропаганде возобновления войны. Однако, все их домыслы сокрушаются прочными фактологическими материалами исторических источников, которые свидетельствуют о том, что с древнейших времен армяне являются коренным народом Армении (всего Армянского нагорья).

10. Армянские топонимы являются важными свидетельствами, как для осуждения преступления Геноцида армян, так и в связи с репарациями, в особенности, с требованием армян по возвращению отечественных земель Западной Армении и Киликии, в соответствии с нормами международного права. Историко-географическая терминология Армянского нагорья, составляя целостность топонимики Армении, является органической частью армянского этно-языкового мышления. Гарантами защиты армянских топонимов, как жизненно важной сферы национальной безопасности Армении, являются Республика Армения и Республика Арцах (НКР).

HISTORICAL CARTOGRAPHY
Owing to more than half a century research work academician Suren T. Yeremyan bridged the past, present and future of Armenian historiography, historical geography and cartography. His historical concept was more vividly expressed in the field of historical cartography, the result of which has been historical atlases and maps reflecting historical realities of ancient and medieval epochs of the history of Armenia and neighbouring countries.

Due to the scrupulous work of the renowned historian-cartographer, Suren Yeremyan, the important position of Armenia in Western Asia was emphasized in the historical maps reflecting the most important epochs of the ancient and medieval history of the Armenian nation. In the 30s of the 20th century and later, S. Yeremyan published maps concerning trade routes crossing Armenia, according to the Peutinger Map and Anonym of Ravenna, as well as a political map depicting Armenia and neighbouring countries (the 1st millennium AD) based on Armenian and foreign sources.

Suren Yeremyan’s “Atlas of Armenian history” contains the following maps: “The Armenian Highland”, “Armenia in the 2nd-I centuries BC”, “Armenia in the 5th-7th centuries”, “Armenia at the end of the 10th century and at the beginning of the 11th century”. He continued the series of thematic maps of Armenian history (from the 9th century BC to the first decades of the 20th century AD) which were published in the “Atlas of the Armenian SSR” (Yerevan, 1961). It contained historical maps of the periods when the Armenian Kingdom existed. The wide chronological coverage is an important peculiarity of S. Yeremyan’s works.

By comparing the data of antique cartographical sources, particularly those of “Manual of Geography” by Claudius Ptolemaeus (Ptolemy) (“Third map of Asia”) to the data provided by “Ashkharhatsuyts” [(«Աշխարհացոյց» - Geographical Atlas) the authors of which are Movses Khorenatsi (the 5th century) and the continuer and editor of his work, Anania Shirakatsi (the 7th century)], S. Yeremyan drew the map of the Kingdom of Great Armenia.
Owing to all of this Suren Yeremyan created a valuable book and map, “Armenia according to Ashkharhatsuyts”\(^1\). He also began restoring the initial original of “Ashkharhatsuyts” and published several of the 15 maps of the World Atlas. S.Yeremyan published the map of “the known world” (the oikumene) as well. It occupied only one part of the globe of the earth, the model of which S. Yeremyan restored, according to “Ashkharhatsuyts”.

Historical cartography as a means of expressing a centuries-long history conceptually gives an opportunity to create an interrelated series of maps. Each historical map drawn by Suren Yeremyan is a thematic continuation of the previous map and this creates links between different historical epochs and sets in one common chain the historical and political and socio-economic phenomena, demographic data, the development of statehood, struggle for freedom, cultural values, thus documenting the history of the native Armenian nation in the territory of the Armenian Highland through maps.

The maps drawn by academician Yeremyan have taken their stable position in the treasury of historical cartography. They were published in the academic edition of history (1966), in the manual of the history of the ancient Orient (Yerevan, 1979), in the respective volumes of the academic 8-volume history of the Armenian people (Yerevan, 1971-1984) and in other publications.

\(^1\) Երեմյան Ս.Տ., Հայաստանը ըստ Աշխարհացոյցի, Երևան, 1963.
With their accuracy S. Yeremyan’s maps containing the Armenian Highland and Great Armenia serve the purpose of solving historiographical problems in scientific and socio-political spheres, preserving the historical memory for future generations and truthfully presenting the historical picture of the Armenian territories. For all his life S. Yeremyan remained true to his calling, working in the sphere of historical cartography. Among the voluminous maps dedicated to different epochs of Armenian history and published in the 80s of the 20th century, the map dedicated to the Armenian Empire of Tigran II the Great has a special significance.

Suren Yeremyan continued the traditions developed by previous generations of Armenian historians and cartographers, thus greatly contributing to the progress of the Armenological school of historical geography and cartography.
A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE MAPS OF ARMENIA

INTRODUCTION

When an Armenian is asked how he or she would describe their country to a non-Armenian, most would reply “we were the first country to accept Christianity as the state religion in the year 301”. This is all true but would it carry any weight if you were to say this to a Muslim, Buddhist, or even an atheist?

This article will help the reader with in gaining some basic awareness about how the non-Armenian geographers regarded the Armenians and the country of Armenia over the past two millennia. The article also has some basic information about Armenian cartography. The Homeland of the Armenian people, Armenia-Haiastan is mentioned in historic sources also as the Land of Ararat (Urartu), Arminiya.

The name Armenia could be observed on maps for various historic periods as well as in the historical and geographical works from the ancient to the most recent times. Armenia was depicted on the maps of Western Asia as an independent state, and later also as a country being partitioned between its neighbouring empires. That had been going on until the mid-twenties of the 20th c. Following the Armenian Genocide perpetrated by the Ottoman Turkey in 1915-1923 Western Armenia and Cilician Armenia were divested of the indigenous Armenian population.

Despite being landlocked, Armenia appeared on portolan marine charts which were produced for navigational purposes and covered coastal countries and towns. This will however be discussed later.

The Early Times

The oldest known map of the world, a Babylonian clay tablet dated by from the sixth century B.C. shows the world as a disc floating in the bitter seas with Babylon at its centre, being surrounded by Assyria, (city of) Harran and Armenia1. On this tablet the River of Euphrates is shown flowing down from the Armenian mountains through Babylon (Iraq) and eventually reaching the Persian Gulf.

The Greek historian Herodotus who lived around 489–425 B.C. was a keen geographer who travelled to Armenia too. According to that geographer, in about ca. 500 B.C. Aristagoras of Miletus performed a map in Sparta, which he drew on an iron plate. The map is said to have shown the territories of Lydia, Phrygia, Ionia, Cilicia, the island of Cyprus, Armenia and the city of Susa, the seat of the king of Persia.

The name of Armenia appears in many Greco-Roman geographical and historical texts and books. The Greek philosopher and geographer Eratosthenes (ca. 276–194 B.C.) after accepting the existed theory on the Earth’s spherical form, suggested that the Earth was the centre of the universe and all other universal bodies would have go around it. His world map included Armenia too (See Fig. 1).

Strabo (ca. 63 B.C. – 24 A.D.) was one of the giants of geography. He was a seasoned traveller who also worked in the library of Alexandria by occasions. The library had numerous works on such subjects as medicine, astronomy, science, literature and philosophy, to which Strabo had seemingly an open access. His voluminous Geographia was completed in the second decade of our era. It contained almost everything what had been known to that time on the geography and cartography. Strabo’s description of Armenia covers many pages of description of the land and its people and includes over 60 references.

Some renowned cartographers prepared maps of the world according to the descriptions provided by Strabo and which invariably included Armenia, placed to the north from Mesopotamia and south of the Caucasus. Thus, Claudius Ptolemaeus of Alexandria, or Ptolemy as he is generally known (ca. 90–168 B.C.) was the most important figure in geography and cartography of the old world, whose books and maps were used extensively well into the sixteenth century. His most important work is the eight-volume book Geographia, the text of which has reached us in its entirety. The first volume of his work talks about geography and ways and methods to be utilized in observing and calculating locations, some of which are still in use today. Most of the volumes are detailed descriptions of some 8,000 locations of the then known world, divided into various regions and countries. The approximate boundaries of every country is described, giving details of the neighbouring countries and the sources and destinations of various rivers, as well as lakes and mountains belonging to each country. (See Fig. 2.)

The chapter concerning Armenia (Book V) is in two parts. Lesser Armenia (Armenia Minor), shown on the map entitled “Tabula I of Asia”, lists 79 names of towns and cities, and Great Armenia (Armenia Maior), which is shown on the map entitled “Tabula III of Asia” lists 85 town and city names. The important towns of Great Armenia are stated to be Artaxata (Artashat), Harmavira (Ar movir), Tigranocerta (Tigranakert), Arsamosata (Arshamashat) and Thospia (Van). Those of Lesser Armenia are Coma, Melitana (Malatia), Nicopolis and Satala. (See Fig. 3.)

In his text Ptolemy often refers to particular maps and discusses how to

---

1 See Rouben Galichian, Historic Maps of Armenia, 37.
draw and update them with all new information received from travellers and other sources. He divided the habitable world into three continents, Europe, Africa and Asia, while the maps accompanying the book were grouped as below:

- Map of the World
- Europe, in ten regional maps
- Africa, in four regional maps
- Asia, in twelve regional maps.

The name of Armenia appears in five of the above set of 27 maps. Ptolemaic maps are simple and lack the elaborate cartouches common in those of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. Some fifteenth and sixteenth-century copies of Ptolemaic maps are hand coloured and some others have reached us uncoloured. A few have been printed on vellum.

**Roman and Christian Cartography and the Middle Ages**

As expected, the name of Armenia is always present on the maps of the Christian era since it was the first and only Christian country east of Asia Minor – Anatolia. In Christian cartography Armenia is frequently identified with Mount Ararat and Noah’s Arc, as per the biblical account of the Flood. In some maps the Garden of Eden or Terrestrial Paradise is shown inside or adjacent to Armenia.

The oldest Roman map is the ‘Peutinger Map’, the archetype of which dates from the middle of the first century CE. This is a road map some 34 cm wide and 6.4 metres long, a fifth-century copy of which has survived. The map shows various routes radiating from Rome to the four corners of the empire, including Armenia, where the names of Artashat, Bagrewand (misspelled Rau-gona), Vostan (Van) and Tigranakert are recognizable.

With the coming of Christianity and religious fervour, especially under the influence of the Biblical theory of the Creation, the western science of cartography suffered immensely and there was no advance at all in the field from the second to the fifteenth century CE, except for cosmetic modifications and representations. In the western Christian world during this period all the old theories and scientific works were pushed aside and were replaced with new ‘facts’ based on the teachings of the scriptures.

Since the sixth century the spherical earth was replaced by a flat disc-shaped one, divided into three continents and surrounded by the oceans. This was adopted by Isidore of Seville (ca. 560–636), who included the T-0 map of the world (see below) in his *Etymologiae*. This type of maps appeared in hundreds of manuscripts and, with some modifications, formed the backbone of the Christian cartography for almost 1000 years.

The maps developed according to this doctrine were simple ones called T-0 maps, which came into being in the Middle Ages. These maps, if they could be called that, showed the earth in the shape of a circle, or letter 0, with the
letter T inserted into it, in order to divide it into three known continents, hence the name, which could also be short for ‘Orbis Terrarum’. In these maps east was invariably at the top, where Paradise was also located. The vertical line forming the stem of the letter T represented the Mediterranean Sea and the two parts of the cross bar were the Rivers Nile and Don, thus dividing the world into the three known continents, the largest being Asia and the smaller two Europe and Africa. Many of these maps have survived in various manuscripts and in varying sizes from 10cm to a few metres in diameter. The later versions of T-O maps contained details of counties and towns, with many descriptions. On these maps Armenia was always represented as the country where Mount Ararat could be found and Noah’s Ark had landed. (See Fig. 4.)

During the eighth century, the Spanish Benedictine monk Beatus of Liébana created his own more decorative version of a T-O map (see Fig. 5). This style was adopted by others, giving rise to a number of similar maps, called Beatus maps. In most Beatus maps Armenia is featured prominently, located next to Paradise and south of the Caucasus Mountains.

The small and simple T-O maps gradually gave way to more elaborate ones, depicting towns, cities or even some fauna and flora. Two of the most important and large scale maps of this type are the Ebstorf Map, which had a diameter of about 3.6 metres (destroyed during the Second World War) and the ‘Mappa Mundi’ (World Map), dating from the thirteenth century, kept in the Hereford Cathedral, England. Both these maps show Armenia in the relatively correct geographical position, with particular attention being paid to Noah’s Ark and Mount Ararat. The third similar map is kept in Vercelli, Italy but was heavily damaged during careless restoration work.

**Armenia in Islamic cartography**

While in the west geographers and cartographers were made to think and work within parameters set by the Church, in the East the Persian and Arab scientists continued to work unhindered by religious dogma. Regrettably, although medieval Islamic world was much advanced in science and astronomy, somehow their advances in cartography did not continue after the thirteenth century.

One of Islamic cartography’s most important foundations is the Balkhi School of geography and maps, which generally described the Islamic countries located in the Persian Gulf, Caspian, Arabian and Red Seas, the eastern Mediterranean and the Indian subcontinent. However, Armenia, together with Russia and Bulgaria, does appear on most Islamic world maps, some of which also include the names of other European countries such as Spain, France and Germany. (See Fig. 6.)

There are a number of important cartographers in the Islamic world including the Persian geographer and scientist Abu Reihān al-Birūnī (973–1048 CE), who travelled extensively and wrote books on geography, other Persians such as...
Ibrāhim Ibn Mohammad al-Fārsi, known as al-Istakhri (died ca. 957 CE), al Muqaddasi (945–1000 CE), Sadiq Isfahānī and Abu Zakarīyā Ibn Muhammad al-Qazwīnī (1203–83), Arabs Ibn Hauqal (d. 934 CE) and Idrissi (1099–1166 CE).

All of the above geographers have produced books describing the world, countries and peoples. As mentioned above, all Balkhi school books contain a world map, as well as 16–20 regional maps, depicting mainly the Islamic world. The only exception being the Christian country of Armenia, which is included on the regional map entitled “The map of Azerbaijan, Arran and Armenia”, where Azerbaijan (ancient Atropatene) is placed south of the Arax River as one of the Iranian provinces (see Fig. 7). For details of 20 Islamic maps see Rouben Galichian, Countries South of the Caucasus in Medieval Maps. Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan, London: Gomidas Institute, 2007.

During what could be called the Norman-Arab period of cartography, this science became more advanced. The most famous of Arab geographers of the era was Ibn al-Sharif al-Idrisi or Edrisi (who was born in Ceuta, Morocco, and studied in Cordoba). After his extensive travels to many parts of the world he was invited to work for the Norman king Roger II of Sicily, for whom he produced a silver globe of the world inscribed with the contemporary map of the known world. In his maps Idrisi includes the countries of Great Armenia and Lesser Armenia. His atlas of the world known as The Book of Roger also includes much detail about Armenia and names many Armenian cities.

In Ottoman Turkey the most important geographers of the seventeenth century were Mehmet Zilli Ibn-Dervish (1611–1684) better known as Evliya Chelebi, who was a traveller and wrote books about his travels in the neighbouring countries, and Mustafa Ibn-Abdullāh (1609–1657) known as Kātib Chelebi or Hāji Khalīfah, who also travelled widely and produced the first important geography book called Jehān Numā, describing various parts of the world. In addition to detailed descriptions, their manuscripts refer extensively to Ottoman and Persian-occupied Armenian territories and cities, accompanied by some map sketches.

**The Portolan Chart and Armenia**

Portolans are marine charts and maps prepared for the seafaring peoples, generally depicting the shorelines and ports of the Mediterranean. They were used mainly by the pilots and navigators. Great Armenia being a landlocked country should not have been included on these charts. Cilician Armenia, however, being an independent kingdom from the eleventh to fourteenth centuries located on the north-eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, would be expected to feature on these marine charts, majority of which were produced between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries.

Portolan maps usually show a detailed coastline with the names of all the coastal towns, estuaries, inlets, bays, promontories, rivers, underwater obsta–

1 Ancient Atropatene (Arm. Atrpatakan).
cles, reefs and other prominent features accompanied by the lines of the com­
pass, called rhumb­lines, and directions of the prevailing winds. Anything that
would interest the ship’s pilot and assist in navigation was shown in as much
detail as possible while inland details were not shown. Most of the maps have
blank areas for the inland spaces, filled with decorations and cartouches. Por­
tolans were drawn on parchment and were almost always coloured, since the
colours provided additional vital information for the captains, such as showing
town sizes and their importance, as well as indicating whether the coastline
was friendly or not.

Portolans of the Mediterranean include much information about the coast­
line of Asia Minor in the Black Sea as well as all the Mediterranean shores. The
Armenian kingdom of Cilicia, located in the north­eastern corner of the Medi­
terranean, features prominently in many Mediterranean portolans of that pe­
riod, sometimes surrounded by a green arch. This was predominantly due to
the fact that the ports of Cilician Armenia were Christian ports, and the map­
makers wanted to show them as friendly to the European seafarers. Great Ar­
menia, being landlocked, would normally not be expected to appear on porto­
lans, since it was out of their useful range. However, this appears not to be
true.

In the Italian and Catalan portolans of the Mediterranean area details of the
coastlines are shown amazingly accurate and consistent, generally being very
advanced for their time. The curious fact is that on majority of the portolans
of the East Mediterranean area Armenia also appears. Armenia Maior (Great
Armenia) is generally depicted with a range of mountains, which are shown as
the source of the Rivers Euphrates and Tigris, sometimes as well as a third
river, the Arax, flowing from these mountains north and west towards the Cas­
pian Sea. These maps also show Mount Ararat placed in Armenia, with Noah’s
Ark perched on top (usually shown sideways) and many include the Armenian
populated cities of Arzenga (Erzinjan) and Malatia. (See Fig. 8).

This was probably due to the fact that the country was well known in the
West because of the activities and information obtained form the Armenian
merchants established in Venice, Amsterdam and other European centres trade
trading with the east. Armenia may have also been known in the west and to
the Christian world because in the year 301 it became the first country to
adopt Christianity as its official state religion while being the easternmost
Christian country. Since then Armenian communities were established in Jeru­
salem where, today, the Armenian Monastery of St James is one of the guard­
ians of the Holy Places, Constantinople and many European cities.

The Late Medieval period.

The last quarter of the fifteenth century saw two important developments
in the world of cartography. First – Gutenberg invented the movable type
printing press, facilitating the printing of Ptolemy’s Geography. Second – to­
wards the end of the century, Columbus discovered the New World, throwing
the world of cartography into turmoil of new discoveries and redrawing of all
world maps.
At the end of the fourteenth century, when the Turks reached the neighbour­
bourhood of Constantinople, some of the manuscripts from its libraries were
transferred to Italy for safekeeping. Ptolemy’s *Geography* was among those.
Later, scholars translated the *Geography* volumes from the original Greek into
Latin and as stated previously, many cartographers such as Donnus Germanus,
Sebastian Münster, Martin Waldseemüller, Berlinghieri and others started pre­
paring maps according to the Ptolemaic texts and coordinates, which accom­
panied the original texts of their newly prepared atlases. To begin with, those
books were in a manuscript form but soon printing took over and various
publishers started to produce printed versions.

There was a profusion of Ptolemaic maps and atlases coming out of the
presses of Rome, Milan, Florence, Ulm and Basel which, with a few exceptions,
were based on the Ptolemaic maps having Armenia Minor as the “First Map of
Asia” and Armenia Major as the “Third Map of Asia”. (See Fig. 3).

One of characteristic features of the maps printed during the sixteenth
and seventeenth centuries was addition of elaborate decorations and embel­
ishments used in their presentation. The cartouche, which was originally in­
tended to frame the title of the map, was now an elaborate artwork sometimes
occupying a large portion of the printed page, aimed at making the map more
attractive and desired object.

Some of the well-known European geographers and cartographers of the
period who produced maps and atlases of certain importance are given in this
list:

- Martin Waldseemüller (1470–1520)
- Sebastian Münster (1489–1552)
- Gerardus Mercator (1512–1594)
- Abraham Ortelius (1528–1598)
- Willem Janszoon Blaeu (1571–1638) and his son Johannes (1596–1673)
- Christopher Saxton (1542–1610)
- John Speed (1552–1629)
- Henricus Hondius (1587–1638)
- Jan Jansson (1588–1664)
- Nicolas Sanson (1600–1667).

Most atlases of the above cartographers include a map of the Turkish Em­
pire, which shows Armenia divided between the Ottoman Empire and Persia.
Although not having an independent country, the name of Armenia appears on
the territory surrounding the Lakes of Van and Sevan and the Mountain of
Ararat, while these were the lands where the Armenians were autochthonous.
(See Fig. 9.)

Guillaume Delisle (1675–1726) produced many atlases such as the *Atlas de
Géographie* in 1707 as well as the *Atlas Russicus*, the first large-scale atlas of
Russia, in 1745. This atlas includes maps of the Caucasus, the Caspian Sea, Per­
sia and Turkey. On these detailed maps one could see Armenia being shown
over an area that extended from Mush to Artsakh. Azerbaijan (ancient Atropa­
tene) is shown there as the north-western province of Iran, located to the
south from the River of Araxes, while the territory lying to the north from Kura river is named Shirvan, Shaki etc. It can be clearly seen on all maps that until 1918 there was no Azerbaijan existing to the north from the Araxes, while Atropatena-Azerbaijan was an Iranian province, lying to the south of the River of Araxes. (See Fig. 10).

**Armenian cartography**

The oldest Armenian geographical volume, the *Ashkharhatsuyts* (pronounced Ash-khar-ha-tsyuts – World Mirror), was penned between 591 and 610 A.D. before the Arab conquest and is attributed by most to the Armenian mathematician and geographer Anania Shirakatsi. The work takes its roots from the text by Pappus of Alexandria, which in its turn was based on Ptolemy’s works. However, the text of *Ashkharhatsuyts* includes much more detailed information and data on Armenia, Caucasus and Persia. The book, written in classical Armenian, has been translated into modern Armenian, Latin, French, and German, as well as reprinted with an introduction in English.

Some specialists believe that the text was originally accompanied by maps; although two versions of the book exist in manuscript as well as printed form, no maps survived. In the eighteenth century a map of historic Armenia was printed at the St. Lazarus (San Lazzaro) Armenian monastery of Venice, prepared and etched according to the descriptions provided in *Ashkharhatsuyts*. (See Fig. 11).

Some Armenian medieval manuscripts include T-O-type and climatic zone maps of the world, bearing the influence of Christian and Islamic cartography traditions. These were important parts that formed the features of Armenian cartography. It led to the printed maps of the seventeenth century. The oldest circular map in Armenian dates comes from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This is a T-O map with the characteristic features for this type of maps. This small map is kept in Matenadaran, the Institute of Old Manuscripts in Yerevan, being bound in a manuscript from Kaffa (Theodosia) of Crimea (See Fig. 12).

During the preparations for a cartographic exhibition in 1991, the authorities at the University of Bologna discovered a roll of cloth, wherein a map almost 3.6 metres long and 1.2 metres wide was discovered. The map was made in full and glorious colour. The only problem was that the inscriptions were in a language unknown to them. As the roll cover bore a title that included the word *Armenia*, the authorities contacted Gabriella Uluhogian (Uluhojian), pro-

---

1 Anania of Shirak, who lived in the seventh century A.D.
5 J. Marquart (Berlin: 1901).
fessor of the Armenian language at the university, for guidance. She was aston­
ished to discover that the map was, in fact, in Armenian, and was a huge
manuscript showing the locations of important Armenian churches, monaster­
ies and Catholicosates¹ and covering the entire area of historic Armenia from
Artsakh (Karabagh) to Constantinople, even including Cyprus and Jerusalem.
The two cartouches of the map contained a detailed description of the hierar­
chy of the Armenian Church as well as details on the occasion of the map’s
preparation. The map had the date 1691 A.D. (See Fig. 13).

The third oldest Armenian map is the World Map printed in 1695 by Thom­
as Vanandetsi in Amsterdam. This map consisted of two hemispheres, namely
that of America and Australia, that were however left incomplete. The cartog­
raphers, being of Dutch origin, utilised the latest cartographic information and
up-to-date styles used in the Netherlands of that time. The map was prepared
on a high art level as well as carefully decorated. At each corner the scenes
related to the four seasons as well as astrological and mythological figures de­
picted.

A large-scale atlas of the world was printed in Venice in 1849. It included
maps of the world, the solar system and each continent, as well as maps of the
Ottoman Empire and Armenia, all carefully laid out and coloured. This must be
the first full atlas designed in the Armenian language.

The Monastery of St. Lazarus and its printing house have a significant place
in Armenian cartography, as from the early eighteenth century for almost two
hundred years the most important maps in the Armenian language were print­
ed there. (See Fig. 14.)

The Maps created after the Nineteenth Century

Since the middle of the nineteenth century, maps have become more ac­
curate and reliable, their differences lying mainly in such relatively minor mat­
ters as place-names, scales, projection and detail. It took much time and effort
on the part of many geographers and cartographers to achieve this greater
reliability. During the same period, in some maps the name of Armenia was
gradually being substituted with other more “acceptable” terminology, de­
pending on who was the producer and where the map was printed. However,
the reasons behind these changes were political rather than cartographical.

Global cartography reached maturity in 1891, when the Fifth International
Geographic Congress approved the execution of the International Map of the
World with a scale of 1/1,000,000. It was only after this final decision that the
world could be properly surveyed, pending peace and the proper cooperation
of the member states, both of which conditions are often elusive, even today.

Note:
For many more maps as well as detailed and comparative studies of wider

¹ Churches located in various regions of Armenia came under the rule of different religious
centers, called Catholicosates.
ranges of maps of Armenia both in Armenian and English refer to the following works of the author of the article, Rouben Galichian.


Fig. 1 – The World Map of Eratosthenes, reconstructed by von Spruner in 1855 is dated around the third century BCE. The three continents are shown named Europe, Asia and Libya. Armenia is placed in the middle of the world, just south of the Caspian and Black Seas.

Fig. 2 – Detail form the World Map of Ptolemy, dating from the second century, showing the area surrounded by the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea, West Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf. Two Armenias are shown. Armenia Maior placed south of the Caucasus and Caucasian Albania, west of Media, north of Mesopotamia and east of Armenia Minor. The map is from Ptolemy’s *Geographia*, printed in 1531.

Fig. 3 – Ptolemy’s “Third Map of Asia” from the *Geographia*, printed in 1531. This map shows Armenia Maior, Colchis (Abkhazia), Iberia (Kartli – part of present-day Georgia) and [Caucasian] Albania.

Fig. 4 – A typical T-O type European world map by Venerable Bede, from the 11th century England. It shows the disc shaped world with East at the top. This is divided into the three continents by the vertical line of the Mediterranean Sea, and horizontal waterways of Don on the left and the Nile at the right. Country names are listed in the space allocated for the continents. The eighth line of the names listed in Asia reads Hircania, Albania, Armenia, Iberia [Kartli], Cappadocia and Asia Minor.

Fig. 5 – This is a world map prepared for Beatus’s *Commentarium in Apocalypsin*, dating from the eighth century. This is an elaborate T-O map with east at the top, where Paradise is shown. Left of the map the name Armenia is inscribed below the Caucasian Mountains (green). The vertical blue mass is the Mediterranean Sea with its abundant islands. The heads represent the ten Apostles placed where they preached.

Fig. 6 – The tenth century *World Map* of Istakhri is one of best examples of the Persian cartography (copy made in 1836). As per Islamic cartography practices, south is at the top of the page. The two gold lined blue inward pointing fingers are the Indian Ocean (left) and the Mediterranean, which is extending north represented by the curved waterways of the Aegean and the Black Seas, eventually connecting to the Caspian Sea (gold-blue circle with white core).

\[1\] Iranian Azerbaijan (ancient Atropatehe).
Armenia is found between the Caspian and the Black Seas and the Iranian province of Azerbaijan is placed to its south.

Fig. 7 – Istakhri’s *Map of Armenia, Arran and Azerbaijan*¹, has North at the top, which is unusual for Islamic maps. The blue mass on the right is part of the Caspian Sea, with the rivers Kura and Arax (on top) and Sefid- Rud at the bottom, flowing into it. Cities of Arran are placed north and south of the Kura, Armenian cities are around the river Arax and Lake Van. Iranian Azerbaijani cities are at the south-east of the map, below the Armenian territory to the south of the River Arax. The twin triangles are the Ararat Mountains and the other large mountain is Mount Sabalan in Iran. Despite the Azerbaijani declarations, the Islamic maps clearly show that Arran and Azerbaijan were two different countries existing at the same time.

Fig. 8 – This is the eastern section of Dulcert’s portolan chart of the Mediterranean, dating from 1339. The toponyms in small script denote the names of the ports and other coastal features, written perpendicular to the shoreline. Top half of the map, with blank interior is Asia Minor inscribed “Turchia”. The lower blank part is the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea. In the north-eastern corner of this sea, separated by a green border is the Cilician Kingdom of Armenia, described as “Armenia Minor”. The green border indicates that these are friendly ports for the Crusaders. On the top right the twin green mountains are described as Mons Taurus, which are the source of Euphrates (lower left) and the Tigris Rivers (lower right). To their east we see Armenia Maior, and the sideways drawn twin peaks of Mount Ararat, with Noah’s Ark perched on top. This is a most unusual detail to be included on a portolan of the Mediterranean, but most of the portolans of the period do depict similar features, while the rest of the area covered by the same charts remain devoid of any toponym or features.

Fig. 9 – Above detail of the area between the Black and the Caspian Seas is from Kohler’s 1718 map *Historic Orient*. Armenia is divided between the Ottoman and Persian empires and is shown extending from Amid (Tigranakert) to the confluence of Kura and Arax Rivers. Aderbigana or Atropatena (Azerbaijan) is the north-western province of Iran, south of the Arax River, while Albania (proper Aluank) is placed north of the River Kura and east of Iberia (Kartli).

Fig. 10 – Guillaume Delisle’s 1730 *Map of the Caspian Sea and its Neighbouring Territories* clearly shows that Aderbigana (Atropatena) is the province south of the Arax and is part of Iran. To its north, across the Kura river are the lands called Chirvan, Chamaki, Derbent and Tabassaran. Armenia covers all of Eastern Armenia as well as most of Western Armenia.

Fig. 11 – Here is the *Map of the Armenia as per the Ashkharhatsuyts* printed in St. Lazzaro in 1751. As evident form the title, the cartographer has used the text of the seventh century geography book for reconstructing the map of Armenia of the time.

Fig. 12 – This T-0 map is the oldest Armenian map dating from the 14th century, kept in a manuscript of various articles in the Matenadaran, Yerevan.

¹Iranian Azerbaijan.
It has east at the top and shows the circular world with Jerusalem and its six gates, drawn disproportionally large, placed at its centre. On the top semicircle – Asia – we can find the cities of the Silk Road, extending from Zayton and Kansayh in China to Kaffa on the Black Sea. Other trading cities of Sarai, Khowrazm, as well as Mardin, Baghdad, Damascus, Venice, Cyprus are also shown. The Red Sea is placed between Asia and Africa (below right) and is painted red.

Fig. 13 – This is a section from the second oldest Armenian map dated 1691, made by the famous Armenian scholar and politician Eremia Cheleby Keomurjian (1637–1695) in Constantinople. It shows all the important Armenian churches, monasteries and religious centres. Here we see Mount Ararat near Echmiadzin, where the Catholicos is entertaining the Persian Sardar, The four peaked Aragats is north (left) of Echmiadzin with the Monastery of Saghmosavanq and other churches found nearby, each with a relevant description in a cartouche.

Fig. 14 – This Armenian-language map of the Ottoman Empire was printed in the Venetian Armenian Monastery of St. Lazzaro in 1787. As per the political situation of the day, Armenia was divided between the Ottoman Empire and Persia, whose domain in the north extended to the Caucasus Mountains.

ՀԱՂՈՐԴՈՒՄՆԵՐ – REPORTS

ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՔԱՐՏԵԶՆԵՐԻ ՊԱՏՄՈՒԹՅԱՆ (ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ)

Հայաստանի հնագույն երկիր հնագույն աշխարհի մեջը Արեգակնինյան պատմականության շրջանում է, որը մի փոքր կավե սալիկ է, որի տեղաշարժին նշվում են երեք երկրներ՝ Բաբելոն, Ասորեստան և Հայաստան՝ Արարատի երկիրից: Սալիկի շրջանի 2600 տարիներից է.

Չնայած Հայաստանի բազմաթիվ պատմիչները գրել են Հայաստանը և հայ ժողովրդի մասին (տե՛ս պատկեր 1, Էրատոսթենեսի Աշխարհացույց քարտեզը): Ստրաբոնը իր Աշխարհագրության մեջ (մ.թ. 64 թ. – 25 թ.) 60 անգամ հիշատակում է Հայաստանը, ներառյալ Մեծ և Փոքր Հայքերը, նրանց պատմությունն ու աշխարհագրությունը:

Ալեքսանդրիացի աշխարհագրագետ Կլավդիոս Պտղոմեոսն իր հանրահայտ Աշխարհագրություն երկում (2-րդ դ.), երկուկտսիլը 8.000 տեղանկույցներ 164-րդ հանդիսացում է, Միջազգային Հայաստանի պատմականության մեջ կարելի է 27 բարձրություն նշել, որոնցից հինգ վրա աշխարհացույցն է, Հայաստանը (տե՛ս պատկեր 2 և 3):

Միջնադարյան Եվրոպայում, երբ գիտությունը գտնվում էր կղեղական հասկերականության տակ, աշխարհացույցները բազմազան են դարձան, որպես այն էրկիրների ազատություն, կարճ է, իրական անց Հայաստանը, որոնցից մեծ մասը Հայաստանի պատմությունն ու ինչպես նա աղբյուրներից հետագա պատմական աշխարհչություններ (տե՛ս պատկեր 4 և 5):
12–15 դդ. Բանբեր Հայագիտության 2013 ¹ 1 (1)

12–15 դդ. ընթացքում Անգլիայում և Իտալիայում պատրաստվեցին մի քանի հսկայական չափերի աշխարհացույց քարտեզներ, որոնք պատրաստված էին անկարգ տարածված տեղեկություններ Հայաստանի, Հայկական լեռնաշխարհի և Նոյյան տապանի վերաբերյալ: Պատրաստված են Անգլիայի Սլավուրի քաղաքի տաճարի, Վերչելիի և Էբսթորֆյան կոչված աշխարհացույց քարտեզները, որոնցից վերջինը ոչնչացավ համաշխարհային պատերազմի ռմբակոծումների ընթացքում:

9–12 դդ. իսլամական աշխարհագրությունը քարտեզագիտությամբ մեծապես առաջադիմեց, քանի որ արաբ խալիֆները իրենց գիտնականներին քաջալերում էին անկաշկանդ նորանոր հետազոտություններ կատարել: Հայաստանն ու Աղվանքը մշտապես տեղ են գտել նաև իսլամական քարտեզներում: Վերլուծելով իսլամական քարտեզները և նրանց ուղեկցող տեքստերը փաստվում է, որ բուն Աղվանքը մի քրիստոնյա երկիր է եղել տեղադրված Կուր գետի ձախափնյակին, իսկ Հայաստանը տեղադրված է բուն Աղվանքից հարավ-արևմուտք և Առաքելականից արևմուտք ու հյուսիս-արևմուտք (տե՛ս պատկեր 6 և 7): Այս տեղադրումները կարելի է տեսնել 9–11 դդ. Բալխի դպրոցին պատկանող իսլամական բոլոր քարտեզներում, ինչպես նաև դրանից հաջորդող քարտեզագետների տարբեր աշխատություններում:

Պորտոլան կոչվող քարտեզները պատրաստվում էին ծովագնացների գործածության համար և ընդհանրացած էին 12–16 դդ. հատկապես Միջերկրածովի շրջանակներում: Սրանք անընդհատ լրացվում էին նորանոր հավաքած տեղեկություններով և դարձան ժամանակի պայմաններից բավականին ճշգրիտ պատկերացում էին իրենց պատկերած տեղանքի վերաբերյալ (տե՛ս պատկեր 8):

Պորտոլանների մեջ մանրակրկիտ կերպով ցուցադրվում էին ծովափուլ քաղաքներն ու գյուղերը, նավահանգիստները, գետանցուները, սակայն ափերից հեռու՝ ցամաքի խորքում, աշխարհագրական տեղեկություններ չէին նշվում: Պորտոլանների մեջ, որոնք ցուցադրում էին մինչև Փոքր Ասիայի արևելյան ծայրամասը, հաճախ կարելի է տեսնել Հայկական լեռնաշխարհը պատկերող լեռները, որոնցից սկիզբ են առնում Եփրատը և Տիգրիսը, ուղղված հյուսիս և արևմուտք, դեպի Կասպից ծով: Տիգրիսից արևելք, Հայաստանի տարածքում ընդհանրապես տեղադրված էր Արագածի զույգ գագաթներով, պատկերված կողքի, գագաթին նստած ունենալով Նոյյան տապանը:
15-րդ դարի կեսին Կոնստանդնուպոլսի գրադարանի կարևոր ձեռագրերի մեկ մասը փոխադրվեց Եվրոպա, ուր մեծ մասն Պտղոմեոսի աշխարհագրությունը, որի սրապատման հետ ապրելով երգեցած է մեկ մաս գրավում։ Պտղոմեոսի ձեռագրերը Եվրոպայում կարևոր դարձան։ Պտղոմեոսի աշխարհագրության հետևանքով Արևմտյան գիտնականները բազմակիկ ձեռագրեր են գրել, որոնք հայտնվեցին Եվրոպայում։ Այս ձեռագրերները զարգացրեցին Եվրոպայի գիտական վայրը։

Այս գիրքը թարգմանվեց լատիներենի և մեծ ազդեցություն ունեցավ եվրոպական քարտեզագիտության վրա։ Այս ձեռագրի շարքում տպագրվեցին աշխարհագրության բազմաթիվ աշխարհագրություններ։ Այս աշխարհագրություններից մեկը Ներկայիս Արևմտյան Հայաստանի տեքստին ու վերականգնված 27 քարտեզներ, որոնց համար եվրոպական գրականության ազդեցությունն անցնում էր։ Այս ձեռագրի շարքում գրականության վերականգնման մեջ մտնում էին Պիետրո Շառկուարի գրականությունները, որոնցից շատերը ներկայացնում էին հայկական ժամանակաշրջանը։

16–17 դդ. Եվրոպայում հրատարակվեցին բազմաթիվ քարտեզներ և ատլասներ, բոլորը կրում էին Հայաստանի կարևոր տարածքը՝ Կովկասի և Միջագետքի միջև։ Այս քարտեզներից որևէ մեկի մեջ, բնականաբար, հնարավոր չի գտնել «Ադրբեջան» կոչվող մի երկիր, որը տեղադրված էր Արաքսից և Կուրից հյուսիս (տե՛ս պատկեր 9)։

Ֆրանսիացի քարտեզագետ Գիյում Դելիլի 1730 թ. քարտեզի վրա (տե՛ս պատկեր 10) պարզ նշված էին Մեծ Հայքը, Վիրքը, Աղվանքը և Ադրբեջանը (Ատրոպատենե, որպես Իրանի հյուսիս-արևմտյան նահանգ)։

Հայկական աշխարհագրական երկերի գլուխգործոցը Շիրակացու Աշխարհացույցը, որի ձեռագրերը, սակայն, քարտեզ չեն պարունակում (տե՛ս պատկեր 11)։ Դրան հաջորդում է Մ ատենադարանի համար 1242 թ. վերականգնված մեկ լատինական տեքստը և 27 քարտեզ (տե՛ս պատկեր 12), իսկ հնագույն տպագիր քարտեզն է Վանանդեցու 1695 թ. Համատարած Աշխարհացույցը։

18-րդ դարի սկզբից կենտրոնական Կովկասի` հիմնականում Հայաստան։ Այս շրջանում քարտեզագրական գիտությունները զարգացան ուղղության համաձայն փոխազդեցության հիման վրա։ Հայաստանի աշխարհագրական գիտությունները զարգացան ուղղության համաձայն փոխազդեցության հիման վրա։ Հայաստանի աշխարհագրական գիտությունները զարգացան ուղղության համաձայն փոխազդեցության հիման վրա։
ОЦИР ПО ИСТОРИИ КАРТ АРМЕНИИ

(РЕЗЮМЕ)

Один из фактов, подтверждающих древний статус Армении – карта мира из Вавилона. Она представляет собой небольшой пласт из глины, который хранится в Британском музее. На нем в центре мира указаны три страны – Вавилон, Ассирия и Армения. Возраст пласта – 2600 лет. На дошедших до нас от этого времени картах Армения, независимо от ее политического и государственного статуса, значилась всегда (рис. 1. Карта мира Эратосфена). До 1920-х годов на всех европейских картах территория от Малатии до Арцаха именовалась Арменией или Айастан.

Большую часть населения этой территории составляли армяне, однако, Западная Армения, включая Килицию, были лишены коренного армянского населения в результате совершенного Османской Турцией в 1915-1923 гг. Геноцида армян. Вследствие этого на современных турецких и других картах на территории Западной Армении перестало указываться название Армения.

Об Армении и армянском народе писали многие древнегреческие историки, Страбон в своей “Географии” (64 г. до н.э. – 25 г.) упоминает Армению 60 раз, в том числе Великую и Малую Армению, их историю и географию.

Крупнейший Александрийский картограф Клавдий Птолемей в своей “Географии” (II в.) указывает 8000 географических названий, 164 из которых относятся к Великой и Малой Армении. В своем труде Птолемей упоминает 27 карт, на пяти из которых обозначена Армения (рис. 2 и 3).

В средневековой Европе, когда наука была под надзором духовенства, на всех картах, с нанесенными на них названиями стран, мы видим Армению, гору Арарат и на вершине Ноев ковчег (рис. 4 и 5).

В XII–XV вв. в Англии и Испании было создано несколько больших географических карт, содержащих еще более подробные сведения об Армении, горе Арарат и Ноевом ковчеге. Это, например, карты мира – хранящаяся в соборе в Хирфорде (Англия), карта известная под названием Верчелли и Эбсторфская карта, уничтоженная во время бомбежки.

Исламская география и картография в IX–XII вв. во многом опережала европейские. Арабские халифы все более интенсивно поощряли занятие своих ученых наукой. В результате в мусульманских странах переживает подъем в том числе и картография. Исламская картография отводила мало места христианским странам за исключением, пожалуй, Армении и собственно Алуанка (Кавказская Албания). Армения находится к юго-западу от собственно Алуанка и к западу и северо-западу от Атрпатакана (рис. 6 и 7).

Такое размещение можно видеть на всех исламских картах IX–XI вв.,

РУБЕН ГАЛИЧЯН
принадлежащих Балхийской школе, а также в работах последующих картографов.

В XII–XVI вв. в Европе (в связи с торговым мореплаванием) были разработаны портуланы (портоланы), морские навигационные карты с подробным описанием береговой полосы Средиземного моря. Время от времени они пополнялись подробностями и довольно точно отражали нанесенные на них данные. Портуланы указывали многие прибрежные пункты – города, селения, порты, гавани, а также рифы и пр., но о внутренней части суши они не предоставляли никаких сведений, и эти части карт часто были украшены миниатюрами и орнаментами. Составлявшие портуланы каталонские и венецианские картографы, предоставлявшие карты также крестоносцам, (в организации походов которых участвовало и венецианское купечество), были прекрасно осведомлены о маршрутах киликийских купцов. И потому на многих картах северо-восточной части Средиземного моря вокруг пограничных портов киликийской Армении можно видеть выписанные зеленым дуги, сообщающие проходящим здесь крестоносцам, что эти порты принадлежат не мусульманам, а христианам и дружественны. На портуланах восточной части Средиземного моря, представлявших также восточную часть Малой Азии, можно было видеть Армянское нагорье, где берут начало текущие на юг Тигр и Евфрат и реку Аракс, текущую к северу и востоку, к Каспийскому морю. К западу от Тигра обозначалась гора Арарат с двумя вершинами и прилепившимся сбоку Ноевым ковчегом. Возможно этот вариант изображения сформировался по рассказам описывающих свою страну армянских купцов.

В середине XV века, когда тюрки уже готовились к захвату Константинополя, часть важных рукописей из хранилищ была переправлена в Европу и в том числе “География” Птолемея, которая все еще была неизвестна на западе. Этот труд, переведенный на латинский язык, оказал значительное влияние на европейскую картографию. Очень скоро в Италии, Германии, в Голландии и т.д. были напечатаны тексты “Географии” и 27 восстановленных карт, что стало стимулом к развитию европейской картографии. На нескольких из этих карт (представляющих Армению в контексте II века) обозначены Великая и Малая Армения. Европейская картография начала возрождаться и в XVI–XVII вв., были изданы карты, на которых между Кавказом и Месопотамией была обозначена Армения. Ни на одной из этих карт невозможно, найти к северу от Аракса страну под названием Азербайджан (рис. 9).

На карте, изданной французским картографом Гийомом Делилем (1730 г. рис. 10) ясно указаны Великая Армения, Иберия, Абхазия и Азербайджан (Атропатена), как северо-западная иранская провинция.

Одним из самых замечательных достижений армянской географической науки является “География” Анании Ширакаци, которая, однако, не имела карт. Затем следует упомянуть хранящуюся в Матенадаране (рук. 1224) армянскую карту XIII–XIV вв., имеющую прототипом латинский тип (рис. 12). Заслуживают внимания сохранившаяся крупномасштабная руко-
писная карта Кеомурджяна, 1691 г., представляющая подробное расположение армянских монастырей и церквей (рис. 13), и самая старая печатная карта – Универсальная карта мира Ванандеци 1695 г.

С середины XVIII в. активную роль в развитии армянской картографии начинает играть конгрегация мхитаристов, в числе лучших образцов, выпущенных трудами членов конгрегации были карты Обетованной земли (1746 г.), исторической Армении (1751 г. и 1786 г.) и Османского государства (1787 г.) (рис. 14), а в 1849 г. был издан первый большой армянский атлас с двенадцатью цветными таблицами.

Fig. 1 – The World Map of Eratosthenes
Fig. 2 – Detail from the World Map of Ptolemy

Fig. 3 – Ptolemy’s “Third Map of Asia” from the Geographia, printed in 1531
Fig. 4 – A typical T-O type European world map by Venerable Bede, from the 11th century England

Fig. 5 – The world map prepared for Beatus’s Commentarium in Apocalypse
Fig. 6 – The tenth century World Map of al–Istakhri

Fig. 7 – Al–Istakhri’s Map of Armenia, Arran and Atrpatakan (Azerbaijan)
Fig. 8 – The eastern section of Dulcert’s portolan chart of the Mediterranean, dating from 1339

Fig. 9 – Above detail of the area between the Black and the Caspian Seas is from Kohler’s 1718 map Historic Orient
Fig. 10 - Guillaume Delisle’s 1730 Map of the Caspian Sea and its Neighbouring Territories

Fig. 11 - The Map of the Armenia as per the Ashkharhatsuyts printed in St. Lazzaro in 1751
Fig. 12 – T-O map is the oldest Armenian map dating from the 14th century, kept in a manuscript of various articles in the Matenadaran, Yerevan.

Fig. 13 – A section from the second oldest Armenian map dated 1691, made by the famous Armenian scholar and politician Eremia Cheleby Keomurjian (1637-1695) in Constantinople.
Fig. 14 – The map of the Ottoman Empire was printed in the Venetian Armenian Monastery of St. Lazzaro in 1787
ARCHAEOLOGY
THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE OF SHENGAVIT: AN ANCIENT TOWN IN THE ARMENIAN HIGHLAND

Simonyan H. E.
Deputy Director of the Scientific Research Center of the Historical and Cultural heritage, PhD in Art and History

INTRODUCTION

The process of research of this culture, which started as far back as the second half of the 19th century, is still in the stage of preliminary, often controversial interpretations.

Before the basic work of Ye. Bayburtyan the archaeological complexes of the Shengavitian type were not viewed as sites of the same period, much less as belonging to the same culture. Ye. Bayburtyan, having at hand the scarce materials discovered during Ye. Lalayan’s and his own excavations, managed to meaningfully compile those

---

1 Below we introduce (present) the site of the Shengavitian culture, which had been discovered before the site Shengavit was excavated. In 1869 in the surroundings of the village of Zaglick the first grave-tomb of this culture was discovered during the exploitation of lime mines (see Куфтин Б. А., Урагский “колумбарий” у подошвы Арарат и Куро-Аракский зиолит, Вестник Государственного музея Грузии, Тбилиси, 1946, XIII, В. Репринтное издание, Издательский дом “Тавраевъ”, Махачкала, 2012, табл. XVI, XX, XIII, pp. 91–92, фиг. 49; Мунчаев Р. М., Кавказ на заре бронзового века, М., 1975, с. 14). Artifacts of Shengavit culture were discovered in 1879 in the grave-tomb of Armavir mound (excavators А. Уваров, see Куфтин Б. А., 1944, tab. XVI, XVII, з, XX, XIII, pp. 80, 92–95, fig. 50; Мунчаев Р. М. 1975, p. 15), in 1887 in the village of Metechli in Karabakh province (see Куфтин Б. А., 1944, p. 93, fig. 40, tab. XVIII, 5; Мунчаев Р. М., 1975, p. 15), in 1893 on the western slope of Aragats mountain (see Марр Н. Я., Ани, 1934, M.-L., tab. VII, fig. 8; Мунчаев Р. М., 1975, p. 15), in 1897 in Нагорно-Карабах (excavator Е. Уваров, see Плитовский Б. Б., Археология Закавказья, Л., 1949, с. 39; Куширева К. Х., Памятники медного века в Нагорном Карабахе, Советская Археология, 1954, XX, сс. 165–167; Мунчаев Р. М., 1975, с. 15). Thanks to the excavations by Ye. Lalayan the Early Bronze Age sites were discovered in 1904 in Mokhrablour–1 in Nakhijevan, in 1913 in Shresh-blour, in the villages of Nizh and Vardashen (see Пчелина, 1913, fig. 48, tab. XXII 1, 2): In 1927–1928 Ye. Bayburtyan carried out excavations at Mokhrablour, Shresh Blour, Elar, Frankanots, in 1935–1936 at Moukhannat-tapa and in 1936–1938 at Shengavit settlement (see Байбуртян Е. А., Псевдономатические памятники Армении, Проблемы Истории материальной культуры, 1933, 1–2, Л., pp. 30–40; Ibid., 2011 (1938). Последовательность древнейших культур Армении на основании археологического материала, Ереван, pp. 21–37) etc.
and determine the archaeological culture calling it *Shengavitian*. Later B.A.Kuftin continuing the researches in this field confirmed Bayburtyan’s thesis, but called it the Kura-Araxes Eneolithic culture, considering and thus limiting its spread only within the territory between the rivers Kura and Araxes.

Many researchers tried to bring together, generalize and put on the map Shengavitian sites, determine correctly their date, reveal the technology of the pottery making their forms, ornamentation, the ways of development of the works of art and applied objects, sort out the local cultural groups, etc. They have, undeniably, contributed greatly to the revelation of Shengavitian culture.

However, the most typical and common Shengavitian material - the pottery, is still in the process of appropriate study and its classification according to the type and ornamentation, to the stages and local variations, the compliance of the dating scales of the artifacts, the scientific observation of the Shengavitian complexes, and as a result of the commonness, its archaeological determination as a separate culture. The social, economic, religious, political, ethnic structure and the historical reconstitution are still in the preliminary phase of study.

---

3 Куфтин Б. А., op. cit., 1944.
9 The period of Shengavitian culture was an important stage of the development of the early Armenian culture (ed.).
Archaeological culture is one of the main concepts of archaeology. It exists in space and time and is characterized by the integrity of culture-creating characteristics typical only to the given, concrete culture. It is an objective reality formed as a result of ethno-cultural activities in a concrete territory and concrete time. The highlighting of the archaeological culture is difficult and complicated work requiring complete and deep knowledge of the archaeological reality of the region, the analysis (by unitary principle) of all essential peculiarities of the whole assortment of the material culture, burial ritual, architecture, economy and world-view, and selection of the culture-creating characteristics. This is probably the reason why a number of archaeological cultures, including also the one called Shengavitian (or Kura-Araxes), do not have their distinct formulations and are called culture a priori. As a result of this the same culture in different regions is often interpreted as a different phenomenon, or the cultures of different periods of the same region (e.g. the Kura-Araxes and Bedenian cultures) are presented as one culture.

The ethno-cultural unit, which covered such a vast territory and which lasted for so many centuries should have played a significant role in the system of the Ancient World cultures. In relation to this theory several works on the historical and cultural re-composition of the Early Bronze Age have been already published in Armenia on the basis of archaeological evidence. Shengavitian culture, which is verified to be spread on the territory of over a dozen modern countries, is the subject of various studies, interpretations and dating by scholars of different countries in their own way. This trend was caused by the divergence between the Soviet and Western methodology and political limitations on

---

one hand, and on the other, the language barrier which was an obstacle in reaching the information in time. However the process of the study of the EBA gradually takes a real shape and develops and every new discovery gives the opportunity to shed light on and elucidate this ancient culture that spread on the territory of Armenia and nearby countries. The central landmarks of this culture are of special interest. One of them was Shengavit town, which gave its name to this culture.

THE LOCATION

The site is located in the Shengavit community of Yerevan, on the left bank of the river Hrazdan (now on the eastern shore of the artificial Yerevan Lake), on a high, flat-topped cape [Fig.1]. On the east it is surrounded with a torrent, on the south with orchards, on the other sides with the Hrazdan river. It is 930 m above the sea-level, and once occupied more than 6 hectares. It had favourable conditions and position for habitation of man [Fig.2].

---

11 The articles and monographs devoted to Shengavitian culture have been published in Armenian, English, French, Russian, Georgian, Persian, Italian and other languages.


13 According to Bayburyan the ravine was on the southern side (see Байбуртят Е., op. cit., 2011, c. 26).

14 Ibid.
The heights of Shengavit from the river Hrazdan as is mentioned in various sources differ - 12m\textsuperscript{15}, 25-30m\textsuperscript{16}, 30m\textsuperscript{17}, and so on. On the grid drawn by Bayburtyan in the 1930s clearly are seen 14 horizontal lines running down to the stream with 1m gaps in between. Now from the top of the mound to the surface of the lake is 20 m, which makes us suppose that the most probable height was the one mentioned by Sardaryan - 30 m.

**THE PRECONDITIONS FOR HABITATION**

The site was built in an appropriate place for defense on a cape with steep slopes, near the river Hrazdan, which was an essential source for food and water. Ye. Bayburtyan confirmed that bones of various sorts of fish were found in Shengavit, and judging by the vertebrae, the fish reached a length of 1 m\textsuperscript{18}.

*Crucial carp is a fish that lives in fresh waters and also in artificial lakes, the utmost length can reach 1 m, the weight - 12-32 kg\textsuperscript{19}.*

S. Sardaryan, too, mentioned the ample of fish bones found during the excavations\textsuperscript{20}. We, also, have found bones of various fish: *Sirulus* sp., *Caoeta* sp., *Salmo* sp., *Cyprinidae indet\textsuperscript{21}.

The existence of ores in the neighborhood of the site, as well as the high-quality, rich, white salt deposits\textsuperscript{22} rather close to the surface (exploited with interruptions up to...

\textsuperscript{15} Khazadayan E., Culture of the Armenian Highland in the 3rd millennium BC, 1967, Yerevan, p. 80; History of the Armenian People (from now on HAP), 1971. Armenia in the period of primitive communal society and the slave-owning system, vol. 1, Yerevan, p. 129.

\textsuperscript{16} History of the Armenian Architecture (from now on HAA), vol. 1, Yerevan, 1996, p. 41.


\textsuperscript{18} Байбуртян Е., op. cit., 2011, p. 58.

\textsuperscript{19} Энциклопедический словарь, 1955, т. 3, Москва, с. 152. Հայկական սովետական հանրագիտարան, Երեվան, 1979, հ. 5, էջ 106:

\textsuperscript{20} Sardaryan S., op. cit., 2004, p. 183.

\textsuperscript{21} Definitions by David Vasilyan, Pam Crabtree, Nairi Manukyan.

\textsuperscript{22} We got this information from the academician Albiq Mkrtchyan. At our request he readily came and told on the spot (the old relief of the area before the artificial reservoir Yerevan Lake was constructed) about the deposits of white salt under the cliffs, and the way they were exploited - by cutting off big pieces of salt with the help of wooden wedges. We express our thanks to him for that. His explanations are confirmed by one of the newspaper articles of XIX c.,[see "Nor Dar (New Century)", December 23, 1888, N 217],which tells us about the exploitation of the salt deposits not far from Tsitsernakaberd in Yerevan, near the road to Ashtarak.
the 1960s) created favorable conditions to promote the organization and development of society and the trade. Since ancient times salt as a very valuable part of food, was of great demand both for people and animals, which most possibly was a source of profit being an object of international trade and exchange.

THE SITE

The site was greatly ruined during the Soviet period - in the 1950s while on the territory of the site a hospital complex was built. At present this site of world significance comprises only 2.72 hectares, the upper layers of its central part (total area 3000 m²) was excavated by S. Sardaryan in 1958-198323.

While preparing for the celebration of the 2750th anniversary of the foundation of Erebuni-Yerevan the territory of the site was equipped with the necessary facilities and fenced. The excavated constructions were partly restored with river stone and cement and sand solution (Fig. 3-4). The site is now under preservation, with its small wooden museum, and is included in “The Erebuni Historical-Archaeological Reservation-Museum” complex under the responsibility of the Yerevan City authorities.

---

HISTORY OF STUDY

In 1936-1938 the expeditions of the Committee for the Preservation of Historical Monuments (headed by Yevgeni Bayburtyan) and in 1958-1964 that of the AS of RA and in 1965-1983 of YSU (headed by Sandro Sardaryan) carried out excavations on the site. Since 2000 to the present the expedition of the “Scientific Research Center for Historical and Cultural Heritage” (headed by Hakob Simonyan) continues the complex study of the site.

The excavations of 2008-2012 were performed in frames of the purposeful research state project of the Science Committee of RA. The excavations of 2009-2010 and 2012 were carried out by Armenian-American joint expedition (codirected by Hakob Simonyan and Mitchell Rothman).

One of the most important preconditions for the study of the Shengavit site is the correct fixation of the excavated buildings and placing them on the main ground-plan. Although the territory of the site was measured many times, several times its teodolithic grid was compiled, yet we do not have by now a complete map (grid) of all the buildings that would serve as a basis. More or less complete is the plan by Yu. Tamanyan, drawn in 1965, but here Ye. Bayburtyan’s excavations are not included, and consequently, the buildings discovered during further excavations are left out, besides, the ground plan is not clear and the contours of the buildings are tangled. The grid presented in this article unites the grids drawn by Bayburtyan, Yu. Tamanyan and S. Davtyan, where the measurements by Yu. Tamanyan, G. Ghafadaryan, and H. Sanamyan are included. So,

27 Sardaryan S., op. cit., 1967, the grid is from the Sardaryan’s book.
28 By uniting these grids drawn on different (various) principles, scales and quality, often arbitrary (opposite to each other) a new and complete map of the site was compiled, which presents all the constructions of the upper horizon excavated by now at Shengavit. We express our gratitude to architechts Hovhannes Sanamyan and Koryun Ghafadaryan and the computer designer Hasmik Stepanyan for their assistance desplayed in this complicated work.
taking as a basis the grid published in Ye. Bayburtyan’s book in 1938 and the one confirming the untouched state of the site, we present the ground-plan of the site, on which we placed the excavated constructional view of Shengavit.

**THE PERIODIZATION**

The oldest artifacts discovered on the territory of the site are dated to the Neolithic-Calcholithic period. There are shards of pottery typical to this period, one stone statuette (Tab. 72), though the undisturbed layers of the mentioned period have not been revealed yet. According to radio-carbon analyses Shengavit as a stable habitat, was formed in the 4th millennium BC and lasted until the 26th-24th cc. BC (tab. 1). This means the main cultural horizons are dated to the Early Bronze Age (the 4th-3rd millennia BC).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R_Date Beta 283206</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 287471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Le 672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 387472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 345981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 387467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 328809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 387473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Le 458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 345980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 345982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date UCL 136275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Bin 5527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 387468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 383205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 387474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Beta 387469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date UCL 136275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date Bin 5526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_Date UCL 136276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calibrated date (calBC)
THE PECULIARITIES OF THE SITE

During the excavations an interesting picture of urban planning was unearthed: closely built houses with round and rectangular ground-plans, household pits, and two-story grain-storing pits with cylindrical stone-laid entrances, which were carefully closed with round tufa lids, came to light (Fig. 5-7). Inside were discovered charred grains of wheat and barley. During our excavations in the northern part of Shengavit more than 10 storing-pits were revealed, which could contain over 40 tons of grain.

S. Sardaryan dug an area of about 3000m² in the central part of the settlement in the II layer from the surface, where he discovered over 50 dwellings with round and rectangular layouts. This means there was a dwelling in every 60m² of the territory. This density of buildings repeats in other parts of Shengavit as well. So, based on this data (the average result of the quantity of houses) we can suppose that on a territory of 60 000 m² there were about 1000 dwellings.

The inner space was surrounded by stone defensive walls, fortified with towers with square layouts. There was a secret tunnel down to the river Hrazdan (Fig. 8).

Sardaryan supposed the defensive wall was built in the period previous to the last building horizon and functioned until the town was abandoned\textsuperscript{32}.

Ye. Bayburtyan, probably taking into consideration, the then existing stereotype about the clan system of Shengavit society denied the existence of the defensive and supporting walls, and the weapons, which he himself discovered\textsuperscript{33}.

During the excavations of Shengavit a big set of tools made of flint, obsidian, tufa, basalt, river stone, bone and bronze was discovered, and this is sound evidence that Shengavit was a town with prospering agriculture and well-developed craft, including spinning (for bone spindle whorls, looms, cf. Tab. 1-2). Seals, marble and onyx scepters (the heads are found), axes (hatchers) of retouched stone, hammers, spindle whorls (one of them had ditches on the surface which supposes gems had been incrusted in it, and thus was very expensive, according to Bronze-Age perceptions) were symbols of supreme power (Tab. 13\textsubscript{12}).


\textsuperscript{33} Байбуртян Е., op. cit., 2011, p. 40, 58.
### Table 1

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHENGAVIT. Hooks, cutters, awls, pins and a harpoon of bone: 1. 2010, square L:6, locus 4001; 2. 2008, grave-
Table 2

Table 13

This spindle whorl is a unique phenomenon in the context of the Armenian archaeology\textsuperscript{34}, but was very common in Troy\textsuperscript{35}. Here, almost in all the 5 horizons there were large stores of such spindle whorls of stone, confirming their Asia Minor origin. Hence it should not be excepted the one found at Shengavit in 2000 was imported from Troy.

The adornments and beads of gold, silver, bronze, as well as cornelian, jasper, gagath, marble, travertin, lime-stone, tufa, bone, sea-shell, faience and glass denote the deep social stratification (Tab. 12, 14-16).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
1 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline
4 & 5 & 6 \\
\hline
7 & 8 & 9 \\
\hline
10 & 11 & 12 \\
\hline
13 & 14 & 15 \\
\hline
16 & 17 & 18 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{34} The only analog known to us was from Dvin, see Кушнарева К.Х., Древнейшие памятники Даина, Ереван, 1977, c. 9, Fig. 7.

\textsuperscript{35} Благен К., Троя и троянцы. Боги и герои города-призрака /translated from English by O. I. Milova, M., 2004, c. 54, fig. 9, p. 84, fig. 16, p. 116, fig. 21, p. 125, fig. 25, p. 131, fig. 28.
Table 14

Table 15

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shengavit town was divided into separate districts where copper traders, stone workers or farmers lived: also other districts with well-organized work-shops are known\textsuperscript{36}.

The molds of stone and terracota for casting weapons, tools and adornments made of various bronze alloys speak of the high level of metal work in Shengavit. During the excavations of 2000 and 2002 fragments of bowls with copper residue were discovered. The bowls were filled with melted metal, and after their restoration, it was estimated that they could contain from 100 to 300 kilos of copper\textsuperscript{37}. The discovery of weight-stones and their etalons proves there was a common system of weight, which was in accordance with the weight system of the Ancient Orient\textsuperscript{38}. Wine-making and beer-brewing developed here, too. Cheese making was also developed here, which is proved by the terracotta sieves found here\textsuperscript{39} (Fig. 9, 10).

Models of solid wheels with sticking out axles (Tab. 3), as well statuettes of oxen, that have ditches (holes) only on one side of the shoulders, denoting their bearing harness, are evidence of their application as the means of transportation. According to Hans Peter Uerpmann one of the hoofs of a cow was deformed because of hard work, and that was the result of the animal being used as a draught. This noteworthy observation makes us conclude that so great was the need of draught animals that cows, too, were used for that purpose.

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{37} Simonyan Н., op. cit., 2012, pp. 18–37.
\bibitem{38} Симонян А., Геворкян А., Бобохян А., Гири и формочки-эталоны из Шенгавита, Археология, этнология, фольклористика Кавказа, Ереван, 2011, in print.
\bibitem{39} Байбуртян Е., op. cit., 2011, p. 49.
\end{thebibliography}
The funerals were performed in an abandoned suburb \(^{40}\) changed into a cemetery outside the defensive wall (Fig. 11) \(^{41}\). Both, personal and group - clan, graves were excavated. The ritual of dissecting corpses was wide-spread \(^{42}\).

Shengavitian art is mainly represented by terracota statuettes of animals: rams, bulls, horses, and others (Tab. 81-6, 9), of men and women (Tab. 10), as well as primitive statuettes of idols made of tufa and baked clay (Tab. 7, 810). Special attention should be paid to over a dozen primitive statues of anthropomorphic tufa idols reaching the height of 80cm, which were discovered during S. Sardaryan’s excavations in the upper layers.

Table 8

| Fig. 11 |

41 That a cemetery was formed in an abandoned suburb of a settlement has analogue in the settlements of Mokhrablour 1 in Nakhijevan, Elar (see Куфтин Б.А., op. cit., 1944, c. 96) and in Dvin (see Кушнерёва К. Х., op. cit., 1977, p. 9, Fig. 9).
Table 9

Table 10

The idols have vertical, rectangular forms with rounding angles, narrowing on top; both sides are touched. One side is flat. Here the head is clearly separated from the body with straight cut base and comparatively deeper touch of the body. The eyes are portrayed by drilled through holes. In our opinion this portrayal of eyes meant an all-seeing deity that could see both forward and backward. The other surface is convex. Here besides the eyes, the mouth and the nave are cut, too (Tab. 4-6). They may possibly be idols denoting female beginnings, which once were adjusted to clay-made altars with a stone basis near to hearths.

Table 4

Table: SHENAVIT. Tufa Idols (Excavations by S. Sardaryan).
Table 5

SHENGAVIT. Tufa Idols (Excavations by S. Sardaryan).
According to archaeologist Hayk Avetisyan who participated in the excavations, idol statues were discovered in the neighborhood of hearths (heathen temples - H.S.) in horizontal position. Unfortunately, the level of the excavations does not give the opportunity to confirm the existence of the terracots deitits, which, in our opinion, were simply destroyed. There is no evidence of the building horizon either (H. Avetisyan believes they belonged to the upper layers). It is not clear in which position the idols and the hearths were placed in the rooms, the place of those constructions in the urbanistic system, the assortment of the finds from the rooms. We have not got either photos or descriptions. S. Yessayan, too, referred to the idols by publishing the pen-drawings and meticulous description of three of them. He was right concluding the idols were put in the center of the dwellings and were viewed on all the sides.\(^43\)

\(^{43}\) Եսայան Ս.Ա., Հին Հայաստանի մարդակերպ արձանիկները (մ.թ.ա. VII-III հազարամյակներ), Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես, 1987, 1, էջ 133-135:
There were also discovered analogous but smaller in size statuettes of red black and gray tufa (Tab. 71, 3-5, 7-9, 87,8). One of them had four drilled through holes on the neck (Tab. 73). Until now no other artifact of such a kind of Shengavitian culture has ever been stated.

Exclusively interesting are the phallus-like pendant-amulets of various colours and stones (Tab. 11).

Table 11

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During our excavations about a dozen phallus-like pendant-amulets have been found at the site by now. Sardaryan had found such amulets, too. The ampleness of these amulets is evidence that they were widely used in the ancient Shengavitian lifestyle.

The cult of phalluses connected with the masculine cult of fruitification was widespread in the Early Farming and Early Bronze Age cultures of the Ancient World. In Shengavitian culture it was reflected by the strong sex signs on male figurines, in relief ornaments of portable and stable, hoof-shaped and round hearths (Karaz, Harich, Shengavit, Orkhevi, etc.) Phallus-shaped pendant-amulets have been stated in Georgia as well, in the “cultic hall” of Tetri Mgveme, in Zegli 1 cemetery in North Ossetia and elsewhere.

Multiple are the attacking weapons: slings, obsidian, flint, bronze and bone arrow-heads of various types and size, spear-heads. During the excavations at Shengavit 55 arrow-heads of bone, obsidian and flint were found (Tab. 17-20). Those made of stone are various; they can be divided into three big groups: a) tailed, b) with straight cut stems, c) arrow-heads with rectangular cuts in the stems. The existence of arrow-heads of various weights and sizes states that they were meant for long-range shooting (arrows with heavy heads), and close fighting (arrows with light heads). Arrow-heads of all types have inadequate wings. They were perhaps broken when being pulled out from the body of the victim, with pieces left in the body, thus causing the latter’s death. The arrow-heads are mostly damaged, which denote their having been used. Besides finished arrow-heads there were found unfinished and spoiled ones. And this denote their being prepared on the spot and hurriedly made during sieges. The assortment of bone arrow-heads also varies. Points with cone-shaped heads and slimmer sharp stem (-holders) prevail (Tab. 20a, 9-13). The bone two-winged arrow-heads with a tail found in 2012 stands apart, for it repeats the type of stone weapons (Tab. 20b). The bronze arrow-head discovered in the cemetery has a pyramid-shaped head and flat, long stem (hilt) (Tab. 20c). This rarely met type with a heavy head meant for long-range shooting lasted until the “Early Kurgan” period.

---

45 Хачатрян Т. С., Древняя культура Ширака, Ереван, 1975, c. 71, fig. 32.
46 Мирихулла Г., О культе плодородия в раннеземледельческой культуре, Археология, этнография, фольклористика Кавказа, Тбилиси, 2004, с. 96-97.
47 According to Sardaryan’s report, he had found copper arrow-heads in Shengavit at the entrance to the round dwelling N 1 in the layer 120cm deep, see Sardaryan S. 2004, p. 280: Their forms and where being is unknown to us.
48 This kind of arrow-heads were discovered also in Kakheti, in a grave tomb 1 in a place called Zeiani near Manavi village in Magarejo region, see - Пицихелаури К., Варазашвили В., Зеiani - курган N 1, Труды Кахетской археологической экспедиции, VIII, Гареджи, Тбилиси, 1988, tab. LV14; in the grave-tomb near Tedotsmind village in Gori region, see - Миндиашвили Г., Раннийкурганус. Тедоцминда, Археология, этнография, фольклористика Кавказа, Тбилиси, 2004, pp. 94-95, also, near Berqaber village in the grave-tomb 1 of Beden culture, excavated by the expedition of YSU in 1987 (heads G. Areshyan and H. Simonyan); all these are dated to the II half of the 3rd millennium BC.
Table 17

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 18 |

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 20

It is noteworthy that the main part of arrow-heads was found in the upper layers when the defense system functioned. Here are combined obsidian and flint tailed arrow-heads and the following them in time ones with straight cut stems and those typical and very common in the Middle and Late Bronze Age of later period with rectangular carvings in the stem. The fact of their being used together is important from the point of the determination of their dating and origin. It is certain that the tailed arrow-heads were typical only of the Early Bronze Age, the closing period of the use of those with straightly cut stems and conus-shaped bone arrow-heads the period of “Early Kurgans”⁴⁹. More lasting was the type of obsidian and flint arrow-heads with rectangular carvings, which starting from the closing period of the EBA lasted until the MBA and LBA.

The use of all these types in Shengavit provides a basis to suppose that types II and III originated in the Ararat Valley and spread all over the northern regions of the Armenian Highland transpassing from the EBA to the “Early Kurgan” period, while the ones with rectangular carvings to the MBA and then to the LBA cultures. The great number of weapons, the rich assortment of arrow-heads of various types and sizes, which were used for defense and attack, the ideal defensive system of the townplace, the layers burned and destroyed by the wars (known in different Bronze-Age sites) are evidence of the uneasy situation and repeated military skirmishes in Armenia of the Shengavitian period.

One of the best proofs of the great military potential of the bearers of the Shengavitian culture is the fact of conquering of the town at the archaeological site of the present Arslan-tepe (Lion Hill) (which was very well-protected for that time) in the mid valley of the Euphrates. The bearers of Shengavityan culture conquered this town, which had a very important trade role, in 3000/2900 BC and founded their new settlement on the palace (temple layer) (VIB1), on the palace (temple) layer dated as of 3500-3000 BC. A large area of the Shengavitian period has been excavated here with typical pits and constructions. Thousands of clay pots have been discovered and all of them belong to VBD2 and are typical of only Shengavitian culture⁵⁰. I think that Lion Hill

⁴⁹ A collection of arrow-heads with straightly cut stems and bone ones is known in the big graves in Tsalka region near Bedeni mountain range, see – Гобеджишвили Г.Ф., Бедени - культура кураннных погребений, Тбилиси, 1980 (in Georgian), tab. VI 27-30 (obsidian arrow-heads with straightly cut stems), tab. XI (bone arrow-heads).

⁵⁰ M. Frangipane. After Collapse: Continuity and Disruption in the Settlement by Kura-Araxes-Linked Pastoral Groups at Arslantepe-Malatya (Turkey). New Data. Paleorient. Journal of Prehistory and Protohistory of Southwestern and Central Asia. Volume thematique Coordinated by C. Chataignier and G. Palumbi. The Kura-Araxes culture from the Caucasus to Iran, Anatolia and the Levant: Between unity and diversity, CNRS Editions, Paris, 2014, 40.2, pp. 169-182 [historical-geographical terminology is incomplete and destorted in these titles, because the name – the Armenian Highland – of one of the main geographical areas of this region is not mentioned, besides, modern Turkish "toponyms" historically have nothing to do with the archaeological sites (ed.)].
has a key significance for discovering the stages of spreading of the Shengavitian culture. Why? It is definite that the Shengavitians could launch a campaign to Lion Hill from the territories where they had lived since the mid-4th millennium BC, i.e., from their proper Homeland. Where is it?. It is definite that the spread of Shengavitian culture to the centre and west of the Armenian Highland occurred later than in its eastern and northern territories. The much earlier monuments of Shengavitian culture have been found in the northern regions of the Armenian Highland: present Berikldeebi (on the right bank of the river Kur), Aygevan, Jrahovit, Mokhrablur - in the Ararat Valley, the Mokhrablur of Nakhijevan and others - in the Sharur plain, Areni - in the Vayots Dzor, Sos Blur (Hill) - in the Karin province, etc. It is noteworthy that the coloured ceramic fragments found in Shengavit are very similar to the excavated material from the Lion Hill (Asrlan-tepe) layers dating 4000-3500 BC.

These facts serve as a basis to conclude that the spread of Shengavitian culture was from the north to the south. A powerful center like Lion Hill could be conquered only by an ethnic group possessing great military potential and high technologies. The large assortment and diversity of weapons discovered as a result of excavations in Shengavit, a great number of population, social stratification and centralization of power in the hands of the high stratum of society, the wealth accumulated as a result of copper and salt production could make the foundation which was able to organize military units capable of long-distance military campaigns.

One of the peculiarities of Shengavit is the round (spherical) terracotta hearth (in scientific literature known by the term “օջախ/ojakh”) 75-100 cm in diameter, with a flat bottom, straight walls 25 cm high, with broad ornamented crown on top, inside - with cavities resembling a clover leaf. Over a dozen hearths have been discovered here by now. B. A. Kuftin wrongly considered them to be movable (portable) fire-places (ojakhs), though as the excavations of 2012 proved their bottoms, in fact, were buried in the clay-plastered floor and fixed with stones. This fact of propping the ojakhs to the floor was mentioned by Bayburtyan as well.

A very high level of development was reached in pottery, which formed the most typical attribute of Shengavitian culture - the production of black, sometimes silverish, with finely polished surface and red lining. The linings of the vessels, particularly the upper, mouth part, were also finely polished and beautified. In Shengavit very common was the tradition of painting red the surfaces and the linings of the pots. This attribute

---


52 Куфтин Б. А., op. cit., 1944, p. 115.

53 Байбуртян Е., op. cit., 2011, p. 33.
was either absent or was limited in other sites, and therefore an opinion formed that
production of painted pottery was not peculiar to Shengavit culture.

One can see small cellular cracks. These appear during baking because of the
difference of thermo-efficiency (temperature) of baking the clay. This is a typical
attribute of Shengavitian culture, which is determined by applying the technique of
covering the inset-skeleton of the pots with a thick layer of *angob*- small-grain (by
B. Kuftin’s term “greasy”) clay.

The surfaces of the pottery discovered at Shengavit are decorated with delicate
relief or inlaid, symbolic ornaments, present almost on all fine tableware. We can
confirm that Shengavit for the quality of the pottery and especially rich decoration stands
above hundreds of other sites of this culture. The high quality of mass production -
every day pottery, can be explained by Shengavit being the central settlement, where
the “culture of the capital” reached the highest stage of prosperity.

Another attribute of Shengavit being an urban settlement is the ampleness of
saw-like flint tools and sickle blades. It is well-known that in Bronze-Age Armenia were
widely used obsidian tools. Flint arrow-heads were found only in the graves of nobility,
while in the graves of common people only obsidian weapons of this kind were put.
Thus we can conclude that flint tools and weapons (arrow-heads, points of spears, etc.)
in Armenia of that period were valued more than obsidian objects.

The spread of the pottery of Shengavitian type to the North, South, East and
West confirms the fact of active trade and cultural contacts between the Armenian
Highland and the North Caucasases, Iran, Syria and Anatolia (Asia Minor, to the west of
the Armenian Highland) in the Early Bronze Age. In the mentioned places other
attributes typical to Shengavitian culture are clearly traced both in architecture and the
sphere of material values.

---

56 Титов В.С., К изучений миграций бронзового века, Археология старого и нового света, Москва, 1982, с. 101-
106; Sardaryan S., op. cit., 2004, pp. 266, 279.
ARMANU - PRUNUS ARMENIACA:
ORIGINATED IN ARMENIA
(historical background of the native land of apricot versus
modern information challenges)

Eduard L. Danielyan*

Along with archaeological and historical geographical proofs, clarifying the origin of the terms arman(n)u and (Prunus) Armeniaca (Ἀρμενιακά) is an important argument for identification of Armanum/

*Doctor of History, Noravank Foundation consultant.

1 According to the Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary: “apricot tree: armanu [TREE] wr. ar-ma-nu “a tree”, Akk. armannu; equals ğesḫašḫur kur-ra; ir [TREE] wr. ir “type of tree” Akk. armannu; apple (tree) armannu [tree] hašḫur ar-ma-nu SLT 015 prism iii 29 [1]; cf. armannu [APRICOT (TREE)] (N). Written forms: GIŠ. ḪAŠḪUR.KUR.RA. Normalized forms: armannu (GIŠ. ḪAŠḪUR.KUR.RA) [2]; A. Bomhard and J. Kerns made the following entry in "Comparative vocabulary of the Nostratic languages": “Sumerian hašḫur ‘apple, apple-tree’… hašḫur-ar-man-nu, hašḫur-kur-ru ‘apricot, apricot-tree’ [3, p. 555]; cf. “GIŠ. ḪAŠḪUR/hašḫuru and /GIŠ. ḪAŠḪUR KUR.RA/armanu have been identified as the apple and/or apricot” [4, p. 205]. I. Gelb [5, pp. 78-82] revived M. Lamberts proposal to identify hašḫur/hašḫuru with apricots, at the same time not accepting the translation of the word armannu or armānu as “apricot” by Thompson and von Soden. J. N. Postgate [suggested to consider šalluru (a species of Prunus) as apricot] [6, pp. 118-119] and M. A. Powell (not taking into consideration archaeological and cuneiform data wrote that classical sources by their silence speak uniformly for a relatively late date for diffusion of the apricot in the Mediterranean area), denoting the meaning of the word hašḫur to be apple, as is generally accepted [cf. 7, pp. 139-140], disagreed with Gelb’s proposal [8, pp. 155-156]. Concerning the term armannu (armānu, armānu) it is noted: “The vocabulary designation “foreign apple” in Hh. III 35f. does not give sufficient evidence to establish the meaning of armannu, and the identification with “apricot” on the basis of the Syriac name “Armenian apple” (Prunus armeniaca) is based solely on the similarity of the words armannu and arm'nāvā” [9, p. 291]. But the Syriac form of the name of “Armenian apple” might be derived on the basis of the toponimical similarity of the origin of the ancient terms armānu (Sumerian and Akkadian) and (Prunus) Armeniaca/ Ἀρμενιακά (Latin and Greek).
Armani with Armenia\footnote{The problem of location of Armanum is widely discussed in archaeological and historical studies [10, p. 6; 11, pp. 65-66; 12, p. 1; 13, pp. 5-34 et al]. At the same time there are researches substantiating the relation/identity of Arman(um/i) to Armenia [14, pp. 416-418; 15, c. 64-66; 16, c. 106-107; 17, c. 30-32; 18, \textit{p} 285-286; 19, pp. 1-21; 20, \textit{p} 32-33 et al]. It has been observed that in the lexicon of the Armenian language a great many names of plants “relate to the local flora, mainly to the mountainous or piedmont landscape of the Armenian Highland, Asia Minor and Northern Mesopotamia, consequently their names had to belong to local languages”. Some of the words, which originated in the Armenian Highland, were borrowed into the neighbouring languages, and it is evidenced by the fact of the presence of “many of these names of plants, medicines even now in the world scientific literature”, traditionally have “the epithet Armenian or are known as plants of the Armenian origin (Plantum armeniacum). In Akkadian texts apricot is called (G\textit{b}) H\textit{a}\textit{sh}\textit{u}r.KUR.RA “mountain apple” or simply armannu - “Armenian”. N. Mkrtchyan noted: “…this plant the Mesopotamians related to a mountainous region, as might be the Armenian Highland”, considering Armannu possibly identical to Armenia [21, \textit{c} 24-25, \textit{c}n. 2].} and its corroboration as the native land of apricot. Comprehensive analysis of archaeological data, written historical sources and research works is the backbone of the problem’s solution\footnote{Besides the scientific researches of the problem some rather doubtful concepts and even biased, politicized speculations have been put forward, which also have found their reflection in modern information warfare.}.

“De Re Rustica” of Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella\footnote{Columella much indebted to earlier authors, at the same time, it is important to pay attention to the fact that he visited Syria and Cilicia [22, pp. X, 77], during which he could get knowledge about agriculture of Armenia (Great Armenia and Armenia Minor), Cappadocia, Phrygia and Persia.} (4 – c. 70 AD) along with a smaller book (“De Arboribus” attributed to him) on trees, are important sources on Roman and other countries’ agriculture. Columella noted: “Tunc praecox bifera descendit ab arbore ficus Armeniisique, et cereolis prunisque Damasci stipantur calathi…” [22, 403-405]\footnote{“Then from twice-bearing trees the early fig falls earthwards; panniers are piled high with plums waxen, Damascene and Armenian…” [23, pp. 42-43]; according to another translation, “Armenians (Armeniisique) and wax plums Damsons” [8, p.155]. In English and French translations of Columella’s work instead of the term Armeniisique sometimes is used abricots, e.g.: “… on entasse dans les paniers les abricots, les prunes couleur de cire, celle de Damas…” [24] or “Sorbi quoque et Armeniaci atque Persici non minima est gratia” is translated: “… Service-apples also and apricots and peaches have no small charm” [25, V. X. 19, pp. 98-99].}.
Plinius Secundus (23 – 79 AD) also mentioned the term *Armeniaca* in the following passages: “Ingens postea turba prunorum…., nec non ab externa gente Armeniaca, quae sola et odore commendatur” [26, XV, 12, 41], “Martio … ab ea proximae florent Armeniaca…”[26, XVI, 42, 103].

According to Dioscorides (40-90 AD), “τὰ δὲ μικρότερα, καλούμενα δὲ Αρμενιακά, Ῥωμαίστι δὲ βρεκόκκια, εὐστομότερα τῶν προειρημένων ἐστίν” [27, I. 115, 5, p. 109].

Rutilius Taurus Aemilianus Palladius (the later 4th century - first half of the 5th century AD) noted: “… Armenia vel praecoqua prunis…” [29, p. 999].

Ch. Daubeny interpreting Columella’s information, wrote: “We find enumerated in the first place, several kinds of plum, viz. the Armeniaca or Apricot, brought from Armenia…” [31, p. 258]. Analyzing the same information, D. J. White noted “Prunus is most likely the plum, *Prunus domestica* L.. The tree is *prunus*, -i, f.; the fruit is *prunum*, -i, n. …Columella mentions *prunus*… Armeniisique… among the fruits harvested at the very end of the gardening year”. Then the author commented: “*Armeniisique: Armenia*, here for *Armeniaca* (sc. *poma*), are apricots, *Prunus armeniaca* L.; the tree is *Armeniaca* (sc. *arboret*). Columella, in discussing types of fruit trees to plant in orchard (pomaria), remarks: “*sorbi quoque et Armeniaci et Persici non minima est gratia*” [32, pp. 117, 321]. Mentioning *Prunus*

---

1 “Afterwards comes a vast crowd of plums… and there is also the Armenian plum, imported from foreign parts, the only plum that recommends itself even by its scent” [26, p. 317].
2 “In March… the next to flower … is Armeniaca ….”. It is noted in the footnote: “Probably the apricot” [26, p. 455].
3 Cf. *praecocia* [26, XVI, 42, 103; 51. 119].
4 “The smaller which are called *Armenian* and in Latin *praecoqua* [premature - ripe before their time] are better for the stomach than the ripe [above]” [28, p. 169].
5 “… the Armenian, or the early one, on plum stocks…” [30, p. 307].
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domestica L. and Prunus armeniaca L. D.White followed the classification developed by Carl Linnaeus (1707-1778) who applied the ancient term "Armeniaca". At the same time D. White remarked: “André thinks that Pliny is referring to the apricot when he mentions a variety of plums which he calls Armeniaca” [32, p. 321; 39, p. 25].

M. A. Powell noted: “The first certain occurrences of apricot are from the 1st century AD. Columella, Pliny, and Dioscorides refer to an “Armenian apple”, “Armenian plum” or merely an “Armenian”. These have… usually been interpreted as referring to the apricot... Pliny speaking of plums, after mentioning various kinds, says, almost as an afterthought “but also (we should not forget) the Armenian from abroad [ab exterme gente Armeniaca], the only one which also commends itself by smell”. Pliny’s mention of its unusual aroma, together with his comment that the almond flowers in January followed by the "Armenian" [Armeniaca; Plin. XVI, 103], in agreement with Columella [XI. 2. 96], who says that such early flowering trees, such as "cherries, tuberes, Armenians [Armeniaceae], and almonds" can be grafted in the latter half of December, point toward the apricot. Dioscorides’ statement [Materia Medica I. 115] that "Armenian apples" (mēla armeniaka) were known to the Romans as praikokia, i.e., Latin praecocia, "early ripe", secures the identification. The Latin term "Early-Ripener"
ultimately won out and has survived in our word "apricot"…" [8, pp.154-155].


Touching upon the problem of the origin of apricot, Don R. Brothwell wrote: “Although in China, which is thought to be its native land,
the apricot was probably cultivated as early as 2200 BC, it seems to have been very slow in spreading. Its progress westwards must have been via Persia and Asia Minor, and we know it was grown by the Assyrians and Babylonians, who called it *armanu*. The Latin term for it, *armeniaca*, has always been understood to imply an Armenian origin but it is more likely that it was first grown in the orchards of Mesopotamia, its name having been subsequently adopted into the language of other countries to which it spread. Apart from the Mesopotamia, there is not much evidence of apricot-growing" [47, p. 136].

Don R. Brothwell supposed China to be the native land of apricot, then presented Mesopotamia as the first place where it grew, at the same time doubted the axiomatic fact of the origin of the term *armeniaca* from *Armenia*.

Babken N. Arakelyan, publishing the results of the Garni excavations, mentioned apricot stone among the 1949-1950 archaeological discoveries: “Следует особо выделить находку в энеолитическом слое косточки абрикоса (*Prunus Armeniaca*). Этой находкой оправдываются научное название абрикоса, ибо трудно предположить, что косточка абрикоса могла бы быть завезена в Армению, к подножью Гехамских гор, в энеолитическую эпоху из Средней Азии, которая считается родиной абрикоса” [49, с.25]. Translation: “The presence of

---

1 Don R. Brothwell mentioned Armenia as a part of a vast region, where some other plants originated (“The bristle oat of western Europe is derived from *Avena barbata* which is indigenous to the region from Armenia along the Mediterranean to the Iberian Peninsula...”; “… *malum punicum*... its original home seems to be the regions of Asia Minor, the Caucasus, Armenia and Persia” (47, p. 100, 134). T. K. Lim considered *Armeniaca vulgaris* Lam. and *Prunus Armeniaca* to be the synonyms and mentioned the Armenian name *Tziran*, but he did not denote Armenia while speaking about the origin and distribution of apricot: "Domestic cultivation in China dates back over 3,000 years ago. It spread to Asia Minor and was introduced to Europe through Greece and Italy by the Romans..." [48, pp. 442-443]. Such a silence about archeological discoveries in Armenia is a result of the neglect of adequate historical sources and scientific literature.
an apricot seed (Prunus Armeniaca) in the Eneolithic stratum is of special interest. This find justifies the scientific name of the apricot, [for] it is difficult to assume that during the Eneolithic era an apricot [stone] could have been introduced into Armenia, in the base of Gegham mountains, from as far distant as Central Asia, the supposed home of the apricot” [50, p. 29].

As a result of misinterpretation of scientific data some scholars have attempted to dispute the archaeologically substantiated viewpoint of B. Arakelyan. M. Faust, D. Surányi, F. Nyútó distorting the above mentioned citation from B. Arakelyan’s book, wrote: “Laufer (1919) identified Sogdiana (ancient name for the area around Samarkand) as the place apricot was native. Jeszejian (1977), an Armenian, naturally described Armenia as the native location of apricot. He based his conclusions on the fact that apricot culture had a long history in

1 Without considering archaeological evidence, M. A. Powell wrote: “It is hard to imagine if apricots had been cultivated in the Near East since the 3rd millennium [B.C.]... It is difficult to conceive that the Phoenicians would not have also known apricots if they had been cultivated in Mesopotamia already in the 3rd millennium... In sum, the classical sources by their silence speak uniformly for a relatively late date for diffusion of the apricot in the Mediterranean area” [8, p.155].

2 Berthold Laufer supported De Candolle’s version: “The Greeks also had the peach under the name "Persian apple," and the apricot as "Armenian apple;" yet peach and apricot are not originally Persian or Armenian, but Chinese cultivations: Iranians and Armenians in this case merely acted as meditators between the far east and the Mediterranean... The name of the latter (apricot) is hin ... Of fruits, the West is chiefly indebted to China for the peach (Amygdalus persica) and the apricot (Prunus armeniaca). It is not impossible that these two gifts were transmitted by the silk-dealers, first to Iran (in the second or first century B.C.), and thence to Armenia, Greece, and Rome (in the first century A.D.). ... De Candolle has ably pleaded for China as the home of the peach and apricot... The zone of the wild apricot may well extend from Russian Turkestan to Sungaria, south-eastern Mongolia, and the Himalaya; but the historical fact remains that the Chinese have been the first to cultivate this fruit from ancient times...” [51, pp. 209-210, 408, 539]. Adherents of the Chinese version do not take into consideration the fact of the toponymical origin of the term Armeniaca and the archaeological discoveries.
Armenia, especially in the area of Yerevan. Apricot seeds from about 3000 B.C. have been discovered at S[h]engavit and at Garni (both near Yerevan), but in the opinion of Arakelyan (1951), a noted archeologist, the fruit form that these seeds have originated was brought into Armenia rather than produced there. De Candolle (1886) [52, pp. 215-218]¹, reviewing the available data on wild apricots in Armenia, stated that several qualified travelers, including Karl Koch, who traveled extensively in Armenia, and the Caucasian mountains, did not find wild apricots there. The apricots these travelers found were all cultivated or escapes from cultivation. Based on this information, De Candole concluded that apricot was not native in Armenia. Apricot seeds were found from a later period at the excavation of Karmir Blur (a fort near Yerevan) from the 8th century B.C. (Arzumanjan 1970). Still later, in the first century A.D., large apricot plantations existed around Echmiadzin (near Yerevan) that were cultivated by Armenian monks” [54, pp. 244-246; 55, pp. 119-120]².

M. Faust, D. Surányi and F. Nyujto mentioned “3000 B.C.”, which corresponds to the beginning of the Early Bronze Age. But B. Arakelyan dated the archaeological layer in which apricot seed (stone) was found to the Eneolithic era, which corresponds to the 6th – mid 4th millennia BC.

¹ N.I. Vavilov critically approaching to De Candolle’s method, noted: “The method of determination of the native land by De Candolle and other authors, according to the locality of the present cultivated plant (Prunus armeniaca L.) in wild state not always may be trusted” [53, c. 95, 234-235].

² The authors wrote: “The name armeniaca may indicate that apricot came to the western world from Armenia… Koch (1869) indicated that Lucullus and Pompeius may have learned about apricots in the war in which they attacked Armenia from Syria during 69-63 B.C… Thus, it is possible that the apricot arrived in Italy during the first century B.C. directly from Armenia and not through Greece”. Then, “forgetting” their own suggestion about Armenia, they wrote: “Apricot was cultivated throughout Asia and it is difficult to know where it may have come from to Europe” [55, p. 122]. But Pompeius was in Armenia in 66 B.C.
Second, from B. Arakelyan’s text it follows that the discovery of apricot stone justified “the scientific name of the apricot”, i.e. Armenia to be the country which gave its name to the fruit. Third, they misrepresented his opinion, because B. Arakelyan never said: “the fruit form that these seeds have originated was brought into Armenia rather than produced there”, but to the contrary, he noted that “it is difficult to assume that during the Eneolithic era an apricot [stone] could have been introduced into Armenia, in the base of Gegham mountains, from as far distant as Central Asia...”. Besides, there is not a single mention in archaeological literature about evidence for existence of apricot in the Eneolithic Age in Middle Asia (or Central Asia) – as “the supposed home of the apricot”.

As a source of such a “supposition” B. Arakelyan mentioned P. M. Zhukovski’s book [56, c. 325-326]. It is rather strange, that in the third edition of that book (1971), while researching the problem of the origin of apricot, P. M. Zhukovski (1988-1975) had not taken into consideration the fact of discovery of apricot stone in Garni. He generally remarked: “The sort of Armeniaca, as many other Prunoideae, by its origin is eastern Asiatic with the main centre in China” [56, (1971), c. 477]...“Middle Asian genetic center” Armeniaca vulgaris L.: “growing wild in Eastern Tian Shan. A part of primary gencentre of wild apricot, once connected with the main one in China. Apricot culture is very old in Middle Asia. It is the secondary genetic centre of the cultured type”, “Western-Asian genetic centre” Armeniaca vulgaris L. is presented as if “preserved” in Dagestan as “an islet” of growing wild apricot. Prejudiced nature of P. Zhukovski’s approach to the question is seen from his following biased statement: “Название Armeniaca (1752г.) ошибочное (родиной абрикоса считали Армению)” ("The name Armeniaca (1752) is incorrect (Armenia was considered to be..."
the native land of apricot”\(^1\).

A group of Turkish-Hungarian researchers published an article in which, opposite to classical floristic classification, they falsely invented “Turkish apricot”, which according to their concoction “originated from the eastern part of the country, near the Turkish-Armenian border” [58, p. 415]. Contrary to such a falsified statement, during millennia, up to the Armenian Genocide (1915-1923), the Armenian gardeners cultivated *Prunus Armeniaca* in the gardens of entire Armenia (Western Armenia and Eastern Armenia)\(^2\). The Armenian western natural border historically is western borderline of the Armenian Highland (along western extremities of Armenia Minor to the west of Great Armenia, when there was no trace of “Turkey” in history\(^3\)). But Turkish forgers went further and, for example, S. Ercisli under the falsified title “Apricot culture in Turkey” wrote: “Turkey

---

\(^1\) As an assertion of such a non-analytical reasoning, the author (without explaining the origin of the name *Armeniaca*) suggested “a version” that “apricot was transposed by the Arabs from ancient Sogdiana to the Mediterranean region. … European geographic group of sorts has a mixed – the Chinese and Middle Asian, as well as the Caucasian – origin” [56, (1971), c. 13, 25, 31, 481-482]. P. Zhukovski ignored as the archaeological discovery in Garni I, as well as the Latin and Greek sources and incorrectly considered apricot to be an unknown fruit in the Mediterranean region until the Arabs introduced it there, i.e. not earlier than the period of the conquests of the Arab caliphate since the mid-7\(^{th}\) century. Moreover, he criticized a priori M. le Baron De Poederlé’s book, as if the author himself named that fruit *Armeniaca*. An incorrect, contradictory remark (in brackets) is also present in D. Gledhill’s book (“armeniacus -a -um Armenian (mistakenly for China), the dull orange colour of *Prunus armeniaca* fruits; armenus -a -um, armeniacus -a -um from Armenia, Armenian” [57, p. 56].

\(^2\) Apricot is a beloved fruit tree for Armenians: the national wind instrument *duduk* is made of it, and the royal gown in ancient Armenia was called “tsirani”; Komitas Vardapet’s song *Tsirani Tsar* (Apricot Tree) is based on folk music; one of the colors of the Armenian Tricolour flag is apricot color, etc.

\(^3\) It is well known that the ancestors of the present-day Turks, Seljuk and Oguz Turkic nomadic hordes (from the trans-Altai and trans-Aral regions) had violently invaded Armenia, the Byzantine Empire and the adjacent lands from the second half of the 60s of the 11th c., A. Palmer noted: “Originally the Turks were nomadic horsemen from Central Asia...” [59, p. 2]. From the 14th century appeared “Osmanlı” (corrupted into “Ottoman” in the languages of western Europe) dynasty (Ibid.). Their “eponym, ‘Osmân, was the son of a certain Ertoghrul who had led into Anatolia (Asia Minor - E.D.) a nameless band of Turkish refugees: an insignificant fragment of the human wreckage...” [60, p. 151].
and Iran (Iranian Plateau) are centers of origin and diversity of many fruit species... Apricot can be grown in all regions of Turkey, except in the Eastern Black Sea Region and in the high plateaus of the East Anatolian Region" [61, p. 715].

In the Republic of Armenia and the NKR (Artsakh) modern researches about the origin and reproduction of apricot brought to a conclusion: “Apricot in Armenia, where vulgar forms of this culture exist until present, was cultivated ever since the ancient times. Seeds of the apricot have been discovered during archaeological excavations of the Garni Temple and Shengavit settlement, having a history of 6000 years. In process of many centuries the reproduction of apricots went by means of its stones, as a result of which a broad spectrum of varieties and forms has been created. Today there are 50 local varieties and large number of forms known in Armenia.... All of them belong to the species of ordinary apricot Armeniaca vulgaris Lam." [63].

1 S. Ercisli, falsifying historical geography, instead of Western Armenia (western part of the Armenian Highland) wrongly noted “the high plateaus of the East Anatolian Region” and distorting the history of the origin of apricot and the original Armenian toponymical terminology of Western Armenia wrote: “Although apricots are grown throughout Turkey, about half the crop is produced in the Central Eastern Anatolia Region. Most important apricot producing centers in Turkey are Malatya, Erzincan, Aras valley (İlgir-Kagizman), Elazig, Sivas... provinces” [61, p. 715]. But in reality these are Melitene (a centre of Armenia Minor) to the west of Great Armenia, Armenian Erzinka, ancient Eriza (Երիզա) in the gavar of Ekeghoat (Ուրքոց, Երիզա) of the province of Bardzr Haik (Upper Armenia) of Great Armenia; the ancient Armenian Eraskh-Arax (Երասխ-Արաքս) River; ancient Armenian Horeberd-Kharberd (Հորեբերդ-Խարբերդ) in the valley of the Aratsani (Արածանի) River (the Eastern Euphrates); ancient Armenian Sebastia (Սեբաստիա) in Armenia Minor. The same falsification of the toponymical terminology of Western Armenia and the origin and cultivation of apricot was presented also in another fabricated article by S. Ercisli and co-authors [62, p. 223].

2 It is noted: "The age of ethno-botanic materials goes back to the eighth millennium B.C. According to archeological studies, Armenia has been home for cereals, vegetables, melons, and essential oil plants, as well as for numerous types of fruit trees (wheat, barley, rye, lentil, oat, pea, melon, watermelon, apricot, grape, quince, pomegranate, etc.). Because Armenia still preserves the wild species of the mentioned cultivars and centralizes the largest amounts of these plants, the country is considered to be one of the world’s centers of origin of many cultivated crops [64, p. 82]. R. Chapman touching the problem of apricot, wrote: "It is called this because early scientists of the West, like Turner, believed it came to them from the land of Armenia. In modern times, archaeologists have found apricot pits in Armenia digs that go back to the Bronze Age" [65, p. 38] (more exactly - the Eneolithic Age).
In the Areni-1 (in Vayotc Dzor gavar ¹ of the province of Siunik of Great Armenia) archaeological site of the Eneolithic (Chalcolithic) Age, along with different important discoveries², many very diverse vegetal remains (desiccated and charred) were found; among them are of what may be the oldest known intentionally dried fruits: apricots, grapes, prunes [70]. On the basis of these discoveries it has been concluded: “Knowledge of the early use and cultivation of fruits such as apricot (Armeniaca vulgaris), peach (Persica vulgaris) and nuts such as walnuts (Juglans regia) in particular, is patchy and Areni-1 may shed light on their early use.... Areni-1 is one of the oldest sites in the world with well-preserved organic remains, from dried prunes, grapes and grasses, to textiles, rope, mats and wooden implements dating to c. 4000 BC. Moreover, the site sheds much light on the early exploitation and possible domestication of a variety of fruit trees, including walnut and apricot” [71, pp. 126, 128 ].

A holistic scientific approach to the concept of the native land (Armenia) of apricot on the basis of archaeological data, the Sumerian, Akkadian cuneiform and the Latin and Greek sources proves the Armenian toponymical background of the terms armannu and (Prunus) Armeniaca.

October, 2014

¹ Present Vayotc Dzor marz (region).
² The earliest known wine-making and wine preservation facility (4000 BC), leather shoe (3500 BC), three human skulls belonging to females between the ages of 9-16 (one contained a piece of well-preserved brain tissue) (5000-4000 BC) and other objects were discovered in the Areni-1 cave [66, p. 12; 67; 68; 69].
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ARMENOLOGY AND METAARMENOLOGY
AND THE CONCEPT OF METASCIENCE

Brutian G. A.
Academician of NAS RA

The development of science nowadays urges for creating metascience. This refers to almost all sciences. Currently, we speak not only of mathematics, logic, linguistics, biology and other sciences, but also of metamathematics, metalogic, metalinguistics, metabiology and other metasciences. If the subject-matter of science is the study of the laws of reality, then the subject-matter of metascience is the investigation of the very nature of science, its structure, and methods with the help of which science realizes its purposes. It gives basis to affirm that the concept of metascience is of more generic nature, and, thus, it comprises a wider grasp of respective concepts of science. Consequently, the author of this paper insists on the possibility of a metascience for any science, for any study, except for philosophy. It is impossible to create metaphilosophy for philosophy as there are no concepts of larger extension than those we use in philosophy. Philosophy, correspondingly, is both theory and metatheory at the same time. In scientific investigations it is possible to note the term metaknowledge which refers to any science except Armenology (and similar studies). And this is not accidental. To the same degree, Armenology and Metaarmenology are correlative.

1 “Almost” here is still used in an indefinite sense. The exact meaning will be clear when there will be given some explanation on interrelation between philosophy and metaphilosophy.

2 Sometimes a concept of a theory is used instead of a science. The metatheory, in these cases, corresponds to the theory. According to Kleene’s interpretation “in dealing with a particular formal system, we may call the system the object theory, and the metamathematics relating to it its metatheory” (Kleene St.C., Introduction to Metamathematics, New York, Toronto, 1952, p. 62). H. Curry notes: “The notion of epitheory is an outgrowth of Hilbert’s metamathematics... It would be natural to use the term “metatheory” rather than “epitheory” (Curry H.B., Foundations of Mathematical Logic, New York, San Francisco, Toronto, London, 1963, p. 120).

3 See the note (1). It is necessary to mention that there are other interpretations of metaphilosophy (see the journal Metaphilosophy which has been published in the USA since 1970. May be the non-unification of the use of the concept metamathematics serves as the ground of different interpretations of metaphilosophy. It concerns, particularly the use of finitary and nonfinitary methods in metamathematics. According to Kleene’s interpretation “the methods used in the metatheory shall be restricted to methods, called finitary by the formalists, which employ only intuitively conceivable objects and performable processes” (Kleene St. C., Introduction to Metamathematics, p. 63). Kleene notes at the same time that “some authors use “meta-” to identify a language or theory in which another language or theory is made the object of a study not restricted to finitary methods” (Ibid.). The Editor of the Russian translation of Kleene’s mentioned book - V. Uspenski has the same opinion (Клини Ст.К., Введение в метаматематику (перевод с английского), Москва, с. 61; Брутян Г.А., Философия и метафилософия. Вопросы Философии, 1985, 9, c. 85-90; Brutian G., Philosophy and Mataphilosophy, Soviet Studies in Philosophy, 1986, vol. XXI, N 1, pp. 73-86).
concepts. It is impossible to propose even the idea of Metaarmenology without having the correlatively exact comprehension of Armenology as a theory.

It must be underlined that there are notable achievements and scientific contributions in the field of Armenology - within scientific centers of Armenia, as well as in famous universities across the world. This mostly refers to concrete problems from the point of view of their relevance to the Armenian realm (the material of such studies is mostly taken from the Armenian reality). However, it is time also to study the question - what is Armenology, to define the subject-matter of Armenology, the relation of Armenian studies with the other fields of knowledge, to define the place of Armenology in the system of sciences, etc. These questions do not limit the problem under discussion. As a matter of fact, they are questions of different ranges, more exactly the questions of different levels of generalization.

The first question, the answer to which is the preliminary condition for the solution of other problems, is: “What is Armenology?” The answer to this question may be the definition of the subject-matter of Armenology, as well as the enumeration of some properties of its subject-matter with their respective characteristics. The knowledge, involved in the definition of Armenology, will be essentially concise, however – revealing the precise content of the concept defined, the essential properties of the object reflected in the concept. The second case enables us to characterize thoroughly the subject-matter of Armenology listing in comparison some of its essential properties, as well as some inessential properties. When one speaks on Armenology (it happens very rarely and, as a rule, in encyclopaedias) indeterminacy and inaccuracy destroy the border between the mentioned two cases. This circumstance also shows that the problem under discussion has not yet been investigated.

Recapping all the stages of the history of Armenology, it will give us the possibility to notice, first of all, that Armenology studies the matter connected with Armenian reality. The Armenian character of the matter, first of all, is of great interest for Armenologists. The study can be realized in any branch of science if the question under discussion deals with Armenian reality. (It is only the first step to understand what Armenology is and it has no pretensions to be a definition of Armenology).

Let us analyze the term “meta” which will be useful for an exact understanding of the nature of Armenology. The term “meta” was used for the first time in the I c. B.C. The author of this term was Andronikos of Rhodes (Alexandria). While systematizing Aristotle's writings the librarian Andronikos of Rhodes had in mind, the content of those writings as a basis of his systematization. Everything, which, in his opinion, was concerned with the problems of natural science - physics, were named “physics”. Others which were essentially of a philosophical character - Andronikos of Rhodes named “metaphysics” which means in this context “after the physics”. So, the prefix "meta" has been used in the sense “after something”. The history of science shows that many words with the prefix “meta” have been formed, in which this prefix no longer has
the role which it had in the word “metaphysics”\textsuperscript{4}. There are also other cases which remind us of the formation of the word “metaphysics”. In any case, the origin of the word “metamathematics” must be in the center of our attention. David Hilbert’s role in the concept of metamathematics is truly crucial. The second chapter (§5) of the first volume of the book “Grundlagen der Mathematik” written by D. Hilbert and P. Bernays ends with the conclusion that there is to be formed a new field of investigation - the formalization of logical conclusions as a theory of proof. The authors of this book named this theory metamathematics\textsuperscript{5}. This idea has found a larger use subsequently. It was clarified and expanded to become the basis for using the concepts metascience and metatheory which were understood as identical concepts.

Another concept which is very important for the understanding of Armenology as well as Metaarmenology is the concept metalanguage. We must note, first of all, that “language” is a polysemantic word and it expresses different concepts. Saying language in this context we mean natural language, language as a way of forming our thought, as a form of the expression of our thought, and the basic means of exchanging our thought. E. Mendelsohn notes that the language we are studying is called “object-language”, while the language in which we formulate and prove results about object-language is called metalanguage. He notes further that “the contrast between object-language and metalanguage is also present in the study of a foreign language; for example, in a German class; German is the object-language, while the metalanguage, the language we use, is English”\textsuperscript{6}. (These concepts, by the way, have a larger use in Armenian studies. Many Armenologists do not write their works in Armenian. We can conclude that if we write on the Armenian language not in Armenian, then the object-language of the studies is Armenian, while the language in which we write on the Armenian language, must be considered as a metalanguage). Differentiating object-language and metalanguage, A. Church\textsuperscript{7} expresses an idea which has a principal significance and shows a case when the object-language and metalanguage can coincide. According to Church, when we use the language to talk about that same language it cannot be a method of setting up a formalized language. “But once set up, a formalized language with adequate means of expression may be capable of use in order to talk about that language itself; and in particular the very setting up of the language may afterwards be capable of restatement in that language. Thus, it may

\textsuperscript{4} Брутян Г.А., Об одной некорректной экстраполяции. В сб.: Столович Л.Н. (отв. ред.). Принцип социальной памяти. Социальная детерминация познания, Тарту, 1984, с. 6-12.
\textsuperscript{5} Гильберт Д., Бернайс П., Основания математики. Логические исчисления и формализация арифметики. Перевод с немецкого, Москва, 1982, с. 72.
happen that object-language and metalanguage are the same, a situation which it will be important later to take into account\(^8\).

Church's interpretation on the interrelation of object-language and metalanguage, especially his idea that object-language and metalanguage can coincide in some circumstances, shows that not only the concepts of philosophy and metaphilosophy, but also concepts of object-language and metalanguage sometimes can be used in the same sense. It must be noted that this kind of identity of concepts can be conditioned by different factors and can serve toward different aims.

H.Curry pays attention to the overlap of the object-language and metalanguage which can sometimes take place. According to Curry's interpretation, we, then, need to have a third language as a metametalanguage. So, it is possible to form hierarchies of languages with any number of levels\(^9\).

The differences between object-language and metalanguage are relative. The question - which language is the object-language and which the metalanguage, when we use two languages, depends on the context. According to S.Haack: “In talking about systems, the system being talked about is known as the object language, the system being used to talk about it, the metalanguage [N.B. this is a relative rather than an absolute distinction; e.g. one might use French (the metalanguage) to talk about English (the object language) or English to talk about French]\(^10\).

The metalanguage can be formalized\(^11\) or can be common, non-formalized language. As noted W.V. Quine, “In thus construing ordered pairs we do not assume that within the standard language under discussion - the object language - the values of the variables include sets, nor that they include ordered pairs in any sense. The use I propose to make of ordered pairs proceeds wholly within the metalanguage - the ordinary unformalized language in which I describe and discuss the object language\(^12\). The formalized language, of course, gives us greater opportunities for exact and precise conclusions.

Armenology can be defined as a theory of specificities about Armenian which are presented through different fields of scientific knowledge and which are studied by these corresponding sciences with their inherent methods.

Metaarmenology can be defined as a science which investigates the character of Armenology, its place in the system of knowledge, and the methods of its study.

Those definitions need some interpretations.

1. Let us note, first of all, that the theory in the definition of Armenology must be understood as object-theory.

\(^8\) Ibid.
\(^10\) Haack S., Philosophy of Logics, Cambridge, 1979, p. 249.
\(^11\) Church A., op. cit., p. 47.
\(^12\) Quine W.V., Philosophy of Logic. Englewood Cliffs, 1970, pp. 36-37.
2. Armenology - as a theory - is presented in a form of this or that science. It means that there is no Armenology which is not presented as linguistics, or philosophy, or mathematics, etc.

2.1. The mentioning of mathematics here is not accidental. Armenology (as well as German studies, Russian studies, etc.) is often included in the human or social sciences. Meanwhile Armenology, as well as similar studies can be presented through any science, in any field of knowledge. Is it possible to doubt that the book (“Mathematics in Ancient and Medieval Armenia”, Yerevan, 1959) of the doctor of physical-mathematical sciences G. Petrossian concerns Armenology? This is not a unique case. One more example - the books [“The History of Armenian Astronomy” (vol. 1,2, Yerevan, 1964, 1969) and “Geocentric and Heliocentric systems in Armenia” (Yerevan, 1973)] of the doctor of physical-mathematical sciences B. Toumanian also concern Armenology.

3. One of the specificities of the nature of Armenology which may be the most important from the point of view of our knowledge is that the field of this theory can deal with any field of science, let it be human, social, natural, physical, mathematical, technical, etc. It is enough to remember that Armenian materials can be in any science. It can concern Armenian reality which can be exposed in two forms: a) the matter of investigation is from Armenian reality and the author of the investigation is Armenian (for example, H. Manandian on the origin of the Armenians), b) the matter of investigation is from Armenian reality, while the author of the investigation is a foreigner (for example, David Marshal Lang on the civilizational significance of Armenia\(^{13}\), c) it is also possible that the matter of investigation is not from Armenian reality but it can have a connection with Armenology as far as it was investigated by an Armenian (for example, H. Adamian as a Pioneer of The Colour Television Theory). This case is different from the former cases as the matter investigated by Adamian has not any connection with Armenian reality; his investigation is not Armenological. Meanwhile the investigation on Adamian as a Pioneer of The Colour Television Theory, of course, is Armenological.

4. As a matter of fact, everything which concerns Armenian reality can become a matter of scientific investigation by "double subordination". One of them is Armenology, the second - a concrete field of science (linguistics, or historiography, or mathematics, etc.). This situation can be reproduced and expressed, as a conjunction consisting of two members. The first member is constant, while the second one is variable; it depends on the field of knowledge which includes Armenian matters. Such cases are not excluded when the mentioned conjunction can consist of more than two members. It takes place when Armenian matters are included in the joint field of science (for example, history and linguistics) or Armenian matters coexist with other national

matters. F. Conybeare’s book “Anecdota Oxoniensia. A Collation with the Ancient Armenian Versions of the Greek Text of Aristotle’s Categories de Interpretation, de Mundo, de Virtutibus set Vitiis and Porphyry’s Introduction” can be the illustration of it. The very title of the book shows that this work concerns Armenology and Greek Studies from the point of view of textual study, translation and similar problems on the one hand, and to philosophy and logic from the point of view of that branch of knowledge which includes, in this case, the Armenian and Greek matters, on the other hand.\(^{14}\)

5. The nature of Armenology demands the knowing of different sciences. It is necessary to know a concrete field which is under consideration and to know fundamentally the modern theory on that field. It is also necessary to know everything which presents the specificities of Armenian studies.

6. Armenology is often characterized as a system of sciences. The last concept is considered as a generic concept. But if we reconstruct the history of Armenian studies which was realized in different countries at different times, then we can say that these studies, as a rule, concern this or that concrete question. They can be considered as problems which concern the history, linguistics, mathematics, archaeology, and other sciences. They are named “Armenian studies” as far as the matter under investigation is taken from the Armenian reality. Is it possible to realize Armenian studies by the joint means of other sciences? Of course. The origin of the Armenians, for example, demands the joint efforts of historians, linguists, archaeologists and others from the point of view of their theories, as well as of their methodologies. But such an approach can be considered in other fields of studies, too. It means that the system of sciences is not the idea with which we can characterize Armenology or distinguish Armenology from other studies.

7. As to the place of Armenology in the system of sciences, it must be noted that up to now no classification of science can fix the exact place of Armenology. Armenology (as well as Hittitian studies, Georgian studies, Germanic studies, and other similar studies) is usually included in the human sciences or incorrect social sciences. As mathematics, in one sense and philosophy, in another sense, have their special place in the classification of sciences, Armenology (and other similar studies) also must have its own place in the system of sciences. The solution of this problem is one of the main tasks of Metaarmenology.

8. The problem of the methods of Armenian studies is no less an important task of Metaaarmenology. The special place of Armenology in the system of sciences also determines the specificity of the methods of Armenian studies. It is well known that the theory and methods of any study must be a close unit and this demand concerns Armenology, also.

---

\(^{14}\) Compare: Պուշկին Պ. Չ., հնարամուտք գրոց Դատուղ Անյաղթի կամ թարգմանութեանց Արիստոտելի, Վիեննա, 1919.
The description of the methods of Armenian studies and the characteristics of those methods must be a special matter of investigation and not only one. We shall limit our task to a few, but important, comments.

Even the first approach of the analysis of Armenian studies shows that there are such methods used (sometimes explicit and sometimes implicit), as the historical-comparative method, hermeneutics, the method of contextual and subtextual analyses, translation, as the analysis of the text and the specification of the use of the concept and their combination in texts, etc. The short description of those methods from the point of view of Armenian studies is given in our works\textsuperscript{15}. Here we include only some additional comments.

8.1. The above mentioned methods are only examples. As Armenology concerns directly or indirectly all branches of science, all those methods which are useful for all branches of science under discussion can be used in Armenology. It must be underlined that the use of the methods of this or that science in Armenology is not a technical interpolation. Each scientific method, independently of the branch of science where it arose and is largely used, when used in Armenian studies must be explicated from the point of view of the specificity of Armenology. (It is obvious that these methodological demands concern not only Armeology but also any other fields of study).

8.2. The methods used in Armenian studies are not of the same value for every investigation. Their significance and usefulness are determined by the specificity of those branches of Armenology which we investigate. It is obvious, for example, that the historical-comparative method, is very useful for those investigations in Armenian studies which have a historical character.

8.3. The classification of methods used in Armenian Studies has, in some sense, a theoretical as well as practical interest. Those methods can be general-scientific (methods which have an equivalent significance for Armenology as well as for other sciences and studies) and particular-scientific (methods which have a significance for Armenian studies or for a group of sciences which also include Armenian studies).

8.3.1. The methods used in Armenology\textsuperscript{16} are obviously not at the same level from the point of view of their generalization and significance as well as their role in investigations. Moreover, not all the mentioned ways of investigation can be called "methods", for example, objectivity and the necessity to prove. It must be more correct to call the latter a necessary condition for every investigation. Indeed, every researcher must be objective, first of all, must aim at the truth and no consideration must deflect him from the path to the truth. The same concerns also proof in scientific investigation. If


\textsuperscript{16} Brutian G., op. cit., pp. 54-66.
one uses declarative statements instead of proofs, the result cannot be regarded as scientific.

8.4. Proof in Armenian studies can be presented by the force of arguments from content as well as by means of exact logical constructions (among them logical calculations). Let us illustrate this with the use of translation as a method for investigation. First of all, let us note that it is possible to understand translation in different ways. Let us mention some of them which are important in the context of the problem under discussion.

8.4.1. Translation from natural, everyday language into another natural, everyday language. In this case it is possible to discover “behind” the words, more exactly, in the depth of the words a hidden sense, the meaning of which exposes defects, sometimes even mistakes in the original text. It gives us an opportunity to correct the original text. Such a translation gives us a chance, using the content analysis, to make the force of our argumentation stronger.

8.4.2. Translation from natural, everyday language into the language of logical calculation and the interpretation of the result. The aim is the same as in the previous case. Let us illustrate it by the following example. The sentence - “Death or Freedom” (1) is written on the flag of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (Dashnaktsutiun) (ARF(D)). How can we understand that? It is possible to suppose the following: “We shall die or reach freedom”. Probably, the authors of this motto intuitively felt the aim of the motto without an exact analysis. It will be correct if we displace the members of the motto, as the truth value of the disjunction remains the same when we displace the members of the disjunction. As a result of such a transformation, we shall receive “Freedom or Death” (2). It can mean “We shall reach freedom or we shall die”, or “If we do not reach freedom, then we shall die”. This form (2) of the expression of the motto exactly expresses the very aim of the motto. It can be illustrated by the following acts of mathematical logic (by the calculation of propositions).

\[
pvq \equiv p \rightarrow q/1^a/
qvp \equiv q \rightarrow p /2^a/
\]

Here \( p \) designates the proposition “We shall die” (which is an explicit form of “death” written on the flag). Correspondingly \( q \) designates the proposition “We shall be free”. Let us transform the propositions (\(1^a\)) and (\(2^a\)) according to the laws of the calculation of the propositions:

\[
pvq \text{ equiv. } p \rightarrow q/1^b/
qvp \text{ equiv. } q \rightarrow p /2^b/
\]

(\(1^b\)) will be read: “If we do not die, we shall be free”.
(\(2^b\)) will be read: “If we are not free, we shall die”.
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(lb) corresponds to the motto "Death or Freedom" which is fixed on the flag of ARF (D) and gives an inexact comprehension of the aim of the motto.

(2b) corresponds to the motto "Freedom or Death".

It would be proper to exchange motto (1) with motto (2).

It is difficult to overestimate the significance of this form of translation - translation from natural language into the language of logical calculation, but it will be wrong to think that it is the only powerful means to increase the force of the proof in the argumentative text.

8.4.3. Proof without persuasion cannot always reach its aim. It is often necessary to elucidate our thought, our arguments, or conclusions, to make them visible as much as possible without which we cannot always convince the auditorium. The translation from one language of science into another language of science, for example, from the language of algebra into the language of geometry can serve this purpose.

Let us illustrate it by the following simple example. Pythagoras's well-known theorem declares: the square of hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle is equal to the sum of the squares of the other two sides. It can be expressed in algebra by the following formula: $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$, where $c$ is the hypotenuse of the mentioned triangle, $a$ and $b$ are other sides of it.

If $a=b$ this formula is reduced to the following form: $a^2 + a^2 = c^2$, i.e. $2a^2 = c^2$ (3).

However, it is possible to translate this formula from the language of algebra to the language of geometry and express it as follows: square built on the hypotenuse of the isosceles right-angled triangle is twice larger than square built on one of the other sides of the same triangle. Such statement can be proved by purely geometrical method, the idea of which is obvious from the Fig. 1 and also in more simplified form from the Fig. 2. These figures make the considered algebraical relation visual and convincing.

9. There is an urgent need to use two or more methods of investigation in Armenian studies. The problem is conditioned by the character of the subject matter of Armenian studies. The fact that the object theory of Armenology concerns different fields of science testifies that sometimes, maybe often, it is impossible to be satisfied with only one method.

---

17 On this as well as on the similar ways of translation see Sawyer W., A Path to Modern Mathematics, Middlesek, 1969.
At the Conference devoted to 30 Years of Armenian studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in May, 1991 I proposed in my paper the following definition of Armenology: “...Armenology is a science the object-language of which is the specificity of Armenian reality or it studies a metalanguage on the basis of the Armenian language and culture to solve some other similar problems”\(^{18}\). In these works the author of this definition regards it as a proposal which has the character of a working hypothesis. Now we shall try to interpret the proposed hypothesis hoping that in such a way we can create some conditions to improve the definition.

First of all, it must be noted that proposing this definition we introduce science as a kind of language. Science as a language is something different from the language of science and, of course, from an everyday natural, spoken language. In natural language we have a set of words (semantics) and a set of rules of combinations of words (syntax). These concepts are extrapolated and spread in science with a necessary explication. We speak on science as on a language which has also its own semantics and syntax. Science as a language is a set of corresponding concepts (logical semantics) as well as a set of methodological-logical means, ways, and methods (logical syntax) with the help of which we combine concepts of science and come to definite necessary conclusions. When we use object-language and metalanguage in the above mentioned definition of Armenology we mean not the usual, every day, natural language but science as a special kind of language.

It must be said that the definition of Armenology under consideration expresses two different levels: the object-language which belongs to the subject-matter of Armenology and metalanguage which belongs to Metaarmenology. But there is not anything unusual or unexpectable in that. It is a special expression of the case which was described and analyzed by H. Curry: “Sometimes we wish to talk about one language \(L_1\) within another language \(L_2\). In such a case it is customary to call \(L_1\) the object language; \(L_2\), the metalanguage. It is not excluded that \(L_1\) and \(L_2\) may overlap. Ordinarily the object language will be a certain portion of the \(U\) language which it is agreed to remove from it, sometimes we may wish to talk about languages \(L_1\) and \(L_2\) which are related to each other as object language and metalanguage, respectively; in that case we use a third language, \(L_3\), customarily called the metametalanguage. In this way we can continue to form hierarchies of languages with any number of levels. However, no matter how many levels there are, the \(U\) language will be the highest level: if there are two levels, it will be the metalanguage; if there are three levels, it will be the metametalanguage; and so on. Thus the terms “\(U\) language” and “metalanguage” must “be kept distinct”\(^{19}\). In this case, if the definition of Armenology includes the concept of

\(^{18}\) There must be “object language” instead of “object” in the definitions of Armenology given in Brutian G., Armenology: The Subject-Matter and Methods of Study; which correspond to the Armenian text (Բրուտյան Գ., Հայագիտության առարկան և մեթոդները, Երևան, 1999).

\(^{19}\) Curry H.B., Foundations of Mathematical Logic, pp. 31-32.
the object-language of Armenology as well as a definite understanding of Metaarmenology, then the problem under discussion becomes the matter of the analysis of Metametaarmenology. It is necessary to underline that the definitions of Armenology proposed in this paper and the paper read at the Jerusalem Conference on Armenian studies try (from different standpoints and different means of the language of science) to discover the tasks of Armenology and methods which are called upon to solve those tasks. When the object under consideration has many levels and many essences (I am sure that Armenology is such an object) its character determines the possibility of different definitions. David Anhakht (the Invincible), who understood it quite well, analyzed six definitions of philosophy having in mind not to accept one of them and to reject all others, but to show the role of each of them in the process of discovering the multicharacter essence of philosophy: “It should be noted that there are six definitions of philosophy, as follows: The first: Philosophy is knowledge of existence as such. The second: Philosophy is knowledge of divine and human things. The third: Philosophy is contemplation of death. The fourth: Philosophy is becoming similar to God as far as it is humanly possible. The fifth: Philosophy is the art of arts and the science of sciences. The sixth: Philosophy is love of wisdom”.

One can be asked: does everything which is written here on Armenology as a definite study from the point of view of its model, essentially differ from the similar studies as Hittitology, German studies, Georgian studies, Russian studies, etc? We cannot answer these questions without additional research. I think that here are given the necessary characteristics and co-ordinates concerning Armenology and Metaarmenology on the basis of which it is possible to construct models for the other cases. If the necessary data of Armenology in one case and Metaarmenology in the other case satisfy those models during their interpretation, then it will be obvious that these models are constructed exactly. It is theoretically possible that the data of other similar studies can also satisfy exactly the constructed models of Armenology (as well as of Metaarmenology). In this case, it is possible to use these models not only in Armenological and Metaarmenological studies, but also in the above mentioned similar studies. It is also possible that the proposed models can satisfy other similar studies incompletely but particularly. In this case, it is possible to recover these models which are to be used in aforementioned and other relevant fields.

---

20 David the Invincible Philosopher, Definitions and Divisions of Philosophy. English Translation of the Old Armenian Version with Introduction and Notes by Briddet Kendall and Robert W. Thomson. Chico, California, 1983, p. 51. The first, second and sixth definitions belong to Pythagoras (his definitions got to us thanks to his follower Nicomachos’ writings), the third and fourth definitions belong to Plato, and the fifth definition belongs to Aristotle.
IMPORTANCE OF THE ARMENIAN
TOPONYMS' ONTOLOGICAL INTEGRITY
IN THE SYSTEM OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Eduard L. Danielyan*

Armenian toponyms of the Armenian Highland¹ constitute an essential part of Armenia’s historical resources. They symbolize the indigenous Armenian Nation’s² cultural creation - the backbone of the Armenian statehood having more than five millennia old ethno-spiritual and civi-

¹ Doctor of History, Noravank Foundation consultant.
² In antique sources Armenia’s natural environment is mentioned as the Armenian mountains [1, XI. 2. 15 et al], which in spiritual history are known as the mountains of Ararat (Gen. 8.4). Researching physical geographical, geomorphological and geological features of the orography of Armenia (Western and Eastern Armenia) Herman von Abich (1806-1886) introduced historically and scientifically grounded geographic term Das Armenische Hochland or Bergland (the Armenian Highland) [2].

² Since the 19th century the term Armenoid has been introduced in anthropology based on the study of the anthropological type of the Armenians and considering Armenia to be a focal area of its distribution from ancient times [3, p. 228, 240-244; 4, c. 7; 5, c. 25; 6, p. 11]. Th. Gamkrelidze and V. Ivanov proposed that “the Proto-Indo-European homeland of the 5th to 4th millennia B.C.” could be “within eastern Anatolia, the southern Caucasus, and northern Mesopotamia...” and after the Indo-European linguistic community’s fragmentation into dialect groups “the Greek-Armenian-Aryan dialect grouping began to crystallize”, and “subsequently divided into Greek, Armenian, and Indo-Iranian...” [7, pp. 761, 791, 794]. But “eastern Anatolia” corresponds to eastern Asia Minor, “southern Caucasus” – to the southern mountain ranges of the Caucasus (to the north and east of the Kura), so the authors ought to denote the Armenian Highland. According to another opinion, based on the glottochronological analysis, Hittite lineage diverged from Proto-Indo-European around 8,700 years BP, ”perhaps reflecting the initial migration out of Anatolia. Tocharian and the Greco-Armenian lineages are shown as distinct by 7,000 years BP” [8, pp. 435-438; cf. 9, pp. 957-960]. As is seen from the texts and sketch maps’ inscriptions of these publications, the term “Anatolia” was applied not only to Asia Minor, but also incorrectly used instead of the term Armenian Highland.
lizational roots testified by archaeological monuments\(^1\) and architectural relics, petroglyphs and cuneiform inscriptions et al.

Investigation of the ancient and medieval history of Armenia brought D. M. Lang to the following conclusion in his book *Armenia: Cradle of Civilization*: “The ancient land of Armenia is situated in the high mountains... Although Mesopotamia with its ancient civilizations of Sumeria and Babylon, is usually considered together with Egypt as the main source of civilized life in the modern sense, Armenia too has a claim to rank as one of the cradles of human culture. To begin with, Noah’s Ark is stated in the Book of Genesis to have landed on the summit of Mount Ararat, in the very centre of Armenia.... Armenia has a claim on our attention as one of the principal homes of ancient metallurgy, beginning at least five thousand years ago. Later on, Armenia became the first extensive kingdom to adopt Christianity as a state religion pioneering a style of Church architecture which anticipates our own Western Gothic” [15, p. 9].

Armenian toponyms, as important cognitive-protective factors of the national security system, constitute ontological integrity of the Armenian Highland’s historical geographic entity. Contrary to the historical reality, the Turkish hostile propaganda wages information warfare against the history and place names of Armenia and historical memory\(^2\).

Turkish alterations and eradication of the Armenian toponyms were implemented in several stages. After the Turkish-Persian wars and

---

\(^1\)In the Neolithic period obsidian was exported from Armenia to Mesopotamia and the countries of the Near East [10, p. 46]. Archaeological complexes (in Aghdznik, Tsopk, Bardzer Haik’, Ayrrarat, Siunik, Gugark, Vaspurakan, Artsakh and other regions) of the Armenian Highland are evidence for the early agricultural and social-economic life in ancient Armenia of the Neolithic and Chalcolithic periods [11; 12, pp. 115-130], Bronze [13, 14, pp. 2-5 et al] and Iron Ages.

\(^2\)Henry Theriault noted: “As the opening ontological considerations imply, a truly comprehensive understanding of the genocide of Armenians depends on attention to the broader genocidal process in the Ottoman Empire” and during the Young Turk and Kemalist regimes [16].
partitions of Armenia in the 16th and 17th centuries the Ottoman Empire undertook distortion of the toponyms of Western Armenia1 and Cilician Armenia (Kilikia) as a result of expansionist policy, which was based on the bestial pan-Turkism ideology and over the course of time turned into the genocidal program against the indigenous Armenian nation resulting also in distortion of the western Armenian place names, which intensified since the emergence of the Armenian Question followed by the prohibition of using the name Armenia and the massacres of the Armenians in Western Armenia (1894-1896)2 and Kilikia (1909)3. Turkish genocidal policy intensifying since the late 19th and early 20th centuries in the Ottoman Empire resulted in the Armenian Genocide of 1915-19234 committed by the Young Turk and Kemalist regimes [17; 21; 22] in Western Armenia, Kilikia and the Armenian-populated areas of Asia Minor [23 et al].

The Kemalist and successive governments of the Republic of Turkey have continued obliteration of the Armenian place names in Western Armenia and Kilikia forging the political-administrative map of the occupied territories5 by eliminating the native names, translating the

1 Western part of Great Armenia, Armenia Minor and Armenian (Northern) Mesopotamia.
2 W.J. Wintle, Armenia and Its Sorrows. Third edition, 1896, pp. 83-98. R. Safrastyan notes: “The first anti-Armenian program of genocidal nature appeared in the mid-90s of the 19th century. Its implementation ended in mass killings of the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire, with the number of victims totaling 300 thousand… The Young Turks, the Kemalists, right after coming into power, undertook drafting programs of genocidal nature” [17, pp. 114, 148].
3 35.000 Armenians were massacred in Adana and the areas of Kilikia [18, pp. 5-6].
4 More than 1,5 million Armenians were killed and eight hundred thousand deported [19, c. 25; 20, pp. 24-25 et al].
5 “Cartographic war” [24; 25, lg 9-25; 26, pp. 57-58] is waged also against history and historical geography of the lands far away from Armenia. Commenting on the militaristic, pan-Turanic policy during WWII A. A. Chichkin noted: “Indeed, along with military preparations of Turkey at the borders of the USSR, since the autumn of 1941 Turkish media also published geographic maps of the future state…”, and with expansionist fever Turkish aggressors stated: “the border of Turkey is far away beyond the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea… Volga - the River, in which our ancestors watered their horses” [27].
indigenous place names into Turkish or inventing Turkish ones\(^1\), alien to the indigenous Armenian environment.

In both the Soviet and post-Soviet periods falsifications of the history of Armenia and its place names have also been perpetrated in the artificially introduced unit of “Azerbaijan”. After the Artsakh Liberation War (1991-1994) the defeated aggressive Republic of Azerbaijan has been using these falsifications in the militaristic propaganda against the Republic of Armenia and the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic (Artsakh).

Falsifications of the history and historical geography of Armenia, especially, toponymy of Western Armenia and Kilikia\(^2\) are put into service of the genocide denial by the Turkish government, which spends millions for it [29]. Currently Turkey and Azerbaijan\(^3\) are going through a

\(^1\) In this way archaeological sites of Western Armenia, including adjacent Armenian (Northern) Mesopotamia, Kilikia and Asia Minor are “presented” with falsified Turkish names. Touching on the subject of the state-sponsored discrimination in archaeology it is worth paying attention to the general methodological remarks expressed in the article “Archaeology in the service of the state: theoretical considerations” by Philip L. Kohl and Clare Fawcett (in a collection of articles “Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology”): “… We particularly regret lack of coverage on the nationalist practices of archaeology in Israel, Turkey and other Middle Eastern countries... The articles collected here, however, are principally concerned with the abuses of the relationship between nationalist politics and archaeology... The case studies presented in this volume clearly show that archaeologists in the service of the state frequently have manipulated archaeological remains to justify the ownership of land claimed to have been held “from time immemorial” or to support politics of domination and control over neighboring peoples...” [28, pp. 3, 5, 8, 18]. If the authors took into account the state of affairs in the republics of Turkey and Azerbaijan, they would be convinced that Turkey – the perpetrator and the denier of the Armenian Genocide, as well as its ally Azerbaijan, share the top falsifiers and distorters in the fields of archaeology, history and toponymy. The criminal acts of appropriation of the indigenous archaeological monuments with the purpose to “create” non-existent “Turkey’s ancient history and civilization” have been perpetrated by genocide of culture: destruction of Armenian architectural monuments and obliteration of the native place names of archaeological and other historical sites in western part of the Armenian Homeland occupied by genocidal Turkey.

\(^2\) Turkey committing the Armenian Genocide, continues occupation of Western Armenia and Kilikia. It occupied also western territories of Eastern Armenia [Ardahan, Kars region, Sarikamish, Ughtik (Olty), Kaygac, the ruins of Ani, Mount Ararat, Surmalu, Igdir and Koghbe et al.] by the illegal and anti-Armenian treaties signed in Moscow (March 16) and Kars (October 13) between the Bolsheviks and Kemalists in 1921.

\(^3\) It still occupies some eastern Armenian territories [Nakhijevan, Goghtan, the most part of Utik province and some regions (Shahumyan region with Getashen Subregion and Gulistan, et al.) of Artsakh] as a result of the above mentioned notorious treaties, unlawful Kavburo decision (July 5, 1921), aggression and occupation in 1991-1992.
new spate of falsifications and distortions. There are solid academic publications criticizing the baseless denial of the Armenian Genocide.

Since the invention of “the Turkish History Thesis” and till the present times the Turkish state’s ideological machine has been spreading disinformation in the world informational arena using political, financial and propaganda means. At present it is continued through the criminal practices of the Turkish authorities which eradicate the names of the Armenian Highland, Western Armenia and many other Armenian place names, hydronyms and mountain names.

The complete system of the Armenian ethno-geographic names characterizes the natural historic environment and cultural and social-political history of Armenia-Haiastan - the cradle and the Homeland of the Armenian nation. Since the 3rd millennium BC and further the Armenian statehood (as represented by ancient and medieval kingdoms and principalities) has been attested in cuneiform, antique and medieval written sources with the names of Aratta, Armanum, Haiasa, Nairi, Ararat (Urartu)-Van (Biaina), Armina (cf. Arminiya), Αρμενία.

1 The Republic of Turkey relies both on the genocidal experience of the Ottoman and the Young Turk regimes, and pseudo-scientific surrogate – “the Turkish History Thesis” of the pan-Turkic trend [for its fundamental criticism see: 30; 31, pp. 10-16; 32, pp. 131-153], which was fabricated under the supervision of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk in the 1930s. Artificially formed “Azerbaijan’s” criminal record is based on genocidal actions in Baku (September 1918 and January 1991), Shushi (March, 1920), Sumgait, Kirovabad (Gandzak) (1988), Getashen (1991), Maragha (1992) and other places against the native Armenian population, the destruction of the Armenian architectural monuments and falsifications of the "Bunyatovshchina" type (from the 1960-80s up to date, grown by leaps and bounds of the Turkish Armenophobic policy) [33, c. 177-190; 34, c. 41-49; 35, c. 92, 158-162, 168, 175, 202-211, 221-222].

2 Gregory H. Stanton, particularly, notes: “Denial, the final stage of genocide is best overcome by public trials and truth commissions, followed by years of education about the facts of the genocide, particularly for the children of the group or nation that committed the crime. The black hole of forgetting is the negative force that results in future genocides…” [37].

3 For example see, Turgut Özal’s pseudo-politological book with very ambitiously falsified title: “Turkey in Europe and Europe in Turkey” and totally distorted “historical” context [38], which has been completely criticized by Jr. Speros Vryonis [39].
Mега́лъ (Great Armenia) and Αρμένια Μικρά (Armenia Minor) [51, V. 12. 1; 6. 18], Cilician Armenia (Kilikia)\(^1\) et al. In this respect it is worth mentioning the Babylonian map of the world (7\(^{th}\) – 6\(^{th}\) cc. BC) and the maps of the world by Hecataeus of Miletus (550 – 476 BC), Herodotus (484-425 BC), Eratosthenes (276 – 195 BC)\(^2\), the maps of Great Armenia and Armenia Minor by Claudius Ptolemy (83-161 AD), “Geography” of Strabo (64 BC – 24 AD) and other antique and medieval authors’ works, particularly, Movses Khorenatsi’s (5\(^{th}\) century) “Ashkharhatsoyts”\(^3\), as valuable ancient and early medieval geographic and cartographic sources about the history and geography of Armenia.

According to Strabo, “The Euphrates… rises in the northern part of Taurus, and flows toward the west through Armenia the Great, as it is called, to Armenia Minor … [1, XI. 12. 3; cf. 54, III. i. 17; v. 1] it leaves this and Commagene on the right hand; on the left Acilisene and Sophene, belonging to Great Armenia…” [1, XI. 12. 3; cf. 54, III. ii. 2; iii. 1]. According to Claudius Ptolemy, Great Armenia “is terminated in the north by a part of Colchis, by Iberia, and Albania on the line which we have indicated as running along the Cyrus (Kura) river; on the west by Cappadocia along the accessible part of the Euphrates and the part of

\(^1\) The Armenian statehood as manifested by the ancient and medieval kingdoms [generated and reigned by the Haikian (Haikazun) dynasty (from the 3\(^{rd}\) millennium BC) and its branches (until 1 c. AD), the Armenian Arshakuni (until 428), the Haikazun-Sisakyan-Aranshahik (Vachagan the Pious of Artsakh, 484 - the mid-6\(^{th}\) c.), the Bagratuni (885-1045) and its coeval and the subsequent ones (Vaspurakan, Kars-Vanand, Tashir-Dzoraget, Parisos, Siunik, then Kilikia (Principality – 1080-1197, Kingdom - 1198-1375)], and also manifested by the early and late medieval principalities (e.g. the Mamilkaysans of Taron, Sasun and Taik, the Zakarians, the Arstakh Melikdmons et al.) had been based on the Armenian system of principalities.

\(^2\) Eratosthenes: “The Tigris and Euphrates flow from Armenia to the south and enclose Mesopotamia” [53, p. 186].

\(^3\) Ashkharhatsoyts” [“Geography” or “World Atlas” - the geographic and cartographic description of Great Armenia, Armenia Minor, Armenian (Northern) Mesopotamia, neighboring and remote countries on the basis of the ancient and early medieval mapping of the “inhabited (or known) world” – oikumene] was edited and continued in the 7\(^{th}\) century by famous Armenian geographer, mathematician, the founder of Armenian natural philosophic thought Anania Shirakatsi.
Pontus Cappadocia… on the east by a part of the Hyrcanium (Caspian) sea from the mouth of the Cyrus river… and by Media on the line leading to the Caspius mountains… on the south it is terminated by Mesopotamia… then by Assyria… The part of Armenia Minor farthest north is called Orbaisene, below this Aetulane, then Haeretica and below this Orsene and further south after Orsene is Orbisene…” [51, V. 12.1; 1, XII, 3. 29].

Great Armenia, Armenia Minor and Kilikia included correspondingly the whole territory of the Armenian Highland, adjacent hills of Armenian (Northern) Mesopotamia, as well as the coastal zones of the Black, Caspian and Mediterranean Seas.

A research on the Ottoman documents and publications revealed that “the government of Sultan Abdul Hamid II fallaciously substituted the name Armenia by such terms as Kurdistan1 or Anatolia” [58, p. 12] and Turkish forgers started to use wrongly “Eastern Anatolia”2 in relation to Western Armenia. They falsify even former Ottoman publications and maps in which Armenia had been mentioned [58, pp. 21-22].

1 The present-day Kurds sometimes are mistakenly confused with the inhabitants of ancient Korduk (Corduene) [55, p. 177]. But, Korduk was an Armenian region in Korchayk, the 6th province of Great Armenia [56, էջ 108]. As noted N. Adonts, “immigration of Kurd tribes into Armenia” started only since XVI c., as a result of Selim I’s expansionist policy [57, pp. 51-52].

2 Continuing genocidal occupation and re-divisions of Western Armenia and Kilikia, the present-day administrative division of the Republic of Turkey had been established by the state-sponsored First Geography Congress, which was held in Ankara in 1941. Thus, the Turkish government continued the implementation of the plan to cover up the Armenian Genocide, at the same time, moving its military divisions to the borders of the Armenian SSR for purposes of aggression. Thus, Western Armenia was divided into the so-called “Eastern Anatolia” (“Upper Euphrates”, “Erzurum-Kars”, “Upper Murat-Van”, “Hakkari” Subregions), “Southeastern Anatolia” (“Middle Euphrates”, “Tigris” Subregions) Regions and “Eastern Black Sea Subregion”, and Kilikia was divided into “Adana” and “Antalya” Subregions of the “Mediterranean Region” [59]. Western Armenia has been wrongly called “Eastern Anatolia” in Turkish official documents and pseudo-scientific literature. An example of genocidal “territorial appropriation” propagandized in the Republic of Turkey is the program of “Turkish Geographical Society. Activity Report, 2010”, where a “three years plan” (2010-2013) includes activities “in homeland (Internal and East Anatolian Fieldwork…”), i.e. occupied Western Armenia is presented criminally as an “homeland” of Turkic nomadic invaders and their descendants - the genocide perpetrators.
Contrary to such a fraud, the truth is that the word stem of the term “Anatolia” is the Greek word ΑΝΑΤΟΛΗ (“east”) [60, p. 123] and “Anatolia” relates only to Asia Minor.

G.Ripley and Ch.A. Dana noted: “Asia Minor, a peninsula at the western extremity of Asia... bounded N. W. by the Dardanelles (the Hellespont of the ancients), N. by the sea of Marmora (Propontis), the Bosporus, and the Black sea (Pontus Euxinus), E. by the Armenian mountains... S. by the Mediterranean, and W. by the Archipelago (the Aegean Sea)...”. With the same correct methodology Great Armenia and Armenia Minor are depicted to the east of Asia Minor on the map titled “Ancient Asia Minor” [63].

Henry Lynch (1862–1913) also correctly wrote: “I have invited attention to the characteristics which Armenia shares in common with her neighbours in the series of the Asiatic tablelands, Persia on the east and Asia Minor on the west” [64, I, p. 439]. An adequate geographic perception is present also in “The Encyclopedia of World History”: “Asia Minor, or Anatolia, is a peninsula stretching westward from the Armenian mountains to the Aegean Sea, with the Black Sea to the north and the Mediterranean to the south ... Armenia is a mountainous region lying between the Black and Caspian Seas” and at the time of King Menua (810-786 BC) the Urartian (Araratian-E.D.) Kingdom included “the entire Armenian Highland area” [65, p. 46].

Thus, according to the historic sources and historiographical and geographical literature, Anatolia with all its parts (northern, southern,
eastern and western) corresponds to Asia Minor situated to the west of the Armenian Highland [66, c. 14-15; 67, 30-37].

The Turkish official circles' anti-Armenian policy of distortion and falsification of the Armenian geographic names is targeted at deleting from the historical memory the indigenous place names of the western part of the Armenian Homeland – Western Armenia and Kilikia, which suffered the genocidal devastation. D. M. Lang noted with distress: “It is difficult to convey the horror of events of 1915, as the Ottoman government set into action its design for genocide. In April 1915, the Armenian intellectual and community leaders in Istanbul (Constantinople-E.D.) were rounded up and transported in ships to their doom; among the victims were a number of priests, poets, doctors, and the great composer Komitas” [15, p. 288].

Toponymic destruction was also planned by the criminal organizers and perpetrators of the Armenian Genocide. On January 5, 1916, during the genocide Enver Pasha (Deputy Commander-in-Chief) sent a “Decree” to the Turkish military-political authorities with the following misanthropic demand:

“1. It is important to change into Turkish all the names of provinces, regions, villages, mountains and rivers belonging to Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian and other non-Muslim peoples. Making use swiftly of this favourable moment, we beseech your help in carrying out this order.

2. Cooperating with military commanders and administrative personnel within the boundaries of your jurisdiction, respective lists of name changes should be formed of provinces, regions, villages, etc. and be forwarded to military headquarters as soon as possible...

3. It is imperative that the new names reflect the history of our hard-working, exemplary and praiseworthy military... It should be
borne in mind that any sudden change of a conventional name into an inconvenient or improper one may bring about the continuation of using the old name by the population. Therefore, new names should be chosen taking all this into consideration...” [58, p. 14].

Clive Foss notes that the Turkish government “has been systematically changing the names of villages to make them more Turkish. Any name which does not have a meaning in Turkish, or does not sound Turkish, whatever its origin, is replaced by a banal name assigned by a bureau in Ankara, with no respect to local conditions or traditions” [68, p. 268].

From the very beginning of their rule the Kemalist leaders and their accomplices in the Republic of Turkey used the former Turkish regimes’ genocidal experience and methods of falsification of the history of Armenia and toponymical distortions for the criminal denial of the Armenian Genocide. With regard to falsification of the history of Armenia by Esat Uras, Christopher Walker in his book-review unveiling the fallaciousness of Esat’s book, noted “Uras shows no understanding of the history or even the reality of Armenia” [69, p. 166]. Uras denies the Armenian Genocide by falsifying the Armenian history and historical geography [70, pp. 123, 155].

In some studies (with methodological manipulations) the obliteration and distortion of toponyms in Turkey were erroneously attributed to the so-called “nation-building projects in Turkey”, instead of unveiling their criminal background. For example, Asli Gür writes: “If we examine the relationship between the archaeological practices and the na-

tion-building projects in Turkey since the early twentieth century, we see that dominant ideologies of nationalism influenced the way the names and images of archaeological sites and artifacts were appropriated and circulated publicly through icons, images, slogans, and stories…”, and presents Atatürk’s sponsored forgery as an act influenced by “dominant ideologies of nationalism” [71, p. 73], instead of defining it as a part of genocidal policy, because all the actions of “the Turkish state-building” have been motivated and led by discriminative, violent and illegal actions based on the criminal denial of the Armenian Genocide.

The pseudo-scientific rhetoric of the author disguises the fact of the Turkish predatory policy, primarily with regard to the occupied Armenian territories and cultural heritage. Aslı Gür had to remember that the heritages of other ethnic groups [Assyrians, Greeks (against whom the crime of genocide was also committed [20, p. 25]), as well as of those who passed away long ago (in the 2nd–1st millennia BC Hittites, Lydians, Phrygians and others)] have also been systematically plundered by the orders of Turkish authorities.

World history is fundamentally falsified in “the Turkish History Thesis”. Concerning its absurdity Clive Foss critically writes: “…This might seem to be manifest nonsense, especially as it was obvious that Chinese and Indians were not Turks. There was an easy explanation: the Turks arrived, brought civilization, then were absorbed by the local population”. Clive Foss reveals the goal of Kemal’s fraud: “Far more important for the future were developments in the Near East, which the migrating Turks entered by a route south of the Caspian. They brought irrigation and drainage to a land of swamps and established the first organized Turkish states and cities in Sumer and Elam. The Sumerians developed the world’s first writing system… using it to express their Turk-
ish language. Archaeology reveals the grandeur of their civilization. From there, around 5000 BC, Turks entered their holy land of Anatolia and a millennium later had established the Turkish Hittite (Eti) civilization; all this confirmed by excavations in Asia Minor. The language of the Hittites was Turkish, not Semitic or Indo-European...”. Unmasking the pan-Turkist background of Kemal’s fraud, Clive Foss, writes: “ Atatürk’s accomplishments... owe much to the previous discredited regime, the CUP, the “Young Turks” who ran the country from 1908 until the end of the First World War. They... had ideas that find resonance in the Thesis. Their great nationalist ideologue, Ziya Gökalp (1876 -1924), wrote an immensely popular poem describing how the five sons of the ancestral Türk Han rode out from Central Asia to establish the Sumerian, Hittite, Chinese, Indian and Scythian civilizations. Schoolbooks in use in these years presented the Turks... as one of the most ancient nations, originators of agriculture, textiles, and metal tools and weapons. Radiating from Central Asia, they founded states and supported the arts and sciences... The Thesis exercised an influence that has not completely disappeared” [31, pp. 13, 16].

Moreover, pseudo-scientific “interpretations” of history and falsifications of toponyms involved even some archaeologists and historians from other countries who fed grist to the mill of Turkish forgers of history. Such politicized activities resulted, for example, in publication of pseudo-scientific books entitled “Ancient Turkey: a Traveller’s History” (1989, 1999) by Seton Lloyd [72] and “Ancient Turkey” by Antonio Sagona and Paul E.Zimansky [73], where the terms “Eastern Turkey”, “Eastern Anatolia” and many other modern Turkish names have been falsely used [74] instead of ancient and medieval Armenian toponyms of western part of the Armenian Highland. Thus, archaeo-
logical materials are politicized by falsifications and as a result of such discriminating activities ancient cultural heritage of Western Armenia has been brutally plundered¹.

In contrast to the falsified concept of “ancient Turkey”, the progressive British², French, Russian figures in the 17th-20th cc. associated cultural-spiritual perception of Armenia with the Biblical Paradise and the cradle of mankind and civilization³ expressing their inspiration for Armenia⁴ and its spiritual roots in history. A spiritual concept concerning Ararat and Armenia was observed in British [78, pp. 40, 70], as well as in French religious literature (e.g.: “L’Arménie revendique pour elle l’honneur d’avoir été le pays choisi par Dieu pour y créer l’Eden; aux sources de ces quatre fleuves... Noé sortit de l’arche et descendit jusqu’au pied du mont Ararat... L’Arménie doit être considérée comme le berceau du monde” [79, p. 590⁵] concerning Ararat and Armenia [80, I, pp. 18, 354; 81, p. 403; 82, էջ 3-13].

¹Turkish and Azerbaijani falsifications in archaeology may be exemplified by the following spurious publication: “Azerbaijan - Land between East and West. Transfer of knowledge and technology during the „First Globalization“ of the VII-IV millennium BC International Symposium Baku, April 1-3 2009 [75]. Archaeological sites of Armenia are falsely presented as if located in “Eastern Anatolia” and “Azerbaijan” by the Turkish and Azerbaijani forgers, appropriating abominably the cultural heritage of Western and Eastern Armenia. But, in reality, on the one hand, the term “Eastern Anatolia” has nothing to do with the territory of the Armenian Highland, which is to the east of Asia Minor, and, on the other hand, the name of “Azerbaijan” historically corresponds only to the Iranian province of Adarbaigan-Azerbaijan, i.e. ancient Atropatene, which was to the south-east of Great Armenia.

²The British spiritual and cognitive interest towards Armenia was earlier reflected in the Hereford Mappa Mundi (“unique in Britain’s heritage, an outstanding treasure of the medieval world, it records how thirteenth-century scholars interpreted the world in spiritual as well as geographical terms…” [76]. The Hereford Mappa Mundi - World map reflects the Biblical perceptions of Armenia: Noah’s Ark in the mountains of Armenia, Armenia Superior (Great), Armenia Minor.


⁴Movses Khorenatsi’s works (“History of Armenia” from ancient times till the beginning of 440 AD and Ashkharhatsoyts”) were translated into Latin by Gulielmus & Georgius, Gul. Whiston brothers [77].

⁵It is a later edition of The Dictionary by Calmet (1672-1757).
Lord Byron wrote about the Armenians and Armenia: “Whatever may have been their destiny - and it has been bitter - whatever it may be in future, their country must ever be one of the most interesting on the globe; and perhaps their language only requires to be more studied… It is a rich language… If the Scriptures are rightly understood, it was in Armenia that Paradise was placed… It was in Armenia that the flood first abated, and the dove alighted” [83, pp. 8, 10-12].

British Assyriologist and linguist A.H. Sayce wrote with great accuracy in the usage of the names Armenia, Ararat, Van, Vannic Kingdom and kings. He wrote: “It is now more than half a century ago that the existence of inscriptions written in the Cuneiform character, and found in different parts of Armenia, first became known. The French Professor, Saint-Martin, in 1823, gave an account in the Journal Asiatique of the antiquities of Van, and drew attention to the fact that the Armenian historian, Moses [Movses] of Khorene, had described them in such detail as to make it probable he had seen them with his own eyes” [84, p. 377].

Unlike A. Sayce, who defined the period of the Kingdom of Van as “the forgotten early history of Armenia”, S. Lloyd entitled his book’s

---

1 Despite Western Armenia being occupied by the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century, Sayce mentioned Armenia in relation to western and eastern parts of the country. He noted in particular: “Sir A.H. Layard had already visited Armenia in 1850, at the time when he was excavating in Assyria, and had there made copies of the inscriptions in Van and its immediate neighbourhood… Inscriptions in the Vannic character now began to be noticed to the north and east of Armenia”. Later Sayce again mentioned Armenia and Ararat in connection with Van and the cuneiforms discovered there: "Inscription of Menuas, King of Ararat, in the Vannic language…". In another his work published in 1888 (Records of the Past, Being English Translations of the Ancient Monuments of Egypt and Western Asia) he mentioned “…kings who ruled on the shores of Lake Van in Armenia, from the ninth to the seventh centuries before our era”. Sayce used correct toponyms, adequate to Armenia’s historic heritage. Sayce mentioned the sites in Western and Eastern Armenia where inscriptions had been found, noting: “It is to the period of Shalmaneser II… that we must refer the date of the introduction of the cuneiform syllabary into Armenia” [84, p. 385, 388, 389, 394, 402, 405].
Chapter 10: “Urartu: a Long-Forgotten Nation” and wrote: “In addition to all the Anatolian provinces north or east of the Upper Tigris and Euphrates, it occupied large parts of what are now Soviet Armenia and Iranian Azerbaijan.” He baselessly considered the name “Urartu”, as if “wrongly spelt as Ararat”, and used many Armenian geographic names of Western Armenia - Mt. Sipan, Mt. Nemrut, Eriza, Eraskh/Arax, Aratsani, Arches, Manazkert in distorted Turkish forms: Süpan, Nemrut Dag, Erzincan, the Aras, the Murat Su, Ercis, Malazgirt, etc. S. Lloyd also applied wrongly the term “Anatolia” to western part of the territory of Armenia, writing: “… this highland of eastern Turkey” or “eastern Anatolia” [72, pp. 94, 98, 109]. Another example of the influence of the Turkish expansionist falsified “geographical nomenclature” is A. Khurt’s book, where the western part of the Armenian Highland is wrongly

1. In reality this territory corresponds to Western Armenia. S. Loyd had to know about history and geography of Armenia reading A. Toynbee’s works: “The Armenians are perhaps the oldest established of the civilized races in Western Asia... Their home is the tangle of high mountains between the Caspian, the Mediterranean, and the Black Seas. Here the Armenian peasant has lived from time immemorial the hard working life he was leading till the eve of this ultimate catastrophe. Here a strong, civilized Armenian kingdom was the first state in the world to adopt Christianity as its national religion... The Armenian is not only an industrious peasant; he has a talent for handicraft and intellectual pursuits... The Armenian has lost the undivided possession of his proper country... the original Armenia, east of the upper Euphrates and north of the Tigris... the intermittent sufferings of the Armenian race have culminated in an organized, cold-blooded attempt on the part of its Turkish rulers to exterminate it once and for all by methods of inconceivable barbarity and wickedness”[85, pp. 17-19].

2. This mention is from the previous publication (1989) of the book by Seton Lloyd; this part was not edited in the publication of 1999.

3. Iranian Azerbaijan, i.e. ancient Atropatene, to the south-east of Lake Urmia.

4. It is an incorrect opinion, because “Urartu” is an Assyrian form of the original Armenian name Ararat.

5. Seton Lloyd mentioned only Soviet Armenia, which included a part of Eastern Armenia.

6. An example of geographically incorrect presentation of archaeological data is the following interpretation. The territory characterized by the term “Golden Triangle” (the 11th-7th millennia BC) was denoted lying in Northern Syria, “southeast of Anatolia” and western Zagros [86, pp. 80-82]. But the expression “southeast of Anatolia” is wrongly used instead of the South-West of the Armenian Highland and the adjacent northern Mesopotamian territory, where archaeological monuments of the earliest civilizational significance were discovered [87].
called “eastern Anatolia” [88, pp. 547–562]. Falsifications are obvious, because “Anatolia” never covered territory larger than Asia Minor.

The most overwhelming contradictions in abortive attempts of the Turkish falsifiers and their accomplices to “revise history” in accordance with their maniacal “visions” are determined by the fact that their ancestors Seljuk and Oguz Turkic nomadic tribes1 (from the trans-Altai and trans-Aral regions) had violently invaded Armenia, the Byzantine Empire and the adjacent lands from the second half of the 60s of the 11th c., and the Ottomans - in the 13th c., thus they had no association with the ancient and medieval history or original toponymy of Armenia, Asia Minor, the territories on the left bank of the Kura3 and so on. Since the beginning of their invasions till the present time, devastations, plunder and annihilation of Armenian historical relics have been carried out on the lands occupied by those nomads and their savage descendants 4.

1 Alan Palmer noted: "Originally the Turks were nomadic horsemen from Central Asia..." [89, p. 2].
2 Their "eponym, 'Osmân, was the son of a certain Erroghrul who had led into Anatolia (Asia Minor - E.D.) a nameless band of Turkish refugees: an insignificant fragment of the human wreckage..." [90, p. 151]. Some expressions from this extract were wrongly changed by D.C. Somervell, so the meaning of this passage unjustifiably underwent a change in the abridged version of the book ("...of one Erroghrul the leader of a nameless band of refugees...") [91, p. 113].
3 The boundary between Great Armenia and Aluank proper (in Armenian sources) ("Albania", in antique sources) was along the Kura (1, XII, 3. 29). Paytakaran (the eleventh of the 15 provinces of Great Armenia [56, էջ 109]) was to the south of the Kura and the Eraskh (Arax) rivers, bordered on the south-east by the Caspian Sea and on the south by Atropatene.
4 The American journalist R. D. Kaplan witnessed the destruction of the Armenian civilization in Western Armenia, where he traveled, reaching Trebizunt. He wrote that except for an occasional ruin “every trace of Armenian civilization has been erased...” [92, p. 318]. At the dawn of the 21st century, after innumerable assaults of the previous decades, the surviving clusters of many thousand Armenian cross-stones (khachkars) in the Armenian Cemetery of Old Jugha (modern Julia) (in the ancient Armenian gavar Goghtan to the south-east of the Nahijjevan gavar) were destroyed, by the sanctions of the criminal Azerbaijani authorities [93]. New evidences of the programmed annihilation of the Armenian cultural heritage are the turning of Saint Arakelots (Apostles) Armenian Church into a mosque, the destruction of the old Armenian houses in Mush (in Taron gavar, Western Armenia) in 2013 [94] et al.
After the Artsakh Liberation War the defeated Azerbaijani aggressors and their henchmen cling to falsifications using them for the resumption of war propaganda. Anti-Armenian hostility and aggressive practice is characteristic to Azerbaijani “history” inventors fabricating a forged “history” in complete disregard of historical sources and the existing international research. V. Zakharov has criticized a number of Azerbaijani publications that falsify history of Armenia, Russia and other countries.

Completely falsified Azerbaijani school “history” textbooks are full of aggressiveness and hatred against Armenia, as evidenced in one of such

---

1 Anti-Armenian harangues by I. Aliev, the president of the Republic of Azerbaijan, are a manifestation of the state-sanctioned official policies intended to counterfeit history. At the annual general meeting of the NAS of Azerbaijan (26/04/2011) he ordered his “academician-historians” to increase the number of “solid scientific works that Nagorno Karabakh is an ancient and indigenous Azerbaijani land” [95]. Criticizing falsification mania that Azerbaijan’s president is possessed with, V. Zakharov wrote: “In the heat of the moment, Ilham Aliev resorts to anti-historical statements… for him, a graduate of Moscow State Institute of International Relations, it is a shame not to know history… The Azerbaijani leader on 20/11/2009 cynically declared: “…Irevan khanate, Zangezur makhal are Azerbaijani lands… The Armenian state was created on Azerbaijani soil. Now they want to create the second one. It defies all logic, the Azerbaijani people, the Azerbaijani state will never agree with it”. Condemning anti-historic fever of I. Aliev, V. Zakharov notes: “It is a shame to read this historical nonsense… The underlying meaning is evident in this speech: Aliev tries to substantiate the Azerbaijani side’s claims not only to Karabakh, but also to the territory of the Republic of Armenia” [96, c. 4, 53-58].

2 Azerbaijani aggressive leadership and pseudo-historians, following their Turkish “brethren”, also distort the history and geography of Armenia, fabricating the term “Western Azerbaijan”, as is seen, for example, from the antiscientific book “Monuments of Western Azerbaijan” published in Baku [97]. This bellicose ignorance is a complete falsification of the Armenian history. As notes R. Galichyan, “the editors of this megalomaniac fantasy are Azerbaijani academicians… who, contrary to their academic calling have carried deceit and fabrication to the extreme” [98, p. 12].

3 Their authors try to ascribe the history of neighbouring countries to artificial Azerbaijan, particularly, stealing the history of Armenia. In this sphere very active is the head of the president I. Aliev’s administration R. Mekhtiev. Paying attention to the absurdity of his notorious article “Goris-2010 the season of the theatre of the absurd” (it was republished from the newspaper «Бакинский рабочий» in a collection of articles [99, c. 7-51]. [The criticism of this absurd concoction see: 100; 101, c. 90-110]), V. Zakharov concluded: “Such literature is not read in any respectable western academic center. The Baku publication samples handed to participants of any forum, remain in hotel rooms or end up in dustbins” [96, c 130-150].
obscurantist “productions”: “Modern Armenia emerged on the territory of ancient Western Azerbaijan” [102, c. 4.]. But the fact is that only since the middle of 1918 the name “Azerbaijan” has been illegally and falsely applied to a territory (eastward from the Kura to the Caspian Sea shore) out of Iranian Azerbaijan. Thus, all the delirious stuff that the present-day Azerbaijani pseudo-historians fabricate about the so-called “Western” or “Northern Azerbaijan” is a complete gibberish.

1 Azerbaijani text-books’ fabrications are criticized sharply by Russian historians [103, c. 5-6, 24-26, 58, 69-70, 242]. Criticizing the attempts to eradicate historical memory, as a component of information warfare, it has been noted: “Current trends of manipulation and erasing the national memory prove that technologies of information-ontological warfare and “nation building” are most likely applied in this area” [104, б. 28].

2 This name has been stolen from Iranian Adarbaigan/Azerbaijan (ancient Atropatene, which historically has nothing to do with the present-day Republic of Azerbaijan). Ancient Atropatene was to the south-east of the Kingdom of Great Armenia (Strabo, XI, 13, 1). Centuries later, at the end of May 1918 appeared “Eastern-Caucasian Muslim Republic” [105, б. 285] or “the Tartar Republic of Azerbaijan” [106; 107] etc., as a result of pan-Turkic projects. The Musavatist bandit “state” with support of Turkish troops carried out hostile actions against the First Republic of Armenia and her native and integral part Artsakh. Artificial “Azerbaijan” had a heterogeneous population a part of which consisted of alien Turkic speaking Muslims. They were mentioned as “Caucasian” or “Transcaucasian Tatars” in the statistical materials (the late 19th c. – early 20th c.) of the former Russian Empire [108, п.14]. In the Soviet period (from 28 April 1920) artificially used name “Azerbaijan” again was sharply politicized with the aim of annexing Iranian Azerbaijan [109, c. 703, 775-776]. In the 1920s the Turkic-speaking part of the Azerbaijan SSR’s population was called “Turks” in official materials of the population census of the USSR [110, с. 440]. Only since the end of the 1930s appeared the term “Azerbaijanis” in the Azerbaijan SSR, according to the population census of the USSR [111, с.440] and a fabrication of history was intensified. “Azerbaijani” fakers distort the history of Armenia, proper Aluank (on the left bank of the Kura) and Iranian Atropatene. Permanent distortion of history by the Baku falsifiers poses a threat in the region. In the course of decades, the Iranian official circles, politicians and literary figures claiming “that this small region in the Caucasus… has another name and has never been called Azerbaijan”, protested against stealing the name of Iranian Azerbaijan [112, pp. 66-67; 98, п. 7]. As it is noted, “…Tehran has shown… extreme concern with prospects of the rise of sentiments calling for union between the “two Azerbaijans” ” [113, п. 61].

3 Azerbaijani pseudo-historians falsify the history and geography of Armenia with unbridled ignorance, distorting the Armenian name of Erebuni-Erevan and many other geographic names, and fabricate “history” for artificially shaped “Azerbaijan” that had been non-existent in ancient, medieval and modern times. For example, in her pseudo-scientific book F. Mamedova distorts history and geography, artificially narrowing the territory of Armenia and the Armenian Highland, thus wrongly applying the term “Albania” to the territory of Eastern Armenia, etc. Such manipulations with geographic names demonstrate her complete ignorance in history and historical geography. She falsifies geographic position of Armenia, writing: “Armenia is on the territory of Asia Minor”, “…Armenian principalities on the territory of Eastern Anatolia” [114, c. 15, 118, 195, 196, 646]. F. Mamedova’s book is a total mess, where history and geography are completely falsified.
Turkish falsification of the Armenian history, demolition and appropriation of the historical relics have gone in parallel with erasing Armenian place names, as an indication of the genocidal policy. The uprooting millennia-old original toponyms of Western Armenia and Kilikia has been carried out with the purpose to redraw their political-demographic mapping and to cover up the Armenian Genocide. The Turkish occupants are horrified of the Armenian place names of Western Armenia and Kilikia, which are the reminders of genocide and living evidence for reparations.

The governments of Turkey and Azerbaijan spend enormous financial resources for falsifications of the history and historic geography of Armenia. It shows the supreme power of authentic reality of the Armenian history, toponymy and the historic memory as overwhelming resources of national security.

Thus, the historical and geographical terminology of the Armenian Highland, constituting ontological integrity of the place names, belongs to the pivotal layer of the Armenian ethnolinguistic mentality. Toponyms represent the Armenian natural historic environment and cultural heritage’s significance, possessing fundamental importance. The guarantors of the Armenian toponyms’ protection are the Republic of Armenia and the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh (Artsakh).

**November, 2013**
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THE ARBITRAL AWARD ON TURKISH-ARMENIAN BOUNDARY
BY PRESIDENT OF THE USA WOODROW WILSON (NOV. 22, 1920)

[Historical Background, Legal Aspects and International Dimensions]

Jus est ars boni et aequi (lat.)
(The law is the art of the good and the just).

Papian A. A.
Head of Modus Vivendi Center

No other single issue has aroused as much passion and controversy and occupied the attention of the present Armenian public and political life as the relationship with Turkey. The claims of Armenians for moral satisfaction, financial indemnification and territorial readjustment, remain the longest, most intractable, and potentially one of the most dangerous unsolved problems of international relations and world community of the modern times.

The emergence of the Armenian state, the Republic of Armenia, and its presence on the world political stage as the successor of the first Armenian Republic (1918-1920), adds a critical dimension to the matter. The importance of this new dimension is based on the fact that as a subject of international law the Republic of Armenia is in full power and has all legal rights to pursue the implementation of the legal instruments and to insist on the fulfillment of international obligations assumed by the Turkish states, the Republic of Turkey or the Ottoman Empire, as a legal predecessor of the Turkish Republic.

One must analyze all relevant legal instruments, i.e. bilateral and multilateral treaties, Woodrow Wilson’s Arbitral Award, diplomatic documents and international papers, resolutions of international organizations, recommendations of special missions, decisions of law-determining agencies (particularly of the International Court of Justice), the opinions of authoritative institutions to clarify the legal state of Armenian-Turkish confrontation and determinate the legal aspects of the Armenian claims regarding Turkey.

Due to final and binding character of the arbitral awards one should begin with the elaboration of the legal instruments with the Arbitral Award of the President of the United States of America Woodrow Wilson (November 22, 1920).

Arbitration as a procedure for peaceful settlement of disputes between the States

Arbitration exists under both domestic and international law, and arbitration can be carried out between private individuals, between states, or between states and private individuals. Arbitration is a legal alternative to the courts whereby the parties in a dispute agree to submit their respective positions (through agreement or hearing) to a neutral third party - the arbitrator(s) for resolution.
International Public Arbitration (hereinafter - Arbitration) is an effective legal procedure for dispute settlement between the states\(^1\). According to 1953 report of the International Law Commission\(^2\), arbitration is a procedure for the settlement of disputes between States by a binding award on the basis of law and as a result of an undertaking voluntary accepted\(^3\). The essential elements of Arbitration consist of: 1) An agreement on the part of States having a matter, or several matters, in dispute, to refer the decision of them to a tribunal, believed to be impartial, and constituted in such a way as the terms of the agreement specify, and to abide by its judgment; and 2) Consent on the part of the person, persons, or states, nominated for the tribunal, to conduct the inquiry and to deliver judgment\(^4\).

Arbitration has been practiced already in antiquity and in the Middle Ages. The history of modern arbitration is usually considered to begin with the treaty of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States of 1794, (Jay’s Treaty - Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation, between His Britannic Majesty and the United States of America, by their President, Signed on 19 November, 1794, ratified on June 24, 1795\(^5\). The rules of arbitration were codified by The Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, concluded on July 29, 1899 and very slightly amended in the Convention of the same name concluded on October 18, 1907 (entered into force January 26, 1910). The Hague Convention (Article 15 of 1899 and article 37 of 1907) defines international arbitration as: the settlement of disputes between States by judges of their own choice and on the basis of respect of law\(^6\).

The Covenant of the League of Nations (Article 13) provides arbitration and judicial settlement as one of two major procedures of peaceful settlements: The Members of the League agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration\(^7\).

The Charter of the United Nations (Article 33, paragraph 1) expresses its preference for a dispute settlement through arbitration: The parties in any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace an security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial

---

4 Sheldon Amos, Political & Legal Remedies for War, London-Paris-New York, 1880, pp. 164-165.
6 The Hague Court Reports (James Brown Scott, ed.), New York, 1916, LVI-LVII.
settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

**The Historical Background of Wilson’s Arbitration**

On January 19, 1920, the Supreme Council of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers in Paris (Prime Ministers of Great Britain, France and Italy; respectively Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Nitti)\(^8\) agreed to recognize the government of the Armenian State as a *de facto* government on the condition that the recognition should not prejudge the question of the eventual frontier\(^9\). The United States recognized the *de facto* government of the Republic of Armenia on April 23, 1920\(^10\), on the condition that the territorial frontiers should be left for later determination\(^11\).

On April 26, 1920, the Supreme Council (including this time the Japanese Ambassador to Paris Matsui as well) meeting at San Remo requested: a) The United States to assume mandate over Armenia; b) The President of the United States to make an Arbitral Decision to fix the boundaries of Armenia with Turkey\(^12\): *The Supreme Council hopes that, however the American Government may reply to the wider matter of the Mandate, the President will undertake this honourable duty not only for the sake of the country chiefly concerned but for that of the peace of the Near East*\(^13\).

On May 17, 1920, the Secretary of State informed the American Ambassador in France that the President had agreed to act as arbitrator\(^14\). In mid-July the State Department began to assemble a team of experts for the assignment: *The Committee upon the Arbitration of the Boundary between Turkey and Armenia*. *The Boundary Committee* was headed by Professor William Westermann, his key associates were Lawrence Martin and Harrison G. Dwight. As the Treaty of Sevres was signed on August 10, 1920, *The Boundary Committee* began its deliberations.

The guidelines adopted by the committee were to draw the southern and western boundaries of Armenia on the basis of a combination of ethnic, religious, economic, geographic, and military factors. *The Committee* had at its disposal all the papers of *The American Peace Delegation* and *The Harbord Mission*, the files of the Department of State, War, and Interior, and the cartological services of the United States Geological Survey. Aside from the advice of experts in government service and direct consultations with General Harbord, *The Committee* sought input of missionaries and others with field

---


\(^11\) Hackworth, op. cit., p. 715.

\(^12\) The Treaties of Peace, 1919-1923 (Preface by Lt. – Col. Lawrence Martin), vol. I, New York, 1924, XXXII.

\(^13\) FRUS, p. 780.

\(^14\) Ibid., p. 783.
experience who could give detailed information about the ethnic makeup of particular villages near the border; the roads and markets connecting certain villages, towns, and cities, and specific physical landmarks.

The *Full Report of the Committee upon the Arbitration of the Boundary between Turkey and Armenia* was submitted to the Department of State on September 28, 1920, five months after the Allied Supreme Council's invitation to President Wilson. The report defined the area submitted for arbitration, the sources available to and used by the Committee, the principles and bases on which the work had proceeded, the need for the inclusion of Trebizond (Trapezunt) to guarantee unimpeded access to the sea, the desirability of demilitarization frontier line, the character of the resulting Armenian state, the immediate financial outlook of Armenia, and the existing political situation in the Near East. The seven appendices of the report included the documents relative to the arbitration, the maps used in drawing the boundaries, issue of Kharput (Kharberd), the question of Trebizond, the status of the boundary between Turkey and Persia, the military situation in relation to Armenia, and the financial position of those parts of the four vilayets (Armenian provinces) assigned to Armenia.

Insofar as the four provinces in question were concerned, the key factors were geography, economy, and ethnography. Historic and ethical considerations were passed over. The committee tried to draw boundaries in which the Armenian element, when combined with the inhabitants of the exiting state (the Republic of Armenia) in Russian Armenia, would constitute almost half of total population and within few years from an absolute majority in nearly all districts. Such calculations took into account the wartime deportations and massacres of the Armenians, Muslim losses during the war, as well as the probability that some part of the remaining Muslim population would take advantage of the provisions of the peace treaty regarding voluntary relocation to territories that were to be left to Turkey or to an autonomous Kurdistan.

The Territory that was being allocated to Armenia by arbitration (40,000 square miles = 103,599 square kilometers) was less than half of the territory (108,000 square miles = 279,718 square kilometers), which in cuneiform, ancient Greek and Latin, medieval Armenian and other European sources and maps throughout centuries had largely been called Armenia (as the historical title). Since 1878 it had continued to hold the legal title

---

15 For the Full Report with relative materials, see US Archives, General Records of the Department of State (Decimal file, 1910-1920), RG 59, RG 59, 760.6715/65.

16 The Armenian Genocide.

17 The notion of an historic title is well known in international law. Historic title is a title that has been so long established by common repute that this common knowledge is itself a sufficient title. Since the 17th c. in the Ottoman sources and maps Armenia's name (in the form of Ermenistan) and Armenian toponyms had been periodically mentioned (see: Galichian R., Historic Maps of Armenia. The Cartographic Heritage, London, 2004), but simultaneously, in the course of time falsification and destruction of Armenian toponyms constituted part of the Ottoman
Armenia or The Six Armenian vilayets (provinces), as was defined in the Article 24 of the Mudros Armistice. It should be underlined that the territory was referred just as The six Armenian vilayets not The six Armenian vilayets of the Ottoman Empire.

The drastic cutback of the territory for Armenians was due to far-reaching reduction of native Armenian population because of the Turkish policy of annihilation of Armenians - the Armenian Genocide. The Armenian provisions of the Sevres Treaty were agreed upon by the Powers after due consideration of the facts that Turkish Armenia was emptied of its Armenian inhabitants.

The committee made calculations, based on prewar statistics, that the population of the territories to be included in the new Armenian state had been 3,570,000 of whom Muslims (Turks, Kurds, “Tartars”, and others) had formed 49%, Armenians 40%, Lazes 5%, Greeks 4%, and other groups 1%. It was anticipated that large numbers of Armenian refugees and exiles would return to an independent Armenia. Hence, after the first year of repatriation and readjustment, the population of the Armenian Republic would be around 3 million, of whom Armenians would make up 50%, Muslims 40%, Lazes 6%, Greeks 3%, and other groups 1%. The rise in the absolute number and proportion of Armenians was expected to increase steadily and rapidly in subsequent years.

Even though Westermann’s boundary committee submitted its findings to the Department of State on September 28, 1920, two more months were to pass before President Wilson relayed his arbitration decision to the Allied governments. The State Department: 1) sent the committee’s report to the War Department for its observations, and 2) requested through Ambassador Hugh Wallace in Paris formal notification from the Allied Supreme Council about the signing of the Treaty of Sevres and an authenticated copy of the document. It was only on November 12, 1920, that The Committee’s Report was finally delivered to the White House.

Ten days later, on November 22, 1920, Woodrow Wilson signed the final Report, titled: Decision of the President of the United States of America respecting the Frontier between Turkey and Armenia, Access for Armenia to the Sea, and the Demilitarization of Turkish Territory adjacent to the Armenian Frontier.

expansionist policy (Sahakyan L., Turkification of the Toponyms in the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey, Montreal, 2011).
22 Ibid., p. 40.
24 Ibid., p. 31; Hackworth, op. cit., p. 715.
The Full Report of the Committee upon the Arbitration of the Boundary between Turkey and Armenia (The Report - 89 pages, and Appendices to the Report - 152 pages) consists of ten chapters:

1. Chapter I. The Request for the Arbitral Decision of President Wilson, pp. 1-3. (An overview of the Pre-Arbitration Process)
2. Chapter II. Strict Limitations of the Area Submitted to the Arbitration of President Wilson, pp. 4-6. (Definition of the area submitted for arbitration)
3. Chapter III. Sources of Information Available to the Committee Formulating this Report, pp. 7-9. (The sources available to and used by the committee)
4. Chapter IV. Factors Used as the Basis of the Boundary Decision, pp. 10-15. (The principles and bases on which the work had proceeded)
5. Chapter V. The Necessity of Supplying an Unimpeded Sea Terminal in Trebizond Sandjak, pp. 16-23. (The need for the inclusion of Trebizond in the new Armenian state)
6. Chapter VI. Provisions for Demilitarization of Adjacent Turkish Territory, pp. 24-36. (The desirability of demilitarization frontier line)
7. Chapter VI. Covering Letter of the President Wilson to the Supreme Council and the Arbitral Decision of President Wilson, pp. 38-65. (The Arbitral Award of the President with attached letter)
8. Chapter VIII. Area, Population and Economic Character of the New State of Armenia, pp. 66-73. (The character of the resulting Armenian state)
9. Chapter IX. The Present Political Situation in the Near East, pp. 74-83. (The existing political state of affairs in the Near East)
10. Chapter X. Immediate Financial Outlook of the Republic of Armenia, pp. 84-86. (The financial prospect of Armenia)

Maps: Boundary between Turkey and Armenia as determined by Woodrow Wilson President, President of the United States of America, November 22, 1920:

Scale - 1: 1,000,000.
Scale - 1: 200,000 (19 sheets).

The seven appendices of the report included:

Appendix I. Documents upon the Request for the Arbitral Decision.
No. 3. Note from the French Ambassador at Washington, March 12, 1920.
No. 4. Mr. Colby’s Reply to the above, March 24, 1920.
No. 5. American Recognition of Armenia, April 23, 1920.
No. 6-10. Telegrams from San Remo, April 24-27, 1920.
No. 11. The President’s Acceptance of the Invitation to Arbitrate, May 17, 1920.

Appendix II. (Is not available).
Appendix III. Maps Used in Determining the Actual Boundaries of the Four Vilayets and in Drawing the frontier of Armenia.

Appendix IV. The Question of Kharpur. Discussion of the Possibility of Including Kharpur in the Boundary Decision.

Appendix V. The Necessity of supplying an Unimpeded Sea Terminal in Trebizond Sandjak.

No. 2. Railroad Project for Turkish Armenia before the War (Karshut Valley).
No. 3. M. Venizelos' Statement on Trebizond before the Council of Ten (February 4, 1919).
No. 4. M. Venizelos' Statement on Trebizond before the Greek Parliament (May 13, 1920).
No. 5. The Petition of the Pontic Greeks (July 10, 1920).
No. 7. General Discussion of Armenia's Access to the Sea.
No. 8. Text of the Armenian Minorities Treaty.
No. 9. The Petition to President Wilson from the Armenian Delegation.
Appendix VI. (Is not available).
Appendix VII. Status of the Old Boundary between Turkey and Persia, at the Point where the Boundary Between Turkey (Autonomous Area of Kurdistan) and Armenia Joins it.
Appendix VIII. (Is not available).
Appendix X. Financial Position of the Portion of the Four Vilayets Assigned to the New State of Armenia.

MAPS
1. Boundaries of Armenia, as proposed by the London Inter-Allied Commission of February 1920 (See Appendix I, No. 2).
2. Armenian Claims (See Appendix IV).
   Original Claim of the Armenian National Delegation at the Peace Conference;
   Reduced Claim of the two Armenian Delegations, since January, 1920;
   Boundary established by President Wilson's Decision.
3. Claims of the Pontic Greeks (See Appendix V, Nos. 3, 4, 5).
   Original Claim at Peace Conference; Reduced Claim, 1920;
   Greek Territory in Thrace and in Smyrna District Boundary established by President Wilson's Decision.
4. Armenia's Routes of Access to the Sea (See Appendix V, Nos. 2, 4, 9).
   Trebizond-Erzerum Caravan Route;
Trebizond-Erzerum Railway Project;
Western frontier Essential to Armenia.

5. Armenia in Relation to the new Turkish Empire (See Appendix IX).
Frontiers of Turkey as established by the Treaty of Sèvres and by President Wilson’s Decision;
Areas of Especial Interest as established by the Tripartite Convention of August 10, 1920, between Great Britain, France and Italy;
Existing Railways.

In the cover letter to the Supreme Council, Wilson wrote: With full consciousness of the responsibility placed upon me by the request, I have approached this difficult task with eagerness to serve the best interests of the Armenian people as well as the remaining inhabitants, of whatever race or religious belief they may be, in this stricken country, attempting to exercise also the strictest possible justice toward the populations, whether Turkish, Kurdish, Greek or Armenian, living in the adjacent areas.\(^{25}\)

The text of the Arbitration Decision, reasonably not The Full Report, was cabled to Ambassador Wallace in Paris on November 24, 1920, with instructions that it should be handed to the Secretary General of the Peace Conference for submission to the Allied Supreme Council.\(^{26}\) Wallace responded on December 7, 1920, that he had delivered the documents that morning. Wallace’s attached note was dated December 6, 1920.

So under the Arbitral Award of November 22, 1920, the boundary between Armenia and Turkey was settled conclusively and Turkish-Armenian international boundary was subsequently delimited\(^{27}\), as clearly states The Hague Convention\(^{28}\) (article 54 of the 1899; article 81 of the 1907): The Award, duly pronounced and notified to the agents of the parties, settles [puts an end to] the dispute definitively and without appeal.\(^{29}\)

The Validity of the Arbitral Award

For the Arbitral Award to be valid it must meet certain criteria:
1) The arbitrators must not have been subjected to any undue external influence such as coercion, bribery or corruption;
2) The production of proofs must have been free from fraud and the proofs produced must not have contained any essential errors;
3) The compromis must have been valid;

\(^{25}\) For the full text of Wilson’s letter see: FRUS, v. III: 790-795.

\(^{26}\) Ibid., pp. 789-790.

\(^{27}\) Cukwurah A.O., op. cit., p. 31; Hackworth, op. cit., p. 715.

\(^{28}\) The 1899 Convention was ratified by Turkey on July 12, 1907. (The Hague Court Reports, op. cit., CII).

\(^{29}\) The Hague Court Reports, op. cit.:LXXXIX. Cf. also the Article # 54 of the 1899 Convention with slightly deferent wording: The Award, duly pronounced & notified to the agents of the parties [at variance, puts an end to] the dispute definitively & without appeal.
4) The arbitrators must not have exceeded their powers\(^{30}\).

**Criterion 1.** The arbitrators must not have been subjected to any undue external influence such as coercion, bribery or corruption.

In Armenian-Turkish boundary case the arbitrator, as was agreed in the compromis (i.e. Article 89, the Treaty of Sèvres), was the President of the United States, namely Woodrow Wilson. President Wilson was often challenged for his policy and had various disagreements with other politicians and political bodies. Nevertheless, never has anyone questioned his political or personal integrity and he was never blamed acting under external influence.

Conclusion: It is apparent and doubtless that the arbitrator have not been subjected to any undue external influence, to coercion, bribery or corruption.

**Criterion 2.** The production of proofs must have been free from fraud and the proofs produced must not have contained any essential errors.

As mentioned above, for the assignment the State Department organized (mid-July 1920) a special task group, which was officially named: Committee upon the Arbitration of the Boundary between Turkey and Armenia.

The head of The Committee was William Linn Westermann, professor of the University of Wisconsin and Columbia University (1923-48), a prominent expert in the history and politics of the Near and Middle East. In 1919 he had been the chief of the Western Asia division of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace in Paris\(^{31}\). The principal collaborators and contributors in the committee were Major (Dr.) Lawrence Martin of the Army General Staff, who had participated as the geographer of the Harbord Mission, and Harrison G. Dwight of the Near Eastern division of the Department of State\(^{32}\).

All experts in the task group were knowledgeable, experienced and impartial professionals. After over two months of intensive and thorough work, at the end of September 1920, the task group produced a Full Report of the Committee upon the Arbitration of the Boundary between Turkey and Armenia.

The Report was sent to the War Department for its observations on September 28, 1920. After seven weeks of comprehensive and scrupulous observations the committee’s report was finally delivered to the White House on November 12, 1920. Ten days later, on November 22, 1920, Woodrow Wilson signed the final report, and officially delivered the award through the US Embassy in Paris on December 6, 1920.

President Wilson’s Award is highly regarded by international lawyers at present. Cf.: President Wilson’s arbitral decision was not implemented. Nevertheless, this award must be regarded as one of the most significant analyses of the various factors that have to be


\(^{32}\) Ibid.
taken into account in the determination of international boundaries and of the relationship among them\(^{33}\). Cf. also: President Wilson’s determination of the territorial frontiers of the newly established Armenian State is particularly interesting because it includes an explanation of the reasons motivating it: the need for a “natural frontier”; “geographical and economic unity for the new state”; ethic and religious factors of the population were taken account of so far as compatible; security, and the problem of access to the sea, were other important conditions\(^{34}\).

Conclusion: The arbitral award was drawn by respectful and well-informed experts, and, in addition, passed through the United States Government’s two relevant department’s scrutiny and inspection. It is obvious that the State Department and the Department of War were capable of excluding any fraud or to notice any essential error in the production of proofs. Finally the award was signed by the US President, who would never tolerate any misconduct.

**Criterion 3.** The compromis must have been valid.
There are several factors that prove the validity of the compromis.
Factor a) The compromis was duly incorporated in the treaty.

The consent of States to submit a dispute to arbitration may be expressed in different ways: a) by a special arbitration treaty or compromis; b) by the inclusion in any treaty of a special arbitration clause providing for arbitration of any dispute between the parties, which might arise in connection with the application of that treaty; c) by a general treaty of arbitration according to which the parties undertake to submit to arbitration all, or certain kinds, of disputes between them which might arise in the future\(^{35}\).

The consent of Armenia and Turkey, as well as of other High Contracting Parties to submit to the arbitration of the President of the United States the determination of the frontier to be fixed between Turkey and Armenia, and to be bound by the award to accept his decision thereupon was done by the inclusion of a special arbitration clause in the Treaty of Sèvres (August 10, 1920), [Article 89]: Turkey and Armenia as well as the other High Contracting Parties agree to submit to the arbitration of the President of the United States of America the question of the frontier to be fixed between Turkey and Armenia in the Vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van and Bitlis, and to accept his decision thereupon, as well as any stipulations he may prescribe as to access for Armenia to the sea, and as to the demilitarization of any portion of Turkish territory adjacent to the said frontier\(^{36}\).

---


\(^{34}\) Munkman A. L. W., Adjudication & Adjustment – International Judicial Decision & the Settlement of Territorial & Boundary Disputes, Malcolm N. Show (ed.), Title to Territory, Dartmouth, 2005, p. 139, fn. 4.


\(^{36}\) The official full text of the Treaty of Sevres was published in British & Foreign State Papers, 1920, vol. CXIII, printed & published by His Majesty's Stationary Office, London, 1923, pp. 652-776 (hereinafter – British Papers) and separately, as
Factor b) The compromis was duly negotiated.

In a joint note, on April 20, 1920, the Allied High Commissioners in Constantinople (Istanbul) summoned the Turkish authorities to send a Peace Delegation to receive the draft peace treaty. The Ottoman delegation, headed by Senator Tevfik Pasha (Bey) [former Grand Vezier] left for Paris in May 1, 1920\textsuperscript{37}. Ten days later, on May 11, it was formally given the draft peace treaty. Turkish Government was accorded one month to submit in writing any observations or objections it might have relative to the treaty\textsuperscript{38}. Tevfik Bey officially acknowledged the receipt of the treaty and pronounced that the document would be given the earnest and immediate attention of his government\textsuperscript{39}. At the end of May, Damad Ferid, the Grand Vezier of Turkey, applied to the Supreme Council for one-month extension in presenting the Turkish observations on the settlement. The Supreme Council compromised by granting a 2-week extension until June 25, 1920\textsuperscript{40}.

The first set of Turkish observations, bearing the signature of Damad Ferid Pasha, was submitted on June 25, 1920. On July 7 second Turkish memorandum was received. In adopting a reply Supreme Council authorized the drafting committee to make minor revisions on the wording of the treaty without altering the substance\textsuperscript{41}. Regarding the future of Armenia and the arbitration of the boundaries, the Supreme Council stated: they can make no change in the provisions which provide for the creation of a free Armenia within boundaries which the President of the United States will determine as fair and just\textsuperscript{42}. The certitude that Armenians will not be safe and will not be treated fairly by Turkish authorities was based on lifelong understanding that: During the past twenty years Armenians have been massacred under conditions of unexampled barbarity, and during the war the record of the Turkish Government in massacre, in deportation and in maltreatment of prisoners of war immeasurably exceeded even its own previous record (...) Not only has the Turkish government failed to protect its subjects of other races from pillage, outrage and murder, but there is abundant evidence that it has been responsible for directing and organizing savagery against people to whom it owed protection\textsuperscript{43}.

The Allied response was delivered to the Turkish delegation on July 17, 1920.

\textsuperscript{39} British Papers, vol. XIII, p. 70.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p. 79.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., vol. VIII, pp. 553-556.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
Factor c) The compromis was signed by authorized representatives of a lawful government.

In 1918-1922, Sultan-Caliph Mehmed VI was the head of the Ottoman Empire, politically recognized legitimate ruler\textsuperscript{44}. Sultan represents the \textit{de jure} Government\textsuperscript{45}. Pursuant to article 3 of the Ottoman constitution [December 23, 1876; July 23, 1908]: \textit{The Ottoman sovereignty (…) belongs to the eldest Prince of the House of Ottomans}. Treaty making power was vested in the Sultan. The Sultan had the sole power to legislate. Among the sovereign rights of the Sultan (the Ottoman Constitution, article 7) was the conclusion of the treaties.

On July 22, 1920, Sultan Mehmed VI, the constitutional head of the state, convened a \textit{Suray-I Saltanat} (Crown Council), at the Yildiz Palace. The argument for signature was based on the \textit{necessities of the situation}. The Council, which was attended by fifty prominent Turkish political & military figures, including former ministers, senators and generals, as well as by Prime Minister Damad Ferid Pasha, recommended in favor of signing the treaty. The Sultan rounded up the proceedings by asking those in favor of signature to stand up. Everybody but one stood up. The Treaty was accepted\textsuperscript{46}. The final treaty, including the arbitral clause [Article 89] was signed by Turkish plenipotentiaries [General Haadi Pasha, Senator; Riza Tevfik Bey, Senator; Rechad Haliss Bey, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Turkey at Berne] sent by the Sultan’s Government at Constantinople under the leadership of Damad Ferid Pasha\textsuperscript{47}.

Conclusion: The compromis was valid.

\textbf{Criterion 4. The arbitrators must not have exceeded their powers.}

The compromis [Article 89 of the Sèvres Treaty] asked the arbitrator: 1) to fix the frontier between Turkey and Armenia in the Vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van and Bitlis, 2) to provide access for Armenia to sea, 3) to prescribe stipulations for the demilitarization of Turkish territory adjacent to the Turkish-Armenian frontier.

President Woodrow Wilson strictly remained within the assignment which has been prescribed by compromis. Even there was a strong pressure on him by missionary groups to include town of Karpurt and vicinities in the future Republic of Armenia, but Wilson did not exceed his powers.

Conclusion: The official title of President Wilson’s decision clearly shows that he accurately fulfilled his duty.

\textbf{Legal Features and the Current Status of the Award}

\textsuperscript{44} Toynbee A. I., Kenneth P. Kirkwood, Turkey, New York, 1927, p. 151.
\textsuperscript{45} Armstrong H., Turkey in Travail, The Birth of a New Nation, London, 1925, p. 113.
\textsuperscript{46} Salahi Ramsdan Sonyel, Turkish Diplomacy 1918-1923, Mustafa Kemal and the Turkish National Movement, London, 1975, p. 82.
a) Though the arbitration mainly is done out of courts, but it is a legal procedure. The arbitration is based either upon contract law or, in the case of international arbitration, the law of treaties, and the agreement between the parties to submit their dispute to arbitration is a legally binding contract. Thus, the indispensable feature of an arbitration is that it produces an award that is final and binding: *The arbitral award is the final and binding decision by an arbitrator in the full settlement of a dispute*\(^{48}\). By agreeing to submit the dispute to arbitration, i.e. *compromis*\(^{49}\), the parties in advance agree to accept the decision\(^{50}\).

b) Pursuant to Article 89 of the Treaty of Sèvres, the arbitral clause was endorsed by *the other High Contracting Parties*, so the issue of determination of the boundary was submitted to the arbitration on behalf of all state-signatories of the Treaty of Sèvres as well. As the Treaty of Sèvres was signed by lawful representatives (*having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form*) of the 18 countries (The British Empire [separately] 1. United Kingdom, 2. Canada, 3. Australia, 4. New Zealand, 5. Union of South Africa, 6. India\(^\text{51}\), 7. France, 8. Italy and 9. Japan [as Principal Allied Powers], as well as by 10. Armenia, 11. Belgium, 12. Greece, 13. Poland, 14. Portugal, 15. Romania, 16. Kingdom of Serbs-Croats-Slovenes\(^\text{52}\), and 17. Czecho-Slovak Republic\(^\text{53}\) of the one part and 18. Turkey of the other part), and they pledged to accept the decision thereupon. Thus, it is definitely compulsory arbitration and is obligatory for all of them.

c) Once arbitration has been properly executed it becomes irrevocable. It employs the legal doctrine of *Res Judicata (finality of judgments)*, which holds that once a legal claim has come to final conclusion it can never again be litigated\(^{54}\). The doctrine of *res judicata* is considered applicable to all arbitral awards, whether the special agreement or general treaty of arbitration contains such a provision or not.

d) The arbitral awards and court judgments are similar in their nature, as both are based on law\(^{55}\). They both are legal decisions. Therefore, the Doctrine of Collateral Estoppel, which affirms that an issue, which has already been legally duly determined, cannot be reopened or litigated again in a subsequent proceeding, applies in arbitration cases as well\(^{56}\).

e) If an arbitration party conforms the award or, by lack of any action in a reasonable period, never confront the award, which believed to be a tacit agreement, the award

\(^{48}\) A Dictionary of Arbitration & its Terms, op. cit.: 32.

\(^{49}\) The *compromis* is the arbitration agreement between sovereign States which empowers them to arbitrate an existing dispute (A Dictionary of Arbitration & its Terms, op. cit., p. 54).

\(^{50}\) Ibid., p. 27.

\(^{51}\) At present: India, Pakistan and Bangladesh.

\(^{52}\) At present: Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Macedonia and Montenegro.

\(^{53}\) At present: Czech Republic & Slovak Republic.

\(^{54}\) A Dictionary of Arbitration and its Terms, op. cit., p. 198.

\(^{55}\) Manual of Public International Law, op. cit., p. 584.

\(^{56}\) A Dictionary of Arbitration & its Terms, op. cit., p. 49.
considered valid and biding. It is thereafter precluded from going back on that recognition and challenging the validity of the award [Arbitral Award by the King of Spain (1960) International Court of Justice, Rep. 213]57.

Turkey never has challenged the validity of President Wilson’s arbitral award, never started any action for cancellation of the award, and by lack of any action gave its tacit agreement, therefore the award is absolutely and definitely valid and binding.

f) The arbitration decisions engage the parties for an unlimited period58. The validity of the arbitration is not dependent upon its subsequent implementation.

g) The President is the representative authority in the United States, his voice is the voice of the nation59. The President’s representative character also implies that all official utterances of the President are of international cognizance and are presumed to be authoritative60. Foreign nations must accept the assertion of the President as final61. By virtue of the arbitrator’s position the award is binding for the US as well.

h) Annulment (nullification of the legality) of an arbitral award occurs only when there is some authoritative public or judicial confirmation of the ground for such an annulment. This confirmation might come from an international agency such as the International Court of Justice. Confirmation of the ground of an annulment might also be based on international public opinion deriving from general principals of law common to all nations62. Refusal by the losing party to comply with the award is not in itself equivalent to a lawful annulment. The plea of nullity is not admissible at all and this view is based upon Article 81 of The Hague Convention I of 1907, and the absence of any international machinery to declare an award null and void63.

Conclusions

Territorial disputes, even when they are of law intensity, continue to represent a significant threat to the international peace and security. It is particularly true of those conflicts that remain unresolved for a long time, allowing the rational bases of settlement to be layered by painful emotions. For example, Ararat is not a mere mountain for Armenians. It is not a number of million tones of stone, soil and snow. It’s the core of the Armenian national and Biblical-Christian identity. Thus, the Turkish captivity of Ararat and the world ignorance of the fact have grown into a very considerable psychological factor, which is impossible to ignore.

60 Ibid., p. 37.
61 Ibid., p. 38.
After the arbitral award of the President of the USA (signed on 22 November 22, 1920, and duly notified on December 6, 1920) the presence and all acts taken by the Turkish Republic in the *Wilsonian Armenia* are, in fact, illegal and invalid. Consequently, in spite of the long standing occupation Turkey does not possess any legal title to the territory, and its *de facto* sovereignty is not more than an administrative control by force of arms. Belligerent occupation does not yield lawful rule over a territory. A single act of control is not enough to establish a transfer of title as Turkey might hope. Not even continuous occupation since 1920/1, forced changed demography of the territories and practices (turkification of the ancient Armenian names of the localities, towns, villages, districts, etc.) aiming at altering the heritage and the character of the country would help Turkey get the title.

The Arbitral Award of the President of the United States never was revoked and it can’t be done. There is not a single legal instrument that conceded *Wilsonian Armenia* to Turkey. Furthermore, the boundary between Armenia and Turkey, as determined by President of the United States, was reconfirmed by the Republic of Turkey by virtue Article 16 of the Treaty of Lausanne (July 24, 1923). By the Treaty of Lausanne, which is considered *birth certificate of the Republic of Turkey*, Turkey and other High Contracting Parties recognized the Turkish title only over the territories situated inside the frontiers *laid down* in the Treaty of Lausanne. No frontier was laid down between Armenia and Turkey, thus, *Wilsonian Armenia* defiantly and evidently was not included in the Republic of Turkey. By renouncing all *rights and title* over territories *situated outside the frontiers laid down* in the Treaty of Lausanne, the Republic of Turkey renounced its title *whatsoever* over *Wilsonian Armenia* and by virtue of international treaty reconfirmed the legal effects of the arbitral award of the President of the United States: *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 those territories and islands being settled or to be settled by the parties concerned* (*Article 16*).

It is true that Armenia possesses the legal validity to the *Wilsonian Armenia*, but it is also true that legal validity by itself will not lead to a solution. Indeed, Armenia is the *de jure* holder of the title and Turkey grips the control, and none would relinquish its claims, based on Armenian side on the legal validity and on Turkish side on the military power. There is no doubt that international law is the only way to bring about a just and peaceful resolution, thus a durable and permanent solution.
On August 1, 1914, World War I broke out. It lasted for four years. 33 states were involved. The principal role-players, however, were two hostile military-political blocks, formed at the end of the XIX - beginning of the 20th century: the Entente, with its core England, France and Russia, and the Central Powers - Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey (October 29). 1.5 billion people, or 75% of the world population was drawn into the war, mobilized were 74 million. The death toll amounted to 10 million, plus 20 million injured in the military operations at various war stages.

World War I was the most tragic event in the history of mankind, which, certainly, did not go past the Armenian people. It was exactly in the years of World War I, when the first genocide of the 19th century - Armenocide - was committed. And in our opinion, the Armenian Genocide attaches a unique shade to the slaughter of 1914-1918, stressing even more the global tragedy of the human being.

The Genocide of 1915 derived from the brutal, nationalistic, carnivorous and rapacious policy, pursued by the Turkish sultans and, later, the Young Turks against the non-Turkish nations, particularly, Armenians, during the preceding decades, if not centuries. It was not a policy of individuals, but an official state policy, whose pendulum swung between persecution and carnage.\(^1\)

The Ottoman Empire, as was mentioned, was a horrendous prison, or, rather, a dungeon of nations. In this sense, interesting is the opinion of the modern Egyptian thinker and historian, professor Mohammad Shakik Gharbal. He has studied the history of the Ottoman Empire and the policy of the Turkish government towards the non-Turkish nations, including Egyptians and other Arabic peoples. Gharbal, himself an Arab intellectual, is quite knowledgeable about Islam and the laws of Islam, and among them - Shariah. Based on his own wealth of knowledge and awareness of the Ottoman realities, he specified the anatomy of the Ottoman state and society, which, undoubtedly, can help shed light on the causes of the Armenian Genocide, too. He believes that “the fiasco, stagnation and decay of the Ottoman Empire are reasoned by the fact that it

had not anchored on any new religious, or political, or social ideas; instead, it rested upon war and expansion, and did not open its doors for the great number of his rayyas, confessing different religions and belonging to different nations”.

In our opinion, the characterization of the Ottoman Empire, made by the Egyptian author, quite precisely describes the condition of that rotten body. Firstly, Mohammad Shakik Gharbal points out, that Turkey was not anxious to seek and rely on any new ideas, but chose the old and beaten path of wars, subjugations and violence.

Secondly, it had never occurred to the rulers of the Ottoman Empire to change, at least to some extent, the status of its Christian citizens, rayyas, or, as it were, slaves, to open a door for them, to give them a grain of hope. Their firm conviction was that a rayya should remain a rayya. An attitude like this could not but lead to a tragedy for the Christian peoples (persecutions, violence, slaughters, genocide) on the one hand, and decay, and, finally, the collapse of the Empire per se, on the other. For a state with an anatomy like that, genocide was a matter-of-course, and it was perpetrated against Western Armenians.

With time, a dense stratum of Turks, Kurds and Circassians, matured in killings and slaughters, were formed in the Ottoman Empire. It was a kind of specialty for them, a mode of life, a never exhausting illegal way to heap up wealth. At the same time, it was a way for them to secure a certain place and position in the Ottoman state hierarchy. This particular stratum was one of the most interested parties in the Armenian Genocide; they were both the support and perpetrators of the Armenocide.

One thing should be also taken into account: the slaughters of Assyrians, Arabs, Bulgarians, Armenians, Greeks, Serbs and other Slavs, periodically organized in the Ottoman Empire, resulted in the society getting used to the massacres of the non-Turkish peoples. The most violent and bloody individual killings and mass murders would not even serve cause for riots or any opposition among the Turks, because they accepted it as ordinary.

In such a country and under the existing conditions, it was easy to mobilize the numerous dark, retrograde and bloodthirsty forces to plan and perpetrate not only mass murders and national purges, but also genocides. Armenians fell under this flywheel.

The professional investigation of the anatomy of the Ottoman Empire lets us deduce that the latter engendered the crime of genocide, and typologically could be categorized as a “genocidal state”. The Ottoman state system with an inclination to slaughters and genocide had provided itself with an adequate concept, a theoretical foundation for the preparation and perpetration of the Armenian Genocide.

---

At the initial phase, the concept of Ottomanism was put in circulation, according to which, all the nations of the Empire, Moslem or Christian - Turks, Arabs, Kurds, Western Armenians, Greeks, Slavs, Assyrians and others, were announced Ottomanians. By that theory, they constituted a “single”, “united nation” - the Ottoman “nation”. The concept of Ottomanism was, perhaps, the first public manifesto on the assimilation of nations.

The non-Turkish nations were quick to realize what a terrible threat was concealed behind the ideology of Ottomanism, and they unitedly rose up against this extremely dangerous policy of the Ottoman ruling clique. The ideology of Ottomanism failed.

Thereafter, particularly after the Young Turks’ rise to power, the Ottoman ideologists flung out the theory of Turkism-Turanism, which turned out more dangerous than the concept of Ottomanism. Turkism became their official ideology.

Turkism is double-faced. One face is turned inside - towards all the nations in the Ottoman Empire. Its objective is to prepare grounds - political, military and social conditions, a favorable moral and psychological atmosphere - for converting all the Moslems and Christians into Turks. Not merely to be announced Turks but converted forcibly into Turks, i.e. Turkization, - a most important distinctive aspect, since it necessarily implied a resort to violence. This was envisioned to be carried out by three levels: first - forcible Turkization of the Moslem and Christian nations, and forcible conversion of Christians into Moslems; second - ethnic purges, which implied deportation of all the ethnic groups, refusing to be converted; third - extermination of entire ethnic groups and peoples, i.e., genocide. The goal of this policy was to create a “pure” Turkish state, based on the essentially racist attitude, implying the higher rank and superiority of the Turkic ethnos.

The second goal pursued was that of maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire and preventing its further disintegration.

The reverse of the theory of Turkism was turned towards all the peoples beyond the Ottoman Empire - in the Caucasus, Central Asia, the Crimea and Uralic territories in Russia, etc., speaking Turkic languages. The idea was to create a “Great Turanian Empire”, which would embrace an enormously big territory from the eastern coasts of Asia Minor to western Siberia and as far as the Chinese frontier. This program, the stalwarts of which can be found in some political circles of today’s Turkey3, presents the core of pan-Turkism. It also accounted for the fact that, in World War I, Turkey participated as a member of the military-political grouping, hostile to Russia.

These expansionistic aspirations of pan-Turkism were a menace for the vital interests of Russia, Iran and other states in the region. It posed a great danger for

---

3 Graham Fuller, Turkey Faces East. New Orientations toward the Middle East and the Old Soviet Union, RAND, Santa Monica, 1992.
Armenia, too. Geographically, Armenia lay on the crossroads of pan-Turkism. In this connection, one of the leaders of the Young Turks, Ali Ihsan, pointed out that, but for Armenia, the Caucasus would have been theirs since long. So the Armenians faced a dilemma: to adopt Turkism, or to get out of the way of pan-Turkism.

Thus, the Armenian Genocide completely fit in the bounds of creation of a ‘pure’ Turkish state, maintaining the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire, as well as in the bounds of the Young Turks’ plans of Turanism, pan-Turkism. So the causes for the Genocide should be sought right there, i.e., in the combined Ottoman and Young Turks concepts, and, consequently, in the anti-Armenian policy, founded on them.

It is worthwhile to address another factor too, by which the Armenian Genocide was largely conditioned. The matter at issue is, paradoxical as it might seem, the liberation from the Ottoman yoke, and declaration of independence by the Balkan peoples.

In the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, and the First Balkan War of 1912-1913, both ended in Turkey’s defeat, the latter almost entirely lost its European domains. In Europe, only the capital city of Constantinople with a relatively small adjoining terrain remained theirs. This was a big blow and a big loss for the Ottoman Empire, with a sobering effect on its rulers, too. They became conscious, that a serious menace is impending over the Empire - if not its being, then its integrity is endangered, and that it is important to stifle by all means the aspirations of the nations for independence, which would entail the further splitting of the Empire.

It would be appropriate to mention, though, that the Balkans was but the periphery of the Empire, and the loss of the former did not mean the downfall of the latter. Nor did it directly threat the core of Turkey, Asia Minor. Western Armenia was different. The leadership of the Young Turks realized that the loss of Western Armenia would not only mean the decline of the Empire, but would question the very existence of the Turkish state per se. At the same time, they knew very well, that they could not rely ad infinitum on the controversies between the European states, in order to hamper the reforms in the Armenian regions.

There was no certainty that, some day, the issue of independence of Western Armenia would not be put on the agenda. All this considered, the Turks, who had been occupants not only in the western Armenian lands, but also in Asia Minor, took the advantage of the occasion, granted by WWI, and once and for all to solve the Armenian Question in the manner, which sultan Abdulhamid II had been employing for 33 long years, i.e. in the manner of eradication of all and every Armenian from the entire territory of the Ottoman Empire and, particularly, Western Armenia, Cilician Armenia, Asia Minor and Armenian Mesopotamia, which meant genocide - Armenocide.

In the time of World War I, Turkey undertook and succeeded in committing that devilish crime. All the prerequisites were there for that: the state system, capable of
repressions, tyranny and mass bloody slaughters and extensively experienced and skilled in perpetrating them; the adequate theory (Ottomanism, Turkism and pan-Turkism); the adequate genocidal mechanism and favorable international chaotic conditions.

Such were, in general outline, the prerequisites and causes of the first genocide of the 20th century - the Armenocide.

Before that, Turkey dealt with the European Great Powers, also known as “The European Concert”, comprising England, Austria-Hungary, Germany, Russia and France. Although serious controversies did happen among these states, and Turkey never missed its chance to derive a benefit from the situation, but, more often, the former stepped in with coordinated demands to the sultan and, sometimes, were persistent enough to make him meet their demands.

The war broke the “European Concert” into two confronting blocks, which fought against each other: England, France and Russia with their allies were on the one side, and Germany, Austria-Hungary and Ottoman Turkey - on the other.

During the war, the Entente countries - England, France and Russia - lost their power to get involved, this way or another, in the domestic affairs of the Ottoman Empire and to come up with demands to its leadership, among others - regarding the Armenian Question.

This gave the Turkish rulers liberty to act. From that time on, they had not any worries whatsoever as to how the Entente countries would react to any of their steps. And the Ottoman leadership, guided by the Young Turk triumvirate, undertook the creation of the “pure Turkish” polity. The “settlement” of the Armenian Question by means of genocide was made an integral part of it.

There was only one force, able to intervene and stop the Ottoman rulers. The force was Turkey’s ally Germany. The latter, however, did not even raise a finger to seize the Young Turk murderers by hand. One of the major goals of Germany was to turn Turkey to a base, with its help to drive out its foes - England and France, thereby to reinforce itself in the Near East. Besides, Germany was planning to use Turkey against its other enemy - Russia. Therefore, during the war, it assisted and backed up Turkey in every way, in order to make its primary strategic plan come true. Dominating for Germany were its own far-reaching goals, and not the prevention of the Armenian Genocide.

As was mentioned, nor were there any forces inside Turkey able to hamper the designed crime. Thus, encouraged by the internal and external favorable conditions, the leaders of the Young Turks - Talat, Enver and Cemal, who had already committed one criminal act by drawing Turkey into the war, committed the second criminal act - the murder of the Armenians in their historical Homeland, Western Armenia, Cilician Armenia and other places.
The resolution of the Young Turks on the solution of the Armenian Question by way of genocide was adopted in the early 1910s, at a number of secret sessions and conferences of the Central Committee of the Union and Progress Party. At the consecutive congress of the Party in 1911 in Saloniki, a quite definitive decision was passed on: Turkization of the non-Turkish nations of the Empire, which evenly applied to the Armenians, living there.

In 1914, with the signature of the minister of interior Talat, secret decrees were dispatched to the local governors regarding the special preparatory measures to be taken for the extermination of the Armenians, all to a man. One of the leaders of the Young Turks, who was also one of the topmost chiefs of the Armenian Genocide, Dr. Nazim, at the end of 1914, addressing the secret session of the Party, where the ultimate decision about the Armenian Genocide was passed, said, “The Armenian people should be destroyed to the roots, in order not a single Armenian be left in our country, in order that the very name be forgotten. Now the war is under way. There will be no other favorable occasion like this. The interference of the Great Powers and vociferous protests of the world mass media will remain unnoticed, and even if they get to know, they will face an accomplished fact, thereby the problem will be done with. This time our actions must be aimed at the total extermination of the Armenians; it is necessary to destroy all of them, to the last man... I want Turks and only Turks to live on this soil and to be in full possession of it. To hell with all the non-Turkish elements, no matter what their nationality or religion is!”

In order to organize and mercilessly perpetrate the Armenian Genocide, by the resolution of the Central Committee of the Union and Progress Party, the “Executive Committee of Three” was established in February, 1914, consisting of Dr. Nazim, Shaqir Behaeddin and Midhat Shuqri.

The Young Turk Triumvirate - Talat, Enver and Cemal, functioned through this Committee, which assumed full responsibility for organizing and implementing the deportation and slaughter of all the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire. The Committee, conferred with emergency powers, meticulously developed every technical detail of the deportation and extermination of the Armenians, such as the time frames per region, the routes and destinations of deportation, sites for extermination, etc. The so-called “Teşkilât-ı Mahsusa” - “Special Organization”, founded on the initiative and resolution of the Young Turk Party, acted on the discretion of the “Executive Committee of the

---

4 Mevlan Zade Rifat, Türkiye inkılابının iç yüzü, Halep, 1929, s. 89. Dr. Nazim was the lead theorist and ideologist of the Union and Progress Party, and participated actively in the theoretical substantiation and execution of the Armenian Genocide.
Three”. Actually, it was a merger of two secret services: one of them pursued military objectives and was subject to the ministry of war. Its primary goal was to instigate the Moslems in the Caucasus against Russia. People, familiar with the terrain and customs of the Caucasus, speaking local languages were enrolled and secretly directed there.

The other organization, functioning under the same title, was incorporated in the system of the ministry of interior, and the responsibility for the actual commission of the genocide was placed on it, under the immediate guidance of Shaqir Behaeddin. “Teshqilat-i-Mahsusa” involved criminals, “çete”-s - gangsters, bandits and other dregs of the society, who were liberated from prisons for that very purpose and were capable of a most violent crime.

Running ahead, we should say that the Special Organization fully justified the hopes pinned on them by the Young Turk leaders.

Thus, everything was ready for giving impetus to the genocide: the appropriate concept, the political will of the leaders, the elaborated plan, the relevant mechanism, and favorable international situation.

When Turkey joined the war and mobilization was announced, Western Armenians, like the other peoples of the Empire, were called to the army. Near 60 thousand Armenian men aged 18-45 were enlisted. They were mostly used in construction work. The Young Turk leadership began the practical phase of the plan of the Armenian Genocide by hitting the first blow at the enlisted Armenian soldiers. And it was not accidental. By doing that, they intended to deprive the Armenians of their potential armed support.

By the decree of Turkey’s minister of war Enver, issued in February, 1915, all the Armenian soldiers were disarmed, split into groups of 50-100 and killed. As a matter of fact, Armenians were deprived of any military force, capable to defend their lives, houses, property and settlements. At home only the old and sick, women, children and adolescents were left.

In a diplomatic document, sent on April 10, 1915, from Constantinople to the Foreign Ministry of the Russian Empire, a most faithful description of the situation and atmosphere, prevailing in the country on those days, was given. “The Christian population, particularly the Armenians, is subject to all kinds of persecution, very often - to torture. Under the pretext of calling to army service, people are arrested without age distinction, seized in the streets, churches, shops, trams, etc., neither allowed to finish their activities, nor given a chance to notify their relatives”5.

The second heavy blow was struck at Armenians on April 24 (and the following days), 1915. In Constantinople, the selected elite of the Western Armenians, such as members of Mejlis, the Turkish Parliament, the influential Armenian writer, politician,

5 Архив внешней политики России, полит архив, Д, 3804, л. 22.
and lawyer Grigor Zohrap and social-political figure Arshak Vramyan (Derdzakyan Onik), renowned writers Daniel Varuzhan, Siamanto, Ruben Sevak, Ruben Zardaryan and others, lawyers, teachers, journalists, doctors, public figures, clergymen, men of art - almost 800 people, were arrested and evicted with no official charge. They all were killed on the road to exile, or else - on reaching the destination.6

Party and political figures were arrested and killed as programmed. That fate was foreordained for Nazareth Chaush, the well-known leader of Zeytun; Ishkhan, the prominent public figure of Van; the entire leadership of Urfa - close on one hundred people.

In June, 1915, on one of the central squares of Constantinople, twenty members of the Henchak Party (led by the prominent party leader Paramaz) were hung.

The direction, as well as the priority of the blow was strictly chosen by the Ottoman government. The intention was to behead Western Armenians, to leave them without a military force, political and intellectual leadership, to disorganize and demoralize Armenians and to hamper every possibility on their behalf to prepare or manifest resistance. This action was qualified in genocidology as \textit{politicide}, as an essential part of genocide.

The destruction of almost 60 thousand Armenian soldiers and beheading of the intelligentsia proved fatal for Western Armenians, who lost their capacity to organize and resist. This accounts for the relative ease and the large scale of the perpetration of the Genocide.

Having done that, the executioners cleared the way for themselves and went ahead arresting, evicting and murdering Armenians in their own home - in Western Armenia, Cilicia, and regions and towns in the west of Asia Minor. The Armenian slaughters and deportations embraced the entire Ottoman Empire from East to West, from North to South.

In May 1915, by the sultan’s decree, the law on deportation was endorsed, which implementation was entrusted to the minister of war Enver. The law allowed that the military command forced out and resettled in other places the residents of villages and towns, individually or collectively. In that way, the forcible eviction of the Armenian population from their Homeland and deportation to the Arab deserts was “legalized”. Based on the law on resettlement, the command of the Turkish army dispatched orders to the local governors, obliging them to strictly observe the law, warning that, should any Moslem hide an Armenian in his home, “he will be hung in front of his home, and the home will be put to fire”7. Turk military and civil officers were warned, too, that they should do their best “not to let any Armenian to escape deportation”. For disobedience

6 April 24th is held by Armenians throughout the world as the Memorial Day of the Armenian Genocide.

7 Հայկական հարց, Հանրագիտարան, Երևան, 1996, էջ 465:
to the law, they, “if military officers, will be immediately stripped off their military ranks and appear before the tribunal; if civil servants - will be immediately fired and appear before the military tribunal”".

From May, 1915, mass murders and deportation of the Armenians began in the vilayets of Bitlis, Diyarbekir, Erzurum, Kharberd, Sebastea (Svaz) and Van, i.e. in the six Armenian vilayets, and the vilayet of Trabzon.

**Bitlis (Baghesh) vilayet**, where the Armenian population amounted to 210,000, was totally desolated of Armenians in 1915. Tens of thousands of Armenians were murdered right there, in the town of Bitlis, in the provinces of Mush, Sasun and others, the rest were killed on the road to exile.

In June, 1915, the Young Turks began executing the plan of the Genocide in **Diyarbekir vilayet**. First they killed all the renowned townspeople of Diyarbekir - public, national and religious figures, among them - the spiritual leader Mkrtich Chldatyan. Having done that, they carried on with mass murders. The bulk of the population was destroyed on the roads of deportation, namely, in the region of Ras ul-Ayn. Diyarbekir vilayet, like the other Armenian vilayets, was devoid of Armenians.

The slaughters in **Erzurum (Karin-Ezrum) vilayet** started in the beginning of 1915, when after the defeat at the battle of Sarykamysh, Enver fled to the town of Karin-Erzrum. Right there, by the order of the humiliated and infuriated minister, the Armenian soldiers were disarmed and killed as well as the doctors. This was followed by deportation and beastly destruction of the population of the town and the vilayet. The Turkish troops were besieging the Armenian villages and driving the dwellers out. Those who refused to obey the order and abandon their homes were murdered right at the place.

The population of Erzrum was destroyed on the routes Erzrum - Derjan - Erzinkan, Erzrum -Baber- Derjan, in the environs of Kharberd and Malaty and in Deyr az-Zor, which turned into a cemetery for all the Armenians, driven here from every corner of the Empire. An Erzerum caravan which included 18,000 Armenians, on reaching Aleppo numbered but 150 women and children. The rest were either killed, or died of hunger and diseases on the road. In August, 1915, in Erzrum, a famous town of Armenians, were 50 Armenian households left - those of exceptionally skilled craftsmen, whose lives were saved for them to meet the needs of the Turkish army.

In **Kharberd vilayet** the plan of Genocide was put in effect from July, 1915. Months before, the Armenian schools had already been closed by the Turkish authorities, the Armenians were robbed of their property, the renowned public figures of

---

8 Ibid.
9 According to the Turkish census returns of 1927 only 550 Armenians lived in the entire Province of Bitlis.
the town and province were arrested and put to prison, then burnt alive. In July, the entire Armenian community of Kharberd was expelled and driven to Deyr az-Zor. Almost none of them survived.

On March 15, 1915, the Turkish governors of Svaz (Sebastea) vilayet arrested and killed 40 Armenian party workers. The arrest of 500 intellectuals followed that. Part of them were killed right at the place, on the bank of the Halys River, while the others were drowned in the Tigris. Thereafter, the forcible deportation of the Sebasteans followed. The entire Armenian population of Sebastea was broken down into three caravans; their deportation was accomplished by July, 1915. The overwhelming majority of them were destroyed on the exile road. Suffice it to mention that only 350 people of the first caravan survived and reached Aleppo.

In contrast to the Turkish plans, it proved unrealizable to commit mass murders in Van vilayet. The Armenians in Van had been well prepared, and in the spring of 1915 they heroically resisted the regular Turkish army for about one month. On May 6, 1915, the Russian military units and the Armenian volunteers entered Van, which was a salvation for Armenians. The Van governorship, led by Aram Manukyan, was established. But it did not last long. The Russian troops retreated unexpectedly, and the Armenian population had no choice but to leave their land with them. Sustaining severe torments and at the cost of heavy losses, they reached Eastern Armenia.

The Turkish troops entered Van again, killed all the Armenians, who had not managed to leave with the retreating Russian army, demolished the town, and robbed the Armenian houses of all their possessions.

The mentioned vilayets constituted the areas, where, by the Russo-Turkish Agreement of 1914, two Armenian autonomies were to be founded and governed by European Christian General Viziers. Having cleared these provinces from Armenians, the Young Turks had ruined the very foundation on which that state structure might be erected in the future.

The detachments of the Turkish army, the internal forces, the police, the Teshqilata-i Mahsuse, the chetes, the armed gangs of the Kurd chieftains invaded the settlements, villages and towns, the houses of Armenians, killed the elderly people,

small kids and women, robbed them of their property and possessions, which had been earned by painstaking labor, stole the cattle – everything of any value. The houses of the Armenians, entire neighborhoods and villages were put to fire\textsuperscript{12}. In fact, it was a total slaughter - a genocide on the basis of ethnic distinction.

Part of the population, which was not destroyed at the place, in keeping with the Young Turks’ plan of the Armenian Genocide, was forcibly deported. The Turkish government dispatched edicts to the local governors, ordering them to be ruthless towards the caravans of the Armenian refugees, emerging in their subject area, prohibiting any manifestation of mercy. The interior minister Talat, based on the relevant resolution of the Young Turk Party, wired to the governor of Aleppo in September, 1915, ordering to exterminate the Armenians - women, the old, and even the newborns -with no mercy for any one\textsuperscript{13}.

The expelled Armenians, attended by armed detachments of Turks, were deported to the Arab deserts, Syria and Mesopotamia. The attending detachments - the “warriors” of the Special Organization, the Kurd robbers and other villains - kept killing and persecuting on the exile road. In this respect, all-important is the evidence of the survivors, significant as a first-hand source.

Here is a story told by one of them, Hambartsum Sahakyan (born in 1898 in Sebastea): “We were driven out of our own homes, our gardens. For one hundred and ten days we walked and walked in the wilderness, almost without having a rest. We slept in the open. The old and the sick were not able to walk, they either remained on the road, or the police would shoot and kill them. They made us walk on empty stomach, not even letting us have a sip of water. The Kurds and chetes assaulted and robbed us of our belongings, took away our married and unmarried females. Many a woman and girl threw themselves into the water; the Tigris and Euphrates swarmed with their dead bodies”\textsuperscript{14}.

Many died of hunger, or thirst, or emaciation, or illnesses, notwithstanding the violence, the unbearable climate and weather conditions. According to eyewitnesses, the Euphrates was full of killed and drowned Armenians. Therefore, only small fragments of the caravans reached the destination\textsuperscript{15}.

\textsuperscript{12} Драгоман российского посольства в Константинополе Министерству иностранных дел, Архив внешней политики России, Полит., D. 3504, L. 19.
\textsuperscript{13} Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, Երևան, 1980, էջ 265:
\textsuperscript{14} Սվազլյան Վ., Հայոց Ցեղասպանություն. ականատես-վեր ապրողների վկայություններ, Երևան, 2000, էջ 162:
The Arab settlements, such as Deyr az-Zor, Ras ul-Ayn, Aleppo, Mesqene, Raqqa, Baaquba and Nahr al-Umar, past which the caravans of the evicted were driven, became the milestones of the Armenian Calvary.

The Young Turks, while driving the Armenian caravans through the Arab deserts, pursued two goals. First, they were sure that the hungry, sick and exhausted Armenians would not sustain the hellish conditions and will get devoured by the desert. True enough, a great many Armenians passed away in the sands. Second, the Young Turks assumed that the Islamic Arab environment will be hostile towards the caravans of Christian Armenian refugees, and will carry on their own bloody acts.

But they were wrong. The Arabs suffered from the brutal Ottoman yoke themselves. They hated it and were planning to shake it off. Grave discontent had piled up in the Arab countries, which shortly, in June, 1916, grew into an armed uprising against the Turkish rule. It went down in history as “The Great Arabic Uprising”. Now it is understandable why the Arab peoples, instead of fulfilling the will of the Young Turks and assisting them in their bloody doings, reached out their hands to help the caravans of Armenian refugees, passing through their towns and villages, no matter how fraught with risks it was. The Young Turks’ leadership was well aware of the humane attitude of the Arabs towards the Armenians, and it worried them.

Therefore, as was mentioned, the interior minister and one of the principal organizers of the Armenian Genocide, Talat, in 1915 sent a secret telegram to the governor of Aleppo. All the caravans of Armenian refugees were passing through the province of Aleppo. Talat reminded the governor of the resolution of the Central Committee of the Union and Progress Party on extermination of the Armenians, and demanded that the governor of Aleppo obeyed the resolution and killed all the Armenians, with no sex or age distinction. He required him to be steadfast and to kill the Armenians with a clear conscience. Similar edicts were dispatched from the center to Turk governors of other regions, too, who did carry out these orders energetically and without remorse.

Meanwhile, numerous were cases when Arab officials received the Turkish government’s instruction to destroy the Armenian refugees, passing through their terrain or staying there, but refused to obey these inhumane commands.

That was how the Arab governor of Deyr az-Zor Said Haqim behaved, who not only did not kill the Armenians, but built makeshift houses to shelter the Armenian refugees, particularly the orphans, also providing them with food. He was fired right away. The Arab clerical figure Abdallah Musai also built makeshift houses for the Armenian orphans at his own expense in the Syrian town of Hama, where they lived for almost four months, dressed and fed.

The governor of the region of al-Bashir of Diyarbekir vilayet, Abd al-Suweydi, on receiving the order of the Turkish government to kill Armenians, wired to Istanbul, to the
Turkish government, saying “his conscience does not let him do a thing like that”, and sent in his resignation. The government accepted the resignation. By a special order, al-Suweydi was assassinated - to teach lessons to other noncompliant Arabs. We appreciate the position taken by the Arab elite of Mosul. When the governor of Mosul received the order of the Young Turks to slaughter Armenians, he called upon the local Arab public figures to deliberate and come up with an appropriate decision. They unanimously decided to say no to the demand of the government, and announced that “their conscience does not allow them to wet their hands with the blood of the Armenians”. Words of commendation should be also addressed to the leadership of Egypt, where the Armenian dwellers of Musa Dagh (Ler/Mt.) found refuge. The latter, after forty days of heroic resistance to the detachments of the Turkish regular army, had to eventually abandon their homes and were taken by the French vessels to Port Said. The Egyptian government put up a tent town especially for them in Port Said, and also took care of their food\textsuperscript{16}.

Such examples are plenty. The ones presented, however, are enough for us to positively claim that, but for the philanthropic outreach, extended by the Arab people, national and religious figures and individual officials, the human losses of the Armenians would have been much heavier. Due to the honest and courageous position of the Arabs, hundreds of thousands of Armenians were not only saved from the inevitable destruction, but given refuge, granted the right to settle down, which accounts for the fact that in a number of Arabic countries - Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Jordan and Egypt - Armenian communities were formed. They existed and successfully developed until recent times. At present they are in extremely difficult conditions because of the political turmoil and upheavals in the countries of the Near East.

Despite the military censorship and severe restrictions for dissemination of information during the war time, the world learned about the Genocide of Armenians, committed by the Young Turks. The world community was shocked by the crime, which seemed unbelievable, and which eventually was assessed as a crime against humanity.

Governments of different countries, state, political and public figures, clerics, writers, men of art and others, raised their voices of protest against the criminal actions of the leadership of the Young Turks, and in support of the Armenian people.

On May 24, 1915, in London, Paris and Petrograd, the simultaneous joint official statement of England, France and Russia was issued concerning the personal responsibility of the Turkish government members for the slaughters of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. Taking into account the importance of the document and the issues explicated there, we think it appropriate to present it whole. Here it is: “During

\textsuperscript{16}Հովհաննիսյան Ն., Արաբական աշխարհը և Հայկական հարցը: Հայկական հարցը: Հանրագիտարան, էջ 50.
this whole month massacres of Armenians are implemented in Armenia by Turks and Kurds, with evident permission of the Ottoman authorities, and sometimes with their immediate help. In mid-April massacres of Armenians took place in Erzerum, Derjan, Bitlis, Mush, Sasun, Zeitun and Cilicia. In the environs of Van inhabitants of hundreds of villages were annihilated and Kurds have captured the Armenian district of Van... At the same time the Turkish government of Constantinople imprisoned and unspeakably persecuted the peaceful Armenian inhabitants. In view of those new crimes of Turkey against humanity and civilization, the Allied governments of Russia, France and England announce publicly to the Sublime-Porte, that they will hold personally responsible for all these crimes all members of the Turkish government, as well as those local representatives of it, who are implicated in such massacres” 17.

The joint Anglo-French-Russian statement was an official document of extreme, one should say unprecedented, importance. Its significance was conditioned by three factors.

First, it was, perhaps, the first document of the 20th century, which claimed some other government and its members jointly and severally responsible for the offences and crimes they had committed.

Later, particularly after the Nuremberg Trial, which held the headship of Nazi Germany responsible for the committed crimes, including the Jewish Holocaust, and condemned them to death, such condemnation deserved common recognition by international law and the world community. Today it is applied extensively and performs certain restrictive functions.

Unfortunately, the triple statement concerning the personal responsibility of the members of the Turkish government for the Armenian Genocide was not enforced neither in its time, nor later. The Armenian Genocide has not had its Nuremberg.

Nonetheless, the joint statement of the governments of England, France and Russia is a unique historical document and has not lost its topicality.

Second, the content of the document, the logic and evidence cited unequivocally bespeak of the fact that the Armenian slaughters are perceived by Triple Entente as genocide, although the term was missing in the text of the statement. It, certainly could not have been there, because the term genocide was presented formally for the first time by Rafael Lemkin in 1944.

Nonetheless, the Armenian slaughters and the crimes of the Young Turks are in full accord with the definition of genocide, documented in the UN Declaration of 1948 on genocide.

Third, England, France and Russia in their statement emphasize definitively that the Armenian Genocide is not only a crime against Armenians, but against humanity and civilization. Consequently, Talat, Enver, Cemal, Nazim, Behaeddin and other Young Turk leaders are perpetrators of crimes against humanity and civilization.

This, of course, seriously aggravates the crime committed by them.

The Armenian Genocide became a subject of deep concern for Pope Benedictus XV of Rome. On September 10, 1915, he addressed the Ottomans sultan Mohammad V, who replaced Abdulhamid II in 1909, not to let the massacres of Armenians happen, strictly denouncing the Young Turks’ criminals for the slaughters of the “innocent people” - Armenians.\(^\text{18}\)

The Armenian Genocide was condemned by public figures in the Moslem world, too. In their opinion, what the Turkish leaders had been doing to Armenians was against the principles of Islam. In this respect, of exceptional significance was the position taken by the indisputable authority of the Moslem world, such as Hussein ibn Ali al-Hashimi, the Sharif of the major religious center of all Moslems of the world, Mecca, and the governor of Hejaz. It is worthwhile mentioning that he was a direct descendant of prophet Mohammad’s kin, which circumstance added particular moment to his words.

Hussein ibn Ali addressed the Moslem world in 1916 and 1917. In both addresses he strictly criticized the Young Turk Party of Union and Progress, its leaders Talat, Enver and Djemal, who, in his opinion, through the wrong policy and poor organization lead the Empire to decline. He particularly blamed the policy of the Young Turks towards the non-Turkish peoples of the Empire. To prove his standpoint, he brought three arguments.

First, the attempts of the Young Turks to convert all the peoples of the Empire into Turks.

Second, their hostile attitudes towards Arabs and the Arabic language: the latter had been banned at schools, state offices, the court, etc., despite the fact that Arabic is the language of the sacred book of all Moslems all over the world, the Koran.

Hussein ibn Ali also considered the hanging of 21 prominent Arab national-political figures by the direct order of Cemal pasha as a manifestation of anti-Arab and criminal policy of the Young Turks.

\(^\text{18}\) Roman Pope John Paul II reminded of this on his visit to Yerevan on September 26th, 2001, to participate in the celebration of the 1700 Anniversary of the Declaration of Christianity in Armenia as a State Religion. He visited the Monument to Genocide, where he placed the memorial plaque of Benedictus XV on the Wall of Silence. The memorial plaque of Pope John Paul II was placed there, too, with the following inscription, "Remember, oh Lord, the torments of the sons of this nation, and bless Armenia", "Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն", սեպտեմբեր 27, 2001, էջ 1.
Third, mass murders of Armenians all through the territory of the Empire during the war years.  

With respect to the slaughters or the Genocide of Armenians, the Sharif of Mecca sent a special address to emirs Faysal, who was his own son, and Abdel Aziz al-Jarbay. Both were at the head of the Arab Revolt against the Ottoman Empire at that period of time. Hussein ibn Ali ordered them to extend the broadest assistance to the Armenians, survivors of the slaughters, and to protect them, “as you protect Your own self, Your children and Your property, because they (Armenians - N.H.) are the zimmis of Moslems”.

He set in the pillory the Young Turks and required that they quit relations with the Islamic world, with the sacred Koran and the Sunnah, since their perpetrations have nothing in common with Islam and its virtues.

Turkey’s allies Germany and Austria-Hungary were well aware of the Genocide of Armenians. It is evidenced by numerous secret messages, which the diplomats, who worked in Turkey, dutifully sent to their governments. Particularly significant are the messages of the German Consul and Ambassador. We would like to cite some of them.

The Consul of Germany in Turkey, Shoibner, on June 2, 1915 reported to the Turkish Embassy in Constantinople, that “The Armenian population should be evicted from all the plains and, probably, also from Erzurum, towards Deyr az-Zor. This large-scale deportation equals to a mass destruction, since in absence of any kind of transportation half of the exiled will hardly survive and reach the destination alive, and this is likely to destroy not the Armenians only, but the whole country”.

The Consul touched upon a hypothetical rebellion of Armenians, widely employed by the Young Turks to justify themselves for their misdoings against Armenians. He remarked that “these actions could not have been based on speculations of a military nature, because the probability that the local Armenians would rebel should be excluded, since the deported are old people, women and children”. This message also concerns the forcible conversion of Armenians into Moslems. The German Consul informs its Embassy that “those Armenians, who adopt Islam, are not deported”. This
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19 See: The Arabic Sources on the Crime Aimed to Exterminate Armenians, Beirut, 1988 (in Arabic).
20 Ibid: “Zimmi” literally means “people under wardship”, or “wards”. According to the medieval Arab-Islamic customary law, they were the peoples inhabiting the borderland, who, although not Moslems, still had their own sacred book. They were Christians, Jews, Zoroastrians and others, who each had their sacred book – the Holy Bible, Torah, Avesta, etc., respectively. They had the right to maintain and confess their own religion; guaranteed were their lives, freedom, inviolability of their property, etc. In other words, the Islamic State and Koran patronized them, and infringement of their rights, the more so – murder of a zimmi, a ward, based on ethnic-religious distinction, was considered impermissible. See: Филимонов Э. Г., Абдусамедов А. И., Ислам в СССР, Москва, 1983, с. 37.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
is a potent manifestation of the policy of genocide, because in accordance with
genocidology and the international instruments on genocide, the forcible conversion of
individuals or groups of individuals into another religion, or deliberately inflicting on them
such conditions as to induce them to deny their own religion and to adopt another
religion, is considered application of the policy of genocide towards them.

Of crucial value are the reports of Vangenheim, the Ambassador of Germany in
Turkey, to Bethmann-Hollweg, and the chancellor of Germany.

In his report, dated June 17, 1915, the Ambassador informs the head of his
government that ‘it is quite obvious that the deportation of the Armenians is not only a
result of military measures’, and brings the following statement, made by Talat during
the conversation with a German diplomat assigned in Turkey, where he said, “The
Sublime Porte wants to employ the World War, in order to eventually get even with the
interior enemies (local Christians)”24.

The content of the report of the German Ambassador to Chancellor Bethmann-
Hollweg, dated July 7, 1915, is valuable, too. Having informed the Chancellor about the
large-scale deportation of the Armenians, the Ambassador concludes that “these
actions and the method of implementing the deportation show that the government
indeed means to exterminate the Armenian nation within the Turkish state”25.

Obviously, the assessment of the events and the policy of the Young Turks
towards Armenians, cited in the diplomatic documents of Turkey’s ally Germany, fully
coincide with that of the Entente countries. This is clear evidence of the fact that the
Turkish government was consistently effecting its plan of total extermination of the
Armenians.

There was, however, a ‘minor’ discrepancy there. Unlike the Entente countries,
which did not have the opportunity to exert influence on the Turkish government,
Germany did have that opportunity. It was the only country at that moment able to avert
or stop the Genocide of Armenians. It could, and it did not. The explanation was given
above. It reckoned its narrow, selfish, so-called strategic interests higher than saving an
entire nation from extermination.

For that very reason, quite substantiated is the viewpoint that, in the Genocide of
Armenians, Imperial Germany has its own sizeable portion of guilt.

Public, political and religious figures, writers, scientists, men of art of many
countries throughout the world raised their voices of protest and in defense of
Armenians. Among them were Lord James Bryce and one of the greatest historians of
the 20th century Arnold Toynbee of England; Protestant clergyman Johannes Lepsius,
Armin Wegner, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg of Germany; Anatole France and
Roman Rolland of France; Fridtjof Nansen of Norway; Maxim Gorky, Valery Brusov and

24 Ibid., S. 83-84.
25 Ibid., S. 94.
Yuri Veselovsky of Russia; the outstanding Arab political and public figure Fayez el-Ghoseyn and many-many others.

To have a more comprehensive picture of the genocidal policy of the Turkish government, it is necessary to dwell on yet another important issue, the more so as this will help us to get a fuller understanding of the causes of the Armenian Genocide.

The matter concerns some non-Turkish nations, such as Assyrians, Greeks and Arabs, who during World War I, together with Armenians, were subject to or faced the risk of genocide.

In 1915 the Turkish government, in implementation of the plan of creating a ‘pure’ Turkish state, undertook the perpetration of the genocide against Christian Assyrians, too. The policy of their extermination was carried out in the Armenian vilayets of Van, Bitlis and Diyarbekir, were they lived mixed with the Armenians, as well as in the regions of Haqkar and Urmia, when during the war the latter was occupied by the Turkish army for a short while, in Urfa (Urha-Edessa), Adana and others.

The “substantiation” of the slaughters was the same as that of the Armenian slaughters, as if “the community was armed and rebelled against the state.”26

The genocide of the Assyrians is relatively less studied and very often is cited as “forgotten genocide”. It was perpetrated with unspeakable brutality. Let us refer to a document about the slaughters of Assyrians in Tur-Abdin region, committed on June 5, 1915 by the Turkish armed forces and “Hamidie” gangsters. Ten thousand Assyrians were killed. “The most severe methods were employed. The skulls of small kids were smashed with rocks; the bodies of girls and women, who resisted to be raped or converted into Islam, were cut to pieces live; men were mostly beheaded, or else thrown into the nearby river; the clergy, monks and nuns were skinned or burnt live”27.

The picture was very much the same in other vilayets and regions, too. Thus, in the vilayet of Diyarbekir most brutal slaughters of many a thousand Assyrians and Chaldean Christians were perpetrated; in Mardin and Urfa - murdered were also Catholic Christians28.

500,000 Assyrians, or two thirds of the entire population, fell victim of the genocidal policy of the Young Turks29. This ancient civilized nation faced the menace of total physical extermination - in the name of bringing about the insane plans of the Young Turks’ to create a “pure” Turkish state and “Great Turan”.

In 1914-1918, genocidal policy was likewise pursued against the Greeks, residing in the Ottoman Empire. The Greeks of Constantinople, Smyrna, Trapezunt, the entire

---

27 Ibid., p. 9.
28 Fuad Hasan Hafiz, History of the Armenian People, p.313.
29 Documentation on the Genocide against the Assyrian-Suryoye-Chaldean-Arameic People, p. 7, 9.
North Pontus and other regions of the Empire were subject to violence, oppression, deportation and murders. In 1914 alone, the Young Turks deported 90,000 Greeks from Macedonia and Asia Minor, while from 1916 they began exterminating the Greeks of Pontus. The date of this tragedy is observed in Greece as the memorial day of the genocide.

As cited above, the Young Turks’ policy of forcible conversion into Turks was not only pursued towards the non-Christians, but also towards the non-Turkish Moslem communities. Otherwise, it would not be feasible to turn the Ottoman Empire into a pure-blooded, unadulterated Turkish state. A glaring example of this is their policy towards Arabs.

Among the Arab national-political figures and historians, dominating is the viewpoint that in the time of World War I, the Young Turks were planning, along with the Armenians, to exterminate also the Arabs. An authoritative and knowledgeable Arab historian as Amin Said is, writes that the success, achieved by the German-Turkish block in the beginning of the war, “turned the heads of the Istanbul headship, who were energetic stalwarts of Pan-Turkism. They decided that the time is ripe for putting an end to the two strong national movements - that of the Arab nationalists in Syria, Iraq and Hejaz, and the Armenian movement”\(^{30}\) in Western Armenia. He continues, that the campaign, intending to exterminate the Armenians, was led by the Minister of Interior Talat, who in 1917-1918 assumed also the Grand Vezier’s office, while in the Arabic countries it was led by another representative of the Young Turk triumvirate, Cemal. “In Syria,’ Amin Said writes, “the implementation of the plan was taken up by the Minister of Navy and the colleague of Talat-bey, Ahmad Cemal-pasha, labeled in Syria “bloodthirsty”. In Beirut, Damascus and Gaza gallows were put up. Ahmad Cemal-pasha hung, deported and put in prison”\(^{31}\).

Indeed, by his order the elite of the Arab national movement and political ideology, the brilliant constellation of figures, devoted to their own nation, to the liberation of their homeland, such as Abd al-Hamid az-Zahrawi, Shakik al-Azym, Shuqri al-Asali, Qarim al-Khalil, Salim al-Jazairi and many others from Syria, Egypt, Lebanon, Palestine, Iraq, etc. were hung. Summing up, the Arab historian maintains that the Young Turks, their entire leadership, while committing these crimes, “attempted to totally exterminate two nationalities - Armenians and Arabs”\(^{32}\).

The same opinion is held by the Arab historians Zeine Zeine, Masoud Dahir, Hafiz Fuad Hasan, and many others. Zeine Zeine points out that in 1915 Cemal-pasha

\(^{30}\) Амин Сайт, Востание арабов XX веке, Москва, 1964, с. 79.
\(^{31}\) Ibid., p. 80.
\(^{32}\) Ibid.
‘condemned to death many Arab leaders’ as traitors, accusing them of the attempts to decentralize the Ottoman Empire and “to sell their country to aliens”33.

Just as in the event of the Genocide of Armenians, in the event of Arabs, too, the broadly practiced murders, detentions and other kinds of violence entailed mass deportations of Arabs. Entire households and tribes were deported, only in the opposite direction: the Armenians were driven to the Arab deserts, while the Arabs were driven to the depths of Anatolia (Asia Minor), where the conditions, created for them, were utterly bad. The deportation was associated with the seizure of the possessions and property of the Arabs34. Having this in mind, the Arab historian Masoud Dahir qualifies the policy of the Young Turks towards the Arabs as a “policy of organized murder”35.

This is proved by the stated below facts, put down on paper by Naim-bey Abdullahhad, first secretary of Nuri-bey, the Aleppo representative of the Central Committee on Deportation. Later the notes were published as Memoirs. They are the records of conversations between those two - a matter of great interest, helpful in shedding more light on the policy of the Young Turks. “Once”, says Naim-bey, “I said to Abdullahhad Nuri-bey, “Bey-effendi, let’s make the deportation of the Armenians less severe, or else death will threat all of Mesopotamia. In that vast terrain no one will be left, but Satan. The kaymakam of Rasul Ayn sends alarming messages.” Nuri-bey laughed. “My son’, he said, “in that way we will at once get rid of two dangerous elements. Don’t the Arabs die with the Armenians? Is that not good? By that the way for Turkism is cleared”36.

The Young Turks did not succeed in accomplishing their genocidal policy against Arabs. In 1916 Arabs rebelled and, with the help of the English, liberated their Homeland, which had been under the Ottoman rule for 400 years. In the ranks of the Arab liberation army the Eastern, or Armenian Legion of three thousand fought.

It is also appropriate to notice that the Young Turks, perpetrating the genocide of the Armenians and Assyrians with the hands of the Kurds, thereafter, when their goal had been achieved, later began slaughters of the Kurds. Such was the “logic” of the genocide and the creation of a “pure” Turkish state.

Thus, the criminal policy of sultan Abdulhamid II and the Young Turks, of their leaders Talat, Enver, Cemal, Nazim, Shaqir Behaeddin and others against the Armenians, Assyrians, Greeks, Arabs and other nations permits us to conclude that in the mid 19th and early 20th century the Ottoman state developed into a genocidal state.

The Armenian Genocide was an all-national tragedy with fatal consequences for all Armenians. In Western Armenia, Cilicia and all over the Ottoman Empire, 1,5 million

34 Ibid.
Armenians were killed and hundreds of thousands deported. The largest part of the native land of the Armenians was desolated of its native inhabitants - Armenians. Instead, the intrusion of Turks and Kurds into the Armenian lands, which had started in the previous centuries, became even more active.

Armenians have been dispossessed of the largest part of their Homeland - Western Armenia, making up nine-tenths of the Armenian Highland37. At present the Republic of Armenia (RA) and the Artsakh Republic (NKR) constitute one-tenth of the territory of the Armenian Homeland.

The Genocide of Armenians and of other nations of the Ottoman Empire left its imprint on the Empire per se, as it has gone down in history as the first genocidal state.

It also left its negative imprint on the international rating and prestige of modern Turkey, as the successor of the Ottoman Empire. Meanwhile, contrary to undeniable facts, the leadership of present-day Turkey is stubbornly denying the fact of the Genocide.

Now about the origin of the term "Armenocide", its connection with the term "genocide", about its author and its characteristic features.

The term “Armenocide” is directly connected with the term "genocide", invented by Raphael Lemkin in 1944 and approved by the United Nations Organization on 9 December, 1948 by adopting "The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of the Genocide". The term "Armenocide" was invented by analogy with the term "genocide" and put in circulation by Moussa Prince in the mid-1960s. Moussa Prince is a brilliant Lebanese scholar and historian, author of several monographic studies on the Armenian Genocide - Armenocide in different languages, sometimes with the help of his wife Marie-Ange Prince38. He gave also its scientific definition, qualifying it as the biggest, gravest and wickedest crime against mankind. According to him "The Armenian Genocide is the most genocidal genocide"39.

The Genocide of Armenians, or Armenocide is the black page in the history of the 20th century.

37 The deportation resulted in Armenians being scattered over various continents - Asia, Europe, America and Africa, and various countries, where they formed Armenian communities with their national, educational, cultural and clerical structures. The Armenian Diaspora emerged.


39 Nikolay Hovhannisyan, Arab Historiography on the Armenian Genocide, Yerevan, 2005
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In order to apply to the United Nations International Court of Justice for the case of
the Armenian Genocide the Republic of Armenia as a plaintiff should draw up its written
plea which must be as concise as possible, in a manner compatible with the full
presentation of Armenia’s position and appending to the plea only strictly selected
documents1.

At the beginning of the plea Armenia can ground the jurisdiction of the International
Court to investigate the case of the Armenian Genocide with the provisions of Article 9
of the UN Genocide Convention, according to which the disputes between Convention
member countries are settled by the International Court2.

In the course of compiling the plea it is necessary to take into consideration that while
assessing submitted evidence the International Court is led by the following standards:

a) the information source (is it biased or neutral);

b) the methods of receiving information (for example, are they anonymous reports
in the media or is the information given by the court or pretrial bodies); c) the quality and
the content of the information (here it is about the facts that are mutually accepted by
disputing sides, or about the facts that are above suspicion)3. If we are led by these
standards while submitting the factual circumstances of the Armenian Genocide we
must rely on the following basic documents, certainly, maintaining chronological order:

1. The joint Declaration of the Entente Powers on May 24, 1915, which condemned
the mass massacring of the Armenians during the perpetration of the Armenian
Genocide. This document was officially published in the capitals of three countries
and was handed to the Turkish authorities.

2. The indictments of the Young Turks’ leaders and other court procedures in the
Turkish Military Tribunals from the April 28, 1919 to June 5, shorthand record of

---

trials and verdicts which give sufficient and reliable information about the organized policy of Turks for mass extermination of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

3. The Treaty of Sèvres which was signed by the Turkish legal authorities and the victorious countries on August 10, 1920.

4. The Arbitration Decision (The Arbitral Award) of President of the USA Woodrow Wilson (Nov. 22, 1920) demarcating the Armenian-Turkish Boundary.

5. The Treaty of Lausanne on July 24, 1923, on the protection of the rights of the non-Muslim population, particularly the Armenians.

6. The advisory conclusion of the authoritative specialists of international law on the restoration of the rights of the Armenian migrants on August 2, 1929.

The following documents can be submitted as supplementary evidences:

7. The documents of the International Criminal Court.

8. The resolutions recognizing and condemning the Armenian Genocide by the international non-governmental organizations.

The most important component of the plea submitted to the International Court on the case of the Armenian Genocide must be the Declaration simultaneously published in three capitals of the allied countries of the Entente: Paris, London, and Petrograd on May 24, 1915. This Declaration was transferred officially to the Turkish authorities. It was a joint declaration that condemned the mass killing of the Armenians. The Declaration clearly defines the attitude of the Turkish government (not only in the way of the “connivance”, but also with “direct support”) towards the massacre of the Armenians. It is mainly to record the fact that new crimes had been committed. It means that, first, the previous acts of the Armenians’ extermination were also the acts of crimes and, second, the connection of the new crimes with the previous ones is underlined. From the point of view of the international law the Declaration is significant by qualifying the Armenian Genocide as a crime against “humanity and civilization” the personal criminal liability of the international crime is put on the Turkish government and on the members of its local representatives. So, the Declaration internationally put the start of the personal liability of the individuals in the mass killing of the members of any national group, and it obviously and not ambiguously rejected the opportunity to refer to the theory of “state action” according to which the behavior of state authorities was attributed to the state which excluded the personal responsibility of individuals who were the perpetrators of those actions. According to the Declaration, the official status of the individuals who were guilty of the extermination of the Armenians can’t be considered as a justifying factor to mitigate their punishment regardless that they were the either members or the representatives of the government.


5 Геноцид армян в Османской империи. Сборник документов. Под редакцией М. Нерсисяна, Ереван, 1983, с. 280.
It is important to note that the Declaration of the Entente Powers has become a precedent-making document for similar cases in the future from the point of view of their legal and political assessment. During the Second World War on October 30, 1943, the Moscow Declaration was adopted “Concerning Responsibility of Hitlerites for Committed Atrocities”\(^6\). It almost literally repeated the provisions and formulations of the Declaration of the Entente Powers. In the Moscow Declaration of the anti-Nazi coalition personal liability for mass murder was extended to the German officers and soldiers, as well as the members of the Nazi party who had taken part in those actions\(^7\). This document laid the foundation for the process that after the end of the Second World War the victorious powers of the anti-Hitlerite coalition could undertake in the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg during the trial of the Nazi criminals. Unfortunately, the Entente Powers didn’t show the same consistency and determination after World War I in order to perform effectively the provisions of Joint Declaration, particularly in the sense of creating an international tribunal.

It is important to note that on May 28, 1948 (before adopting the UN Genocide Convention) the UN War Crimes Commission considered the formulation “crimes committed against humanity” given to the massacres of the Armenians in the Joint Declaration of the Entente Powers on May 24, 1915, similar to the crimes which during the Nuremberg trials according to international law were qualified, as inhuman acts, i.e. genocide against their own subjects\(^8\). As it is known the Nazi criminals were called to account not only for war crimes but also for the crimes committed against humanity, including genocide.

Based on the res judicata\(^*\) principle the materials of the Young Turks’ trial should be compared with “Elements of Crimes” of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in the plea on the case of the Armenian Genocide. Under Article 6 of the “Elements of Crimes” are presented the concrete characteristics of five criminal acts of the crime of genocide according to the UN Genocide Convention”.

---

No. 1021. CONVENTION1 ON THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE. ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS ON 9 DECEMBER 1948

…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:

\(^6\)http://unterm.un.org/dgaacs/unterm.nsf/0f99a7d734f48ac385256a07005e48fb/d909da1dbe08e8e6852569fa0008e50?OpenDocument

\(^7\) Внешняя политика Советского Союза в период Отечественной войны. Сборник материалов и документов, т. 1, Москва, 1946, с. 418–419.

\(^8\) Геноцид армян: ответственность Турции и обязательства мирового сообщества, т. 2, ч.2, с. 651.

\(^*\) res judicata (Latin word for a matter [already] judged), the legal principle, according to which special court decision can be regarded as precedent in order to investigate the similar cases and make decisions.
(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.9

From these five characteristics the following three are general. According to “Elements of Crimes” of the International Criminal Court (ICC)

... Article 6 (a) Genocide by killing. Elements:
1. The perpetrator killed one or more persons.
2. Such person or persons belonged to a particular national, ethnical, racial or religious group.
3. The perpetrator intended to destroy, in whole or in part, that national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such.
4. The conduct took place in the context of a manifest pattern of similar conduct directed against that group or was conduct that could itself effect such destruction.

Article 6 (b) Genocide by causing serious bodily or mental harm. Elements
1. The perpetrator caused serious bodily or mental harm to one or more persons.
2. Such person or persons belonged to a particular national, ethnical, racial or religious group.
3. The perpetrator intended to destroy, in whole or in part, that national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such.
4. The conduct took place in the context of a manifest pattern of similar conduct directed against that group or was conduct that could itself effect such destruction.

Article 6 (c) Genocide by deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction. Elements
1. The perpetrator inflicted certain conditions of life upon one or more persons.
2. Such person or persons belonged to a particular national, ethnical, racial or religious group.
3. The perpetrator intended to destroy, in whole or in part, that national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such.
4. The conditions of life were calculated to bring about the physical destruction of that group, in whole or in part.
5. The conduct took place in the context of a manifest pattern of similar conduct directed against that group or was conduct that could itself effect such destruction10.

There are many proofs and testimonies in the judicial materials of the Young Turks of the Turkish Military Tribunal such as the indictments, the shorthand records and the verdicts which completely correspond to the above mentioned characteristics of the objective side of corpus delicti of the genocide crime perpetrated against the Armenians.

During the whole trial of the Young Turks the defense was led by the "state action" concept (which was rejected by the international law) basing its arguments on the law about the deportation which had been confirmed by the sultan. The defense claimed that the deportation of Armenians during which the mass killings of the Armenians took place wasn’t the personal initiative of the Young Turks, but it was an action coming from the Ottoman state. So, the liability of the perpetrated actions had been removed completely to the Turkish state, because according to international law the state bears international legal responsibility for adopting such laws which contradict the general principles of the international law. It means that the “Deportation law” and the “Law on abandoned property” which were adopted by the Young Turks government evidently contradicted the general principles of the international law, and the Turkish state should have taken responsibility for that as Nazi Germany did in the International Military Tribunal for the so called “Nuremberg laws” and the discriminatory laws adopted by Germany; by these laws the privileges of Germans were confirmed, and all the other nations were considered outlaw.

The prosecution in 1919-1920 representing the Ottoman authorities was inclined in advance to ascribe all the responsibility to the Young Turks' party. Opposing to the concept of “state action” the prosecution tried to put all the responsibility of the massacres of the Armenians on the individuals, excluding the possibility of the liability of the Turkish state. Whereas in the international law, at least on the theoretical level, the process was taking shape of putting responsibility for international serious crimes both on the state and on the individuals, and also, by putting responsibility for international serious crime on a state which couldn’t release the individuals from the responsibility.

It is noted in the indictment of the Young Turks that it is wrong to refer to Article 92 of the Ottoman Constitution, as the crime committed as “a result of official service by ministers or a member of the Council of Ministers”, concerns to the political crime. Concerning Article 33 of the same Constitution a minister is deprived of privileges of law in the case of being an individual crime committer or a participator of a committed

---

11 Левин Д.Б., Ответственность государств в современном международном праве, Москва, 1966, с. 70.
12 Решетов Ю.А., Борьба с международными преступлениями против мира и безопасности, Москва, 1983, с. 46.
crime\textsuperscript{14}. Thus, the prosecution was inclined to describe the organization of the Armenian massacres as an ordinary crime, whereas in the judicial verdict the crimes committed by the Young Turks were unambiguously qualified as political. So, during the trial the principle issue of which was the extermination of the Armenians, serious grounds occurred for the prosecution to enlarge the field of accusation, and include the accusation for the “government failure” and creation of the fourth branch of authority in all the structures of government\textsuperscript{15}. It is an obviously invented formulation, as the “government failure” means takeover of the state authority. But it was not about the creation of the criminal fourth branch of authority inside the government as Ittihad or Special Organization, but it was about the violent occupation and possession of the whole state government. However, by this invented formulation the prosecution tried again not to let the spread of liability on the Young Turks government which was introducing itself as the state government after taking over the authority.

The indictment included such crimes as massacre, seizure of property, burning of houses and its inhabitants, rapes, tortures and pursuits. Then an appendix was added: the crimes were committed in a “new organized way”, when deported people were collected group by group and then were killed. In the new version of the indictment the fact was emphasized clearly the fact that the deportation was not determined by a military necessity or a disciplinary circumstance. It was noted that the deportation was intended and the decision on it was made by the Ittihad Central Committee, so the tragic consequences of that decision were apparent almost in every corner of the Ottoman Empire\textsuperscript{16}.

The encoded telegrams and the letters which were brought in the first and second indictments gave evidence that the deportations had been intended and organized by the secret order and command of a special center, and besides, it was clearly noted that they had neither been limited nor had local feature. The prosecution underscored that the presence of the intention of crime was beyond suspicion, and it couldn’t be justified. As the indictment records, the aim of the Young Turks’ state program was “at last to solve all the unsolved problems”. It is obvious, that the first of them was the Armenian Question\textsuperscript{17}. It was underlined in the indictment of the chief prosecutor that the deportation of the Armenians was a pretext for massacres, and it was a confirmed fact which was as obvious as two plus two is equal to four\textsuperscript{18}. The intent of that plan was confirmed by the testimonies of general Vehib during the court procedure.

\textsuperscript{14} The Armenian Genocide According to the Documents of the Trial of the Young Turks, by A.H. Papazyan, Yerevan, 1988, p. 48.
\textsuperscript{15} Дадриян В., Обзор материалов турецкого военного трибунала по обвинению в геноциде армян, с. 42.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 43.
\textsuperscript{17} Барсегов Ю.Г., Турецкая доктрина международного права на службе политики геноцида, с. 39.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
It was also noted in the indictment that in order to cover the plan of the Armenians’ extermination the government had realized its decisions by written and oral secret orders and commands which then had been destroyed\textsuperscript{19}. In fact, the Turkish judiciary itself accepted the existence of such secret orders, considering them an important circumstance for describing the criminal working style of the Young Turks.

On June 19, 1919, it was also mentioned in the indictment that regional secretaries had illegally interfered into the affairs of government and had taken part in the crimes committed by Talaat Pasha and his accomplices according to the oral and written secret orders received from the government and the party’s Central Committee\textsuperscript{20}. According to the indictment the crimes were committed on the highest state level\textsuperscript{21}. Actually from the very beginning of the judicial procedure even without investigating the arguments and just relying on the indictments, the court was led by the presumption not to admit the participation of the government in the massacres. But during the judicial procedure necessary and sufficient evidence was presented proving that the massacres had been a result of the policy implemented by all the accused, but, according to the formulation of the court, the defendants had done it not as ministers, but as members of the secret organization.

So, we should state that from the very beginning the accusation had been deliberately formed to confirm the personal guilt of the accused and the guilt of the Young Turks’ party and not accusing them as high level government officials who committed the crimes, because this would result in the undesirable liability of the Turkish state; a state from which the Turkish Military Tribunal sought to escape. The chief prosecutor gave a clarification that the crimes enumerated in the indictment had been committed not by the government but in the name of the Central Committee and based on the decisions of its plenary sessions\textsuperscript{22}. The court noted that the reference to the action of the state could have been discussed on the condition of there being proofs that the massacres hadn’t been intended and had been the inevitable result of the performance of official duties\textsuperscript{23}. The court led by the political line of the sultan’s government concluded that the massacres had been a part of the policy and decisions that had been implemented by the accused as the members of a secret conspirator organization, and not by the ministers and within the framework of official duties of the whole government\textsuperscript{24}. But the prototype of such a system was formed in the Ottoman Empire which later existed in Nazi Germany during the years of the Holocaust.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} The Armenian Genocide According to the Documents of the Trial of the Young Turks, pp. 22, 135.
\textsuperscript{21} Дадриян В., Обзор материалов турецкого военного трибунала по обвинению в геноциде армян, с. 41.
\textsuperscript{22} The Armenian Genocide According to the Documents of the Trial of the Young Turks, p 16.
\textsuperscript{23} Барсегов Ю. Г., Турецкая доктрина международного права на службе политики геноцида, Москва, 2002, с. 40.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
Thus, these substantiations couldn’t stand any criticism, as it was evident that the members of that Secret Organization were the same ministers of the government, and Secret Organization had coalesced in the government, becoming the real government of the Ottoman Empire. It is not accidental that the government of the Ottoman Empire during the period of World War I in the diplomatic documents was called “the Young Turks’ government” which emphasized in the best way the historical fact of coalescence of the Young Turk party with the Ottoman Empire. Accordingly, it is impossible to separate them from each other, and conversely we should state their identification. Finally, the member of the Young Turks’ party and the whole government, regardless of the fact of which organization it joined, represented the Turkish state in the face of that government. Therefore any criminal actions performed by them should be condemned as an action of the representative of the state authority, for which not only the individual is responsible but also the state which that individual represents, in this case the Ottoman Empire. In the Ottoman Empire in conditions of coalescence of the Young Turks party and state government, belonging to the party and being a member of the Secret Organization was an important condition for having high public position.

There was not shown any apparent resistance against the Young Turks' policy in high circles of the Ottoman Empire, and it proves that all the members of the government didn’t oppose that political power, thus accepting what was happening. Knowing about the massacres of Armenians, and the fact that the members of the government hadn’t taken any steps to prevent it and their indifference, according to the UN Genocide Convention is anyway punishable and for Turkish state, because it can be viewed as complicity in the genocide.

Besides, the court tried to separate from each other the terms “intent” and “performance of the official duties”. Whereas the facts directly indicate that the intentional plans of the Young Turks’ party and government to eliminate the Armenians coincided with the genocidal state program of the Ottoman Empire, and it was actualized using all the public resources. Naturally these obvious arguments were ignored by the Turkish jurisdiction, because they were very dangerous for them.

Then the court in its private decision paid attention to the fact that the leading role in the committed crimes had belonged to the Young Turks’ party, and “individual crimes” had been committed in conditions of this party’s leading role. It is evident that the Turkish military court was in a paradoxical situation: on the one hand it strived to present those massive crimes as an ordinary individual crime, but on the other hand the massive nature of the massacres and violence was so obvious that it was impossible to show them as an individual crime.

The verdicts of the Turkish Military Tribunals themselves directly and indirectly confirm the fact of coalescence of the Young Turks’ party with the state authority:

25 Дадриян В., Обзор материалов турецкого военного трибунала по обвинению в геноциде армян, с. 41.
a) Besides the main verdict the Turkish Military Tribunal made a special decision about the criminals who had escaped, by which it was adopted that the Young Turks’ party had taken into its hands the whole power of the state. So, based on this, it can be claimed the state was responsible for the crimes committed by the Young Turks, because the state had allowed them to take into their hands the whole power.

b) The court accused the Young Turks not only of the Armenian massacres, but also for losing some parts of the empire during World War I as a result of their criminal political mistakes. The court accused the Young Turks because they hadn’t even discussed the issue of declaring war in the Mejlis (parliament). It is a very important argument which states again that the whole power of the state belonged to the Young Turks. This argument also emphasizes that the state must be liable for the crimes committed by the Young Turks.

c) Sheikh-ul-Islam Musa Kazim Efendi, the main spiritual leader who had a great influence and could have prevent all those cruelties didn’t take any significant step. Though he tried to justify himself in the court that he wasn’t liable for the criminal actions of the members of the government and only the Ministry of Interior was to be blamed, however, he admitted that Islam and the party were united together, and any decision of the party was a subject for immediate implementation. Besides he gave evidence that coming out the party meant to renounce Islam. The testimonies of the spiritual leader characterized the fact that not only Islam but also the whole state was combined with the Young Turks’ party and made a unit.

d) Talat, Enver, Djemal and Nazim Bey were convicted according to paragraph 1 of Article 45 of the Turkish Criminal Code which states if the participation of the people is proved in the initiatives to change forcibly the form and nature of the government fixed in the Constitution, these people must be executed. According to the Turkish Criminal Code, taking over the state power was among the worst state and political crimes in the country; therefore in this case, when the Young Turks took over the state power, the Turkish state along with the Young Turks have become responsible for the crimes, particularly for the Armenian mass slaughters.

The following important components of the plea on the case of the Armenian Genocide are the corresponding provisions of the Treaty of Sèvres. Articles 226 and

---

26 The Armenian Genocide According to the Documents of the Trial of the Young Turks, p. 113.
27 Ibid., p. 119.
28 Ibid., p. 120.
29 Ibid., p. 119.
30 Ibid., p. 126.
32 ARTICLE 226. The Turkish Government recognizes the right of the Allied Powers to bring before military tribunals persons accused of having committed acts in violation of the laws and customs of war. Such persons
228 were coming from «The Laws and Customs of war» provisions of the Hague Conventions adopted in 1899, and edited in 1907. These provisions repeated Articles of the Treaty of Versailles (1871), Treaty of Saint-Germain (1919), the Treaty of Neuilly (1919) and the Treaty of Trianon (1920), which were about the punishment of war criminals.

Under Article 230 of the Treaty of Sèvres the Turkish government “to hand over to the Allied Powers the persons whose surrender may be required by the latter as being responsible for the massacres committed during the continuance of the state of war on territory which formed part of the Turkish Empire on August 1, 1914.

The Allied Powers reserve to themselves the right to designate the tribunal which shall try the persons so accused, and the Turkish Government undertakes to recognize such tribunal.

In the event of the League of Nations having created in sufficient time a tribunal competent to deal with the said massacres, the Allied Powers reserve to themselves the right to bring the accused persons mentioned above before such tribunal, and the Turkish Government undertakes equally to recognize such tribunal. The provisions of Article 228 apply to the cases dealt with in this Article.”

It was obvious, that Article 230 was a result of the Declaration of the Allied Powers (May 24, 1915), as the Allied Powers had promised to call to liability those who were the accused of the mass killings of the Armenians. This provision was extremely important because Turkey couldn’t avoid handing over the people who were accused of the massacres of the Armenians in the deserts of Mesopotamia only using the justification that they couldn’t hand over the those who had committed crimes in the territories that had not belonged to them anymore.

Under the same Article, Allied Powers reserved to themselves the right to designate the tribunal which should try the accused persons, and the Turkish government undertook to recognize such tribunal. Besides, it was mentioned “in the event of the League of Nations” to create an international tribunal “competent to deal with the said massacres”. During the history of international relations for the first time was put forward the idea of formation of an international tribunal. Thus, the Treaty of

shall, if found guilty, be sentenced to punishments laid down by law. This provision will apply notwithstanding any proceedings or prosecution before a tribunal in Turkey. or in the territory of her allies.

The Turkish Government shall hand over to the Allied Powers or to such one of them as shall so request all persons accused of having committed an act in violation of the laws and customs of war, who are specified either by name or by the rank, office or employment which they held under the Turkish authorities.

33 ARTICLE 228. The Turkish Government undertakes to furnish all documents and information of every kind, the production of which may be considered necessary to ensure the full knowledge of the incriminating acts, the prosecution of offenders and the just appreciation of responsibility.
Sèvres created a legal ground for the prosecution of the Ottoman Empire for the crimes committed against its subject citizens\textsuperscript{34}.

In the report of May 28, 1948, the UN War Crimes Commission paid special attention to Article 230 of the Treaty of Sèvres, and interpreted that the victorious powers by this Article pursued the goal to realize the obligation of the Joint Declaration of Entente Powers according to which those who were guilty for committing crime against humanity must have been called to liability. Such kind of crimes against humanity was the crimes committed in the Ottoman Empire against the subjects who weren’t Turks, particularly against the Armenians and Greeks. That was a precedent for corresponding Articles 6c and 5c of the regulations of the Nuremberg and Tokyo tribunals\textsuperscript{35}.

Under Article 144 of the Treaty of Sèvres, “the Turkish Government recognizes the injustice of the law of 1915 relating to Abandoned Properties (Emval-i-Metroukeh), and of the supplementary provisions thereof, and declares them to be null and void, in the past as in the future.

The Turkish Government solemnly undertakes to facilitate to the greatest possible extent the return to their homes and re-establishment in their businesses of the Turkish subjects of non-Turkish race who have been forcibly driven from their homes by fear of massacre or any other form of pressure since January 1, 1914. It recognizes that any immovable or movable property of the said Turkish subjects or of the communities to which they belong, which can be recovered, must be restored to them as soon as possible, in whatever hands it may be found. Such property shall be restored free of all charges or servitudes with which it may have been burdened and without compensation of any kind to the present owners or occupiers, subject to any action which they may be able to bring against the persons from whom they derived title”.

The significance of Article 144 is extremely important for the Armenians who were the victims of the genocide. This Article provides legal rights for restoration of the Armenians’ properties. Under that Article the concrete mechanisms for the restoration of the property rights were defined\textsuperscript{36}.

The Ottoman government accepted that in the case of finding the movable or immovable properties of the mentioned citizens or the communities of the Empire, no matter who would possess that property at that time, it would be returned immediately to its legal owners, i.e. Western Armenians. Under Article 144, “The Turkish Government agrees that arbitral commissions shall be appointed by the Council of the League of Nations wherever found necessary. These commissions shall each be composed of one

\textsuperscript{34}Տերնոն Ի., Անպատժելիություն, վրեժ և ժխտում. հայկական ցեղասպանությունը միջազգային ատյանների առջև, Երևան, 2003, էջ 11:

\textsuperscript{35}Գենոցիդ արմեն: առաջարկտություն Թուրքիայի և պաշտպանություն միջազգային համագումարի, տ. 2, չ. 1, էջ 651.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid, p. 679.
representative of the Turkish Government, one representative of the community which claims that it or one of its members has been injured, and a chairman appointed by the Council of the League of Nations. These arbitral commissions shall hear all claims covered by this Article and decide them by summary procedure.

The arbitral commissions will have power to order:

1. The provision by the Turkish Government of labour for any work of reconstruction or restoration deemed necessary. This labour shall be recruited from the races inhabiting the territory where the arbitral commission considers the execution of the said works to be necessary.

2. The removal of any person who, after enquiry, shall be recognized as having taken an active part in massacres or deportations or as having provoked them; the measures to be taken with regard to such person's possessions will be indicated by the commission.

3. The disposal of property belonging to members of a community who have died or disappeared since January 1, 1914, without leaving heirs; such property may be handed over to the community instead of to the State.

4. The cancellation of all acts of sale or any acts creating rights over immovable property concluded after January 1, 1914. The indemnification of the holders will be a charge upon the Turkish Government, but must not serve as a pretext for delaying the restitution. The arbitral commission will, however, have the power to impose equitable arrangements between the interested parties, if any sum has been paid by the present holder of such property.

The Turkish Government undertakes to facilitate in the fullest possible measure the work of the commissions and to ensure the execution of their decisions, which will be final. No decision of the Turkish judicial or administrative authorities shall prevail over such decisions.

Actually under this Article rather realistic and effective means and mechanisms were proposed for the restoration of financial and property losses of the Western Armenian population and for overcoming the effects of those losses. All these have not lost their modern relevance, and can be fully practiced on the basis of reparations and restitutions for the Armenian Genocide, with the difference that the Council of the League of Nations will be replaced by the UN Security Council.

Article 144 of the Treaty of Sèvres was amplified with Article 288: "The property, rights and interests in Turkey of former Turkish nationals who acquire ipso facto the nationality of an Allied Power or of a new State in accordance with the provisions of the present Treaty, or any further Treaty regulating the disposal of territories detached from Turkey, shall be restored to them in their actual condition."

Though the Treaty of Sèvres wasn't ratified and was not used because of the changes in the political life of Turkey and geopolitical processes, it is quite a legal document. Though at the time of signing the Treaty the actual power in Turkey was in
the hands of the Kemalists, on July 22, 1920, the legitimate government (represented by the Council of the sultan in Constantinople) of the state voted in favor of signing the Treaty of peace and authorized the Turkish official delegation to sign the Treaty of Sèvres. As it is known even a non-ratified treaty doesn’t completely release the countries having signed that treaty from their liabilities, especially taking into consideration the fact that while signing the document the Turkish official delegation didn’t exceed its full powers. Under Article 18 of Vienna Convention on the “Law of Treaties” in 1969: “OBLIGATION NOT TO DEFEAT THE OBJECT AND PURPOSE OF A TREATY PRIOR TO ITS ENTRY INTO FORCE

A State is obliged to refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose of a treaty when:

(a) It has signed the treaty or has exchanged instruments constituting the treaty subject to ratification, acceptance or approval, until it shall have made its intention clear not to become a party to the treaty; or

(b) It has expressed its consent to be bound by the treaty, pending the entry into force of the treaty and provided that such entry into force is not unduly delayed.

Contrary to international laws, the new Turkish rulers took consistent steps to neutralize the provisions of the Treaty of Sèvres.

It is noteworthy that even in the case of not being ratified, the provisions of the Treaty of Sèvres were used partially to separate the Arab territories from the Ottoman Empire which was provided by the Treaty of Sèvres, and took place before signing the next treaty (Treaty of Lausanne).

The next important component of the plea should be considered US President Woodrow Wilson’s Arbitral Award on determination of Armenian-Turkish boundary on November 22, 1920, which was an international judicial act which declared the liability of Turkey, the state guilty of perpetration of the Armenian Genocide.

That arbitration certainly had its historical and legal backgrounds. After WWI the issue of separating Armenia from Turkey was directly connected with the policy of the deportations and massacres of the Armenians, as had been defined in the Memorandum of US President Woodrow Wilson which was handed to the Ottoman Empire’s government on August 22, 1919, by Admiral Mark L. Bristol, U.S. High Commissioner in Constantinople.

---

37 Барсегов Ю., Геноцид армян-преступление по международному праву, с. 184.
41 Барсегов Ю.Г., Арбитражное решение президента США по армяно-турецкой границе, с. 6.
The issue of legal and political grounds of termination of dominance of Turkey towards Armenia became the investigation for the special King-Crane Commission (Inter-Allied Commission on Mandates) created in 1919 by the US President. In the report of the Commission submitted on August 28, 1919, the following arguments were presented as the special grounds for the separation of the historical Homeland of the Armenians from Turkey:

1. the proved inability of Turks to govern the others;
2. the repeated “horrible massacres of the Armenians” as an adopted intent policy;
3. the complete absence of compassion for the committed massacres or willingness to refuse the committed crimes, moreover their attempts to justify their actions;
4. the extremely hostile attitude toward the Armenians, and the constant threat of the massacres and slaughters;
5. the complete failure of the Articles* of the Treaty (1878) which was aimed at the protection of the Armenians;
6. the availability of sufficient evidence that these two nations couldn’t live peacefully together.
7. the experience of Turkish governing mustn’t be repeated;
8. it is more accurate the Armenians and Turks have separate states;
9. elementary justice demands the separation of the territory from Turkey where the Armenians can be centralized without being obliged to live under Turkish rule;
10. nothing except the above-mentioned can give the Armenians sufficient security guarantees42.

The arguments and the conclusions of the commission had been necessary and sufficient corroborations43 for the document on the arbitration in the issue of demarcation of the Turkish-Armenian boundary by Woodrow Wilson. This approach was then adopted by the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers when Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and the USA on January 30, 1919, noted in their joint resolution that coming out from the historical abuse of the Turkish government towards its nations, and especially coming out from the terrible extermination of the Armenians in the previous years, the allied and united powers came to the agreement that Armenia must be completely separated from Turkey44.

In response to the Turkish anti-arguments the USA sharply reacted. R. Lansing, the United States Secretary of State noted in the telegram addressed to the American Commission participated in Paris Peace Conference on August 16, 1919, that “The President desires Turkish authorities be warned that should they not take immediate

* It is about Articles 61 and 62 of the Berlin Treaty.
42 Барсегов Ю.Г., Арбитражное решение президента США по армяно-турецкой границе, с. 6–7.
43 Nowadays these corroborations are very contemporary. They unmask the Turkish denial policy of the Armenian Genocide.
44 Барсегов Ю.Г., Арбитражное решение президента США по армяно-турецкой границе, с. 7–8.
and efficacious measures to prevent any massacres or other atrocities being perpetrated by Turks, Kurds or other Muslims against Armenians in the Caucasus, or elsewhere, then all support concerning a secure sovereignty over the Turkish portion of the present Ottoman Empire under Article XII of the peace terms, will be withdrawn, and such withdrawal might result in the absolute dissolution of the Turkish Empire and a complete alteration of the condition of peace.\textsuperscript{45}

The suggestion of the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers to Woodrow Wilson to take the role of the arbitrator was made in San Remo conference on April 25, 1920. The next day the Supreme Council of Allied Powers informed the League of Nations about its suggestion to Woodrow Wilson to become an arbiter in the issue of determination of Armenian-Turkish boundaries. On May 11, the terms of peaceful settlement were transferred to the Turkish delegation.\textsuperscript{46} On May 17, 1920, Wilson announced his agreement to be an arbiter. An assertion, that Woodrow Wilson’s arbitral award’ basis was the Treaty of Sèvres which hadn’t been ratified, so it does not have legal power, is groundless. That arbitration has connection with the Treaty of Sèvres, as much as under Article 89 (“Turkey and Armenia as well as the other High Contracting Parties agree to submit to the arbitration of the President of the United States of America the question of the frontier to be fixed between Turkey and Armenia in the vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van and Bitlis, and to accept his decision thereupon, as well as any stipulations he may prescribe as to access for Armenia to the sea, and as to the demilitarisation of any portion of Turkish territory adjacent to the said frontier”). The principal four countries of the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers - the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan in their request to make the US President an arbiter were joined by new ten states: Belgium, Greece, Hedjaz, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Serb-Croat-Slovene state, Czecho-Slovakia and the parties of the dispute Armenia and Turkey. So the Treaty of Sèvres was only a supplementary legal ground for the Arbitral Award, in addition to an earlier suggestion to the US President to become an international arbiter, regardless of the fact that the process of arbitration was in progress. Moreover, Article 90 stated: “In the event of the determination of the frontier under Article 89 involving the transfer of the whole or any part of the territory of the said vilayets to Armenia, Turkey hereby renounces as from the date of such decision all rights and title over the territory so transferred. The provisions of the present Treaty applicable to territory detached from Turkey shall thereupon become applicable to the said territory. The proportion and nature of the financial obligations of Turkey which Armenia will have to assume, or of the rights which will pass to her, on account of the transfer of the said territory will be determined in accordance with Articles 241 to 244.

\textsuperscript{45} Bears H.P., U.S. Naval Detachments in Turkish Waters, 1919-1924. U.S. Navy Department, June, 1943, p. 17;
\textsuperscript{46} Барсегов Ю.Г., Турецкая доктрина международного права на службе политики, с. 27.

Барсегов Ю.Г., Арбитражное решение президента США по армяно-турецкой границе, с. 15.
Part VIII (Financial Clauses) of the present Treaty. Subsequent agreements will, if necessary, decide all questions which are not decided by the present Treaty and which may arise in consequence of the transfer of the said territory”). Thus, the contracting states of the Treaty of Sèvres agreed to adopt the award immediately, and Turkey, which was a side of the dispute, additionally reaffirmed renouncing its rights in relation to the territories transferring to Armenia\(^{47}\).

Thus, the process of arbitration had started before signing the Treaty of Sèvres; therefore it is quite an independent international legal document for Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan as members of the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers on the one hand, and the US President - on the other\(^{48}\).

The suggestion of arbitration to especially Woodrow Wilson in determining borders of Armenia indeed, had its grounds which were determined by the required principles for the choice of international arbiter: justice and impartiality. Based on the circumstances that the USA hadn’t been at war with Turkey the candidacy of the US President was the best option for the role of the arbiter to clarify the boundaries of Armenia and Turkey\(^{49}\). Thus, the principle of neutrality and disinterestedness towards parties of the dispute was provided which was an obligatory condition for a settlement of international disputes with the help of arbitration according to corresponding international norms relevant at that time, and especially according to the Hague Convention for the “Pacific Settlement of International Disputes” 1899 and 1907.

As the political substantiation of this arbitration was a response note signed by Alexandre Millerand, Prime Minister of France on July 17, 1920, against the protest of the Turkish delegation, the note particularly read: “The Turkish government hadn’t performed its duties to protect their non-Turkish subjects from loot, violence and murder. Moreover, there is much evidence showing that the government had taken the liability to organize and lead the most brutal attacks on the population whom it should have protected. For that reason the Allied Powers couldn’t make changes in those provisions which proposed to create an independent Armenia”\(^{50}\).

Though the initiated and conducted arbitration on demarcating Turkish-Armenian borders had begun on the base of the decision and will of the victorious countries\(^*\), nevertheless it didn’t contradict and was implemented according to the existing legal norms of that time. Thus, under Article 54 of the Hague Convention for the “Pacific Settlement of International Disputes” and under Article 81 of the same, but already edited (1907) Convention it was stated “if the arbitral award was made according to the

\(^{47}\) Геноцид армян: ответственность Турции и обязательства мирового сообщества, т. 2, ч. 1, с. 676.

\(^{48}\) Барсегов Ю.Г., Геноцид армян-преступление по международному праву, с.182.

\(^{49}\) Ibid., p.181.

\(^{50}\) Ibid., p. 183.

\(^*\) The same can be said about Nuremberg and Tokyo Trials after World War II organized by the coalition of anti-Nazi countries.
order and the agents of the parties were kept informed, it meant that the dispute subject was solved once and for all and couldn’t be reversed⁵¹.

The arbitration of Woodrow Wilson was limited within concrete territories by the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers. Thus, in the course of implementing the demarcation of the Turkish-Armenian borders the arbiter had to be limited within the Van, Bittlis (Baghesh), Erzerum (Karin-Erzrum), and Trabzon (Trapezunt) provinces, and to guarantee creation of conditions for Armenia to get access to the Black Sea. Without it the arbitration would be incomplete. The contracting states took responsibility to take possible measures for the US President to be able to provide access to the sea⁵².

On November 22, 1920, Woodrow Wilson signed the final Report, titled: “Decision of the President of the United States of America respecting the Frontier between Turkey and Armenia, Access for Armenia to the Sea, and the Demilitarization of Turkish Territory adjacent to the Armenian Frontier”. On December 6 it was officially transferred to the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers⁵³ and was published on December 17, entering into force. The arbiter within his jurisdiction and based on the territorial limitation by the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers while actualizing the demarcation of the Turkish-Armenian boundary confirmed the title and the rights of the Armenians on Van, Baghesh (Bittlis), Erzrum and Trapezunt, this demarcation would have given Armenia also an access to the Black Sea. So, the Armenian territory which should have been returned to the Republic of Armenia would be approximately 103.599 square kilometers. Despite the fact that the Arbitral Award had not been possible to realize because of the new geopolitical changes, it continues to remain the main consequence of the Armenian Genocide: the international document which hasn’t lost its legal power in the settlement of the Armenian-Turkish territorial boundary dispute.

The proof of the above stated is the decision of the UN International Court of Justice on the same type of territorial dispute between Honduras vs. Nicaragua, by which the arbitral award of the King of Spain was adopted as a legal ground to settle that dispute. This case can be a good precedent for recognizing the legitimacy of the arbitral award of Woodrow Wilson⁵⁴.

As the researches and views of authoritative international law experts have particular significance for the international court, it is appropriate to use as a component of the plea on the Armenian Genocide advisory conclusions of specialists given to the issue of the Armenian refugees in 1929.

---

⁵² Барсегов Ю.Г., Арбитражное решение президента США по армяно-турецкой границе, с. 14.
The Armenians who survived the genocide and lived in the Diaspora tried to clarify their opportunities to restore their violated rights according to the international law valid at that time. Taking into account that the Armenian Question appeared to be at a deadlock in the League of Nations, also the denialist attitude of Turkey, on June 5, 1929 “The Central Committee for Armenian Refugees” (CCAR) applied to provide advisory conclusion to the four authoritative international law experts of that time: Gilbert Gidel, Albert de Lapradelle, Louis Le Fur and Andre Mandelstam. In their answer they revealed the nature of Turkey’s illegal policy towards the Armenians.

The next component of the plea are the Articles of the Treaty of Lausanne on the protection of the rights of the non-Muslim population of Turkey. As is known, under Articles 37 and 44 of Lausanne Treaty, Turkey took new liabilities connected with the protection of the rights of its non-Muslim population. Particularly under Article 37: “Turkey undertakes that the stipulations contained in Articles 38 to 44 shall be recognized as fundamental laws, and that no law, no regulation, nor official action shall conflict or interfere with these stipulations, nor shall any law, regulation, nor official action prevail over them”. Moreover, Turkey was obliged to conform its government’s legislation concerning the rights of the non-Muslim population to the Articles of the Lausanne Treaty.

Under Article 38: “1. The Turkish Government undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Turkey without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion.

2. All inhabitants of Turkey shall be entitled to free exercise, whether in public or private, of any creed, religion or belief, the observance of which shall not be incompatible with public order and good morals.

3. Non-Moslem minorities will enjoy full freedom of movement and of emigration, subject to the measures applied, on the whole or on part of the territory, to all Turkish nationals, and which may be taken by the Turkish Government for national defense, or for the maintenance of public order”. Thus, the Turkish government was obliged to ensure the full and complete protection of life and property of the whole population of

55 The authoritative international law experts showed that Turkey’s discriminatory policy definitely contradicted the norms of the international law of that time (Մարուքյան Ա., Հայոց ցեղասպանության գործով միջազգային դատարան դիմելու հիմքերն ու հնարավորությունները, Երևան, 2014, էջ 135-140).
56 Барсегов Ю.Г., Геноцид армян - преступление по международному праву, Москва, 2000, с. 207-211.
57 "1. The Turkish Government undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Turkey without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion.
2. All inhabitants of Turkey shall be entitled to free exercise, whether in public or private, of any creed, religion or belief, the observance of which shall not be incompatible with public order and good morals.
3. Non-Moslem minorities will enjoy full freedom of movement and of emigration, subject to the measures applied, on the whole or on part of the territory, to all Turkish nationals, and which may be taken by the Turkish Government for national defense, or for the maintenance of public order”.
Turkey regardless of gender, nationality, language, race or religion\textsuperscript{59}. The demand of Article 38 was privatized by the first and second paragraphs of Article 39 which stated that non-Muslim minorities which were the subjects of Turkey should have the same rights as the Muslim population. Article 40 of the Treaty defined that the non-Muslim minority should have equal rights to found and conduct charity, religious and social establishments. On the base of the same article they got the right to use their religion and language freely. It was defined by Article 41 that the Turkish government should create favorable conditions for the subjects of Turkey to open elementary schools in order to be able to educate their children with their mother language, especially in the cities and villages where the non-Muslim population formed significant numbers\textsuperscript{60}.

It is important to mention that under Article 42, the Turkish authorities were obliged to ensure the protection of churches, synagogues, cemeteries, and other religious institutions of non-Muslim minorities. Thus, according to this Article, the Armenian churches not only shouldn’t have been destroyed, but conversely they should have been restored\textsuperscript{61}. But contrary to all these provisions, Turkey continued the destruction of the Armenian cultural heritage.

Finally, the resolutions of the international and governmental organizations which recognize and condemn the Armenian Genocide can be submitted to the plea as supplementary credible and objective evidence. These resolutions should be accompanied with the letters of the heads of those organizations: World Peace Congress (1965), World Council of Churches (1983, 1989), The Permanent Peoples’ Tribunal (1984), International Association of Genocide Scholars (1997, 2005, and 2007), Christian Youth Association (2002), and Nobel Prize Awarded Organization (2007).

After submitting of factual circumstances and evidence with the help of the above mentioned components and after being evaluated from the legal point of view the pleading must be concluded by the legal requirements expressing the demands of the Armenian people concerning the losses and their consequences\textsuperscript{62} after the Armenian Genocide.

On the basis of all the above mentioned Armenia should require the court to compel Turkey to adopt the following as temporary measures:

1. To stop the denial policy of the Armenian Genocide: it is the continuation of the committed genocide and its modern manifestation. This requirement can be

\textsuperscript{59}Toriguian Sh., Armenian Question and International Law, p. 186.

\textsuperscript{60}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{61}Papian A., Legal Bases for the Armenian Claims, p. 38.

\textsuperscript{62}a) deprivation of homeland, b) human losses, c) loss of cultural heritage, d) financial losses, e) mental illnesses and psychological complexes.
2. To suspend the application of Article 301 of the Turkish Criminal Code, under which are persecuted human rights activists, journalists for their opinions on history or other areas that are different from the official approach. On June 1, 2005, Article 301 replaced Article 159 of former Criminal Code on the basis of which criminal punishment by imprisonment was defined for the “denigration of Turkishness, the Republic or the Grand National Assembly of Turkey”. In 2008 article 301 was “amended”: the word “Turkishness” was replaced by the phrase “the Turkish Nation”, etc.64.

3. To recognize the verdicts of the Turkish Military Tribunals as legal and to repeal the decisions of Kemal’s regime to review those verdicts.

4. To stop the glorification and honor of the individuals who committed crimes in the territory of Turkey during the First World War, and publicly announce them criminals.

5. To implement the liability to protect non-Muslims’ rights according to the articles 38-44 of the Treaty of Lausanne. The decision of Supreme Court of the Republic of Turkey in 1974 to seize the property of national minorities and to hand it to the state treasury should be considered as the next manifestation of expropriation of the Armenian community of Turkey. This was a flagrant violation of provisions of the Treaty of Lausanne. This fact made Abdullah Gul, the President of Turkey, to confirm “the non-Muslim asset law” on February 26, 2008. The law was adopted by the Grand National Assembly of Turkey with great difficulty, according to which, the country should have returned the property of non-Muslim communities, particularly Armenians during 18 months.65 However, even after adopting the law nothing has been done practically: the Armenian community continues to have financial losses, and this issue continues to remain in the centre of the attention of the international community. The latter demands from Turkey to respect the interests and rights of non-Muslim communities.

The following can be submitted as general requirements:

1. To recognize the arbitral award of the US President Woodrow Wilson on the demarcation of the Turkish-Armenian boundaries as a legal ground for the main consequence of the Armenian Genocide: the deprivation of Homeland.

2. On the basis of the principle of Ex injuria jus non oritur the action of Turks to enjoy the fruits of the Armenian Genocide, particularly to seize the property of the

---

63 Права человека. Сборник международных договоров, с. 781.
64 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Article_301_(Turkish_Penal_Code)#Current_status
65 Dadayan Kh., The Economic Constitute of the Armenian Genocide, and Financial Compensation Issue, p. 185.

* Law does not arise from injustice.
victims of genocide must be considered illegal, so Turkey must be obliged to give the financial compensation to the heirs of the victims or genocide survivors, or the representatives of their profits and rights. To denounce publicly the “Law on Abandoned Properties” adopted by Turkish government and to recognize the provisions of Article 144 of the Treaty of Sèvres as a legal mechanism for the financial compensation to the heirs of victims or genocide survivors, or their representatives.
DEMOGRAPHY AND GOVERNANCE
State governance was of a monarchical nature in ancient and medieval Armenia. The king was the head of the state apparatus and the royal power was hereditary, passing from father to son. This custom was already well developed in the 6th-1st centuries BC, during the reign of the Yervanduni and Artashesyan royal dynasties in the Kingdom of Great Armenia. Its roots go even further back to the Ararat (Urartu) Kingdom and deeper.

In domestic and foreign policy matters, the king had broad legislative and executive authority. He “was the source of law. He could act based on customary or state enacted laws and regulations, and was entitled to revise them and enact new laws”. According to Movses Khorenatsi, the Armenian king Vagharshak “…enacts laws in his royal court, defines times for visits [to the royal court], as well as for counseling, feasting, and taking walks, [the king] defines military hierarchy, first, second, third, and so on… appoints arbitrators in the royal court, in the cities, and in the townships.”

According to the same source, the king “…appoints his armed guards from the family of Haykazn Khor, superb and brave lancers and sword carriers, and appoints a person named Malkhaz as the head of their ministry…”.

It is noteworthy that in 488 AD, Vachagan, the Armenian king of Artsakh and Utik, ratified the “Kanonakan Sahmanadrutyun” (“Canonical Constitution”), which consisted of a preamble, 21 sections, and a conclusion. The document regulated the rights and the responsibilities of the secular and spiritual layers of the Armenian society, as well as taxation and civil matters.

---

1 Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. 1, Երևան, 1971, էջ 672:
2 Մովսէս Խորենացի, Պատմութիւն Հայոց, Երևան, 1991, էջ 117:
3 Ibid., p. 110.
6 Պարույրովսկի, Յ.Մ., Հայոց, աշխատ. Չ. Հայարանքի, Երևան, 1964, էջ 91-100.
According to historical sources, the king was responsible for foreign policy, particularly for decisions on waging wars, making peace, and signing treaties. He was entitled to found cities and give names to them. He was the supreme commander of the armed forces, while also managing all aspects of domestic policies7.

The court was the counseling body of state governance, which consisted of the members of the king’s immediate circles, especially relatives and the elite of noblemen. Ashkharhazhoghov («the forum of delegates») was a unique counseling body, which was summoned by the king at a certain time of the year. Among landlords and noblemen the elite of the rural community was also participating in the assembly. As the supreme counseling body of Armenia, Ashkharhazhoghov was usually assembled in Tsaghkotn region, near the mountain Npat, and in Shahapivan8.

The functional government was realized through the ministries (or departments). Some of them were permanent, including Հազարապետություն (Hazarapetutyun - Ministry of Finance), Մաղխազություն (Maghkhazutyun - the Royal Guard), Մարդպետություն (Mardpetutyun - the Office of Royal Treasury), Սպարապետություն (Sparapetutyun- the Ministry of Defense), etc.; there were also a number of secondary departments.

Hazarapetutyun was one of the main ministries of the state, which was controlling all the rural communities, financial matters, including taxation, and the military9.

Maghkhazutyun was the department of court guards.

Mardapetutyun was the ministry supervising the court, royal manor and the treasury.

In ancient times Metsn Datavarutyun was a privilege of the High priest and after the adoption of Christianity in Armenia as the state religion (301 AD) it became the ministry headed by the Armenian Catholicos.

Sparapet (minister of defense) was the supreme commander of the armed forces of the kingdom of Great Armenia10.

As a rule, the ministries (or departments) were headed by the most influential representatives of the Armenian nobility, while the positions were of an hereditary nature.

The territory of the kingdom of Great Armenia consisted of 124 regions (“gavars”), which were included in 22 “strategies” and the realm of the royal domain. Each “strategy” (or prefecture) had its governor, who in the beginning was appointed by the king, but later the position became the hereditary privilege of the dynasty. Movses

---

7 Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. 1, էջ 672-673:
8 Ibid., pp. 828-829.
9 Ibid., pp. 830-831.
10 Ibid., p. 834.
Khorenatsi states that the king “appoints Sharashan, who was from Sarasar’s family, as «bdeashkh11 mets» (մեծ բդեաշխ) in the south-west, close to the borders with Assyria, on the bank of the Tigris River…”12. At first, the title “landlord” was given to the governors of the regions appointed by the king. Later, however, the title of the landlord became hereditary, while the region became the hereditary property of the princely family (nakharar)13.

The cities in Great Armenia were governed by city governors (վերակացու verakatsu) appointed by the king. Besides the governors, however, there were also the city government councils14. For instance, according to Khorenatsi, the governor of the city of Tigranakert was King Arshak II’s father-in-law, Antioch15/Andovk Patriarch of Syunik16. Rural communities were governed by the appointed community governors, as the lower layers of the state administrative apparatus. Moreover, bigger cities were independent, while smaller ones together with some of the rural communities were part of the “strategies, while certain villages were in the territories of the cities17.

For centuries the landlords were among the most crucial links of state governance (Figure 1). Each landlord was not only a big landowner, but also a governor of a certain region (a body of territorial administration). At the same time, they were entitled to hold positions in state governance and run above mentioned ministries and departments. In their own domains, the nakharars were entitled to taxation, judicial, administrative and military power and fortresses.

---

11 Cf. margravial vitaxae.
12 Մովսէս Խորենացի, էջ 116:
13 Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. 1, էջ 842-843:
14 Ibid., p. 681.
15 Cf. Andovk Patriarch of Syunik, father of Queen Parandzem (see: Հ. Աճառյա ն, Հայոց անձնանունների բառարան, հ. Ա, Երևան, 1942, էջ 158):
16 Մովսէս Խորենացի, էջ 287:
17 Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. 1, էջ 682:
By their nature, the ministries were functional government bodies, authorized to govern the sphere assigned to them (e.g., national defense, economy). Thus, the system of state governance consisted of the monarch, court, «the forum of delegates» (Ashkharhazhoghov), the bodies of functional and territorial administration, and the body of judicial power.

From the early Middle Ages the Armenian Apostolic Church became responsible for spiritual development, education, and, partially, the judiciary (the landlords in their territories were entitled to judicial power). In the periods of the loss of the kingdom, the Church also assumed legislative responsibilities and took control over the judiciary.

It is noteworthy that the organizational structure of the Armenian Apostolic Church has not incurred serious changes during seventeen centuries of its existence, which, no doubt, speaks to its efficiency (Figure 2).
After the abolition of the Armenian Arshakuni kingdom (428 AD) both the Persian and Byzantine parts of Armenia retained certain elements of Armenian statehood. With certain privileges, army, and relative independence, the ministers continued to govern in their domains. The Persian court had appointed a *marzpan* \(^{19}\) in Eastern Armenia. The Church continued to run the ministry of *Mets Datavarutyun*, *Hazarapetutyun* and *Sparapetutyun* continued to function as the main ministries of the Persian Armenia \(^{20}\). The *Hazarapet* (the minister of finance) remained responsible for taxation and matters of state building, while the *Sparapet* (the minister of defense) for the army. The government bodies were functioning under the supervision of the Persian royal court. The Armenian statehood (based on the nakharar system), was preserved owing to the rebellions headed by Vardan Mamikonyan (450 - 451) and Vahan Mamikonyan (481 - 484), as well as the hierarchic governance of the Armenian Apostolic Church \(^{21}\).

The Byzantine part of Armenia retained the hereditary entitlements of the Armenian landlords until 536 AD. Afterwards, administrative-military reforms implemented by Justinian I (527-565) in the government system of the Empire became dominant, and the Armenian landlords, being restricted in their hereditary economic rights, lost their political and military power in Western Armenia \(^{22}\).

---

\(^{18}\) Because of historical circumstances, different Patriarchates have been formed over time, and the Catholicate of the Great House of Cilicia, all are in the hierarchy of the Armenian Apostolic Church headed by the Catholicos of All Armenians.

\(^{19}\) The title of a governor of a territorial administrative unit of the Sasanid kingdom.

\(^{20}\) Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. 2, Երևան, 1984, էջ 166:

\(^{21}\) Դանիելյան Է. Լ., Հին Հայոց պետականության գաղափարական ընկալումը վաղ միջնադարյան հայկական աղբյուրներում, Հարք, Երևան, 2006, 1, էջ 18-31:

\(^{22}\) Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. 2, Երևան, 1984, էջ 219-221, 239-241:
Marzpan of Eastern Armenia was supervised directly by the Persian king. From the 30s of the 7th century, according to historical sources, the country was governed by the Prince of Armenia. After the fall of the Sassanid Kingdom (651 AD) in the second half of the 7th century, in conditions of the rivalry between the Byzantine and the newly formed Arab Caliphate, Armenia restored its territorial integrity and independence. The Prince of Armenia was an independent ruler, albeit not with hereditary entitlements. The Church, especially the Catholicos, and the landlords participated in the government of the country.

At the beginning of the 8th century Armenia was dominated by the Arab Caliphate. The governing system of Armenia appeared under the supervision of an Arab governor-general (vostikan), appointed by the caliph. In the 8th-9th cc. the Armenian people’s struggle against the Arab domination outgrew into the national-liberation struggle reflected in the epic “Davit of Sasun” the roots of which are grounded in the depths of the millennia-old Armenian history.

After the restoration of the Armenian Kingdom, during the reign of the Bagratuni dynasty (885-1045 AD), the king (the monarch) was the head of state, whose powers, like during the former kingdoms of Great Armenia, was of an hereditary nature. State governance, although based on the traditions and features of the earlier Armenian statehood, had its distinctive specifications from the Arshakuni period. The Bagratunis retained the old titles of a number of positions from the past systems of government. The Bagratunis, particularly, favored “the King of Kings” and “the Prince of Princes.”

The Prince of Princes was considered the representative and the deputy of the Armenian king. This position is similar to the position of Hazarapet of the Arshakuni period. The Prince of Princes was supervising all the regional governors, city governors. He was responsible for taxation, and, together with the Sparapet, was heading the Armenian army during wars.

The Church had a considerable input in the government of the country, and the Bagratuni kings were trying to strengthen the spiritual center of Armenia.

The Sparapet, as the commander of the Armenian army, was the second person in the country after the king. In most cases this position was filled with members of the royal family.

The heads of small kingdoms, such as Vaspurakan, Kars, Syunik, and Tashir-Dzoraget, had an important role in the government of regions (nahang) and sub-regions (gavar). The main territories of the kingdom, on the other hand, were governed by

---

23 Тер-Гевондян А., Армения и Арабский халифат, Ереван, 1977, с. 47-49. Թեր-Գեորգի Ա., Հայ-արաբական հարցազգեստը, Երևան, 2000, էջ 207-225:
24 Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. 3, Երևան, 1976, էջ 266:
25 Ibid., p. 363.
26 Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. 2, Երևան, 2000, էջ 318-319:
governor-princes, appointed by the Armenian king. The heads of small kingdoms, too, needed an approval of their authority from the Bagratuni king27.

The social-economic system, including state governance, had a legislative basis. The Armenian kings carried out both executive and legislative functions. As per historical sources (the works of Movses Khorenatsi, Agantangeghos, Pavstos Buzand, Eznik Koghbatsi and Ghazar Parpetsi), the kings enacted different laws, charters, and edicts, aimed at regulating the socio-economic relations in Armenia28. “Gahnamak” and “Zoranamak,” two unique types of edicts, had ratified the position, role, and the size of the military of the governors and landlords in the kingdom. These edicts also classified the governors and landlords based on the Great Armenia system of four military governors and landlords. The regulation of the religious and socio-economic relations was carried out based on the Kanonagirk Hayots (Armenian Book of Canons), which had been in use from ancient times until the beginning of the 20th century. The secular Code of Laws (Datastanagirk by Mkhitar Gosh29) was also in use in medieval Armenia.

The system of the state governance in Cilician Armenia (a great principality in 1080-1198 and a kingdom in 1198-1375) was formed based on the above-mentioned principles of the governance that existed in the times of the Kingdom of Great Armenia, as well as some experience of the European countries30.

Bdeshkhs (margraves vitaxae or duches) kept the second position after the king in ancient Armenia. They were followed by senior landlords, junior landlords, and the free class (ազատներ). In Cilician Armenia, however, the same structure of institutions and the same type of hierarchy had different names: instead of the term nakharar were used the terms prince and baron, alongside of chatelliens (բերդակալներ) and the free class or knights (ասպետներ)31.

As in the past, the king had exclusive rights (to coin money, levy duties, build cities, strategic fortresses, and bridges). The king was the supreme commander of the armed forces and was in charge of foreign affairs; he was entitled to enact laws and manage other important state matters. The centre of the whole country’s governance was the royal court. The governing bodies in the court included the supreme authority (գերագոյ ատեան, դիւան) and the central administrative bodies (ministries - գործակալութիւններ)32. The management of the ministries was implemented not by the

27 Ibid., p. 267, 271, 276-277.
28 Հայ ժողովրդի պատմություն, հ. 2, էջ 483:
29 See: Смбат Спарапет, Судебник, перевод и предисловие А. Галстяна, ред. С. Аревшатян, Ереван, 1958, с. XIX-XXIV.
30 Cf. Микаелян Г.Г., История Киликийского армянского государства, Ереван, 1952, с. 238.
31 Սուքիասյան Ա.Գ., Կիլիկիայի Հայկական պետության և իրավունքի պատմություն (XI-XIV դարեր), Երևան, 1978, էջ 154:
32 Ibid., pp. 159-160.
representatives of the landlord (nakharar) families but by meritocrats. The chancellor ("royal scribe") (դպրապետ - dprapet) was in charge of foreign affairs, the state seal, preparing royal decrees together with the king, etc. The Sparapet (Gundstable) was managing the military establishment, while the head of customs affairs (Maksapetutyun) was in charge of customs, and domestic and foreign trade.

Local self-governing bodies had an important role in the government system of Cilician Armenia. There were cities and districts (gavars) under the direct supervision of the king and governed by governors appointed by the king. Those gavars which were in the domain of landlord-vassals, were governed by barons, who, like landlords, were both landowners and governors. The barons had broad administrative, military, financial, and judicial authorities. There were also representative bodies, the council or assembly of seniors, in the government of gavars. Each gavar consisted of rural communities, which were governed by the council of the seniors (աւագանի) of the community (the priest was also participating in the government of the community). It is noteworthy that the cities, besides the head of the city, also had bodies of sovereignty, such as councils of citizens, guilds, and unions. Like in Great Armenia, the judicial system consisted of state, estate, and religious courts.

State governance in Cilician Armenia was implemented according to Smbat Sparapet’s Datastanagirk (Code of Laws) (1265), which was a unique and very important legislative-normative document. It was created by the objective necessity of reinforcing the statehood and was based on the accomplishments of Armenian theoretical thought and the tradition and experience of state governance in the country.

---

33 Ibid.
34 Սուքիասյան Ա.Գ., op. cit., p. 168.
36 Ibid., p. 176.
Between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries, calamitous demographic and ethnographic changes occurred in the region of Erzrum and throughout all of Western Armenia: the influx of Turkic and Kurdish tribes, the periodic violence and calamities, the forced conversion of many Christians to Islam, and the flight of masses of people to safer localities.

During the fifteenth century, the emerging Ottoman state, after conquering western Asia Minor and much of the Balkans, also turned eastward. Defeating Uzun Hasan and his Ak Koyunlu Turkmen confederation at the battle of Derjan in 1473, Sultan Mehmed II annexed much of the Armenian Highland, and Sultan Selim I extended the empire further in 1514 by overpowering Shah Ismail of Persia (Iran) in the decisive battle of Chaldran, northeast of Lake Van near Mount Ararat. The administrative divisions of the conquered territories were marked by frequent, destabilizing changes resulting from the political and economic interests of the Muslim ruling elite. By the 1530s, Western Armenia had been divided into the eyalets or provinces of Erzrum, Sivas (Sebastia), Van, Diarbekir (Amid, to the south of Tigranakert), Kars, and Akhaltskha. The sanjak or liva (county) of Bayazed (Bayazid/Bayazit, ancient Armenian Kogovit gavar), sometimes mentioned in the sources as a separate eyalet, actually constituted part of the province of Erzrum but with broad autonomy. This expansive province covered an area of 70,000 to 80,000 square kilometers (27,300 to 31,200 square miles), including the following administrative districts: Erzrum, Upper Basen (Passin), Lower or Interior Basen, Khnus, Kghi, Derjan (Terjan), Erznka (Eriza), Baberd (Baiburt), Sper (Ispir), and Tortum, together with the sanjak-liva of Bayazed - the residence of the local pasha - with its four subdistricts: Bayazed, Alashkert, Diadin, and Khamur.

What was the demographic situation in the central provinces of Western Armenia from the end of the fifteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth century, that is, during the period of the Turkish conquests? Examination of various sources clearly reveals that, in spite of the unfavorable ethnic processes during the preceding period, the territory of the province of Erzrum remained populated primarily by native Armenians. In the course of time, however, ethnically alien groups increased in numbers. Valuable information is preserved in the seventeenth-century chronicle «Շինուած Կարնոյ քաղաքին» (Structure of the City of Karin) by Hakob Karnetsi, “who

---

1 About the administrative divisions of the Ottoman Empire, see Birken A., Die provinzen des Osmanischen Reiches, Wiesbaden, 1976.
had profound knowledge of the geography of Bardzr Hayk/Upper Armenia. His Chronicle includes demographic information on the twenty-three gavars or districts of the Erzrum eyalet in the first half of the 17th century. According to this primary source, most districts remained inhabited almost exclusively by the Armenians. Examples of Karnetsi's descriptions are as follows:

Ghzljan (Kuzijan) - “a most beautiful gavar, the baron’s residence, grassy, with ample water, full of animals and sheep and Armenian villages”.

Derjan - “has many villages with Armenian dwellings, and land in the form of a plain, full of grain, animals, lard, and honey, and the town of Bagarich on the shore of the Eprat [Euphrates]”.

Erznka - “has a broad plain with many villages and towns and twenty-four monasteries.... It has the great Armenian city of Erznka, which is full of all manner of wealth, cotton, vineyards, and orchards. And there are now five churches in the city”.

Kamakh - “the land of Daranaghi which has villages and towns and a fast, impregnable fortress above the Euphrates. . . . And it is a very attractive, fruit-bearining small town inhabited by the Armenian nation and has illustrious churches and monasteries”\(^2\). Similar testimonies are given about Bayazed, Khamur, Diadin, Basen, Karin-Erzrum, and other gavars.

According to Karnetsi, in some administrative units there were also alien elements of Turkic origin (in Armenian sources identified by the common name of Tachik or Tajik) as well as Kurds. The Tachiks were found mainly in the northern districts of the province. Hakob Karnetsi wrote the following about the gavar of Gayl or Kelkit: “It has many villages in gorges. It also has the town of Karmri. The inhabitants of the country are Armenians and Tachiks”. The neighboring gavar of Sherian or Sharian had “a population consisting of many Armenians and also of the Romans [Greeks] and Tachiks”. About the district of Upper Basen, situated in the northeastern part of the province, Karnetsi noted: “The inhabitants are Armenians and a few Turks”. It is clearly attested, therefore, that Armenians constituted the majority of the population, with “also Tachiks” or “a few Turks” in some places.

Notwithstanding the fact that some northern districts came to have a mixed Armenian-Turkish population because of the Ottoman government’s measures to transfer and resettle Muslim elements there, the area remained largely Armenian populated. Tachiks constituted a relatively small element. It is seen also from materials published by Turkish researcher Izmet Miroglu\(^3\). In the sixteenth century, according to this data, Christians incontestably formed the majority of the population in Baberd, located northwest of the administrative center at Erzrum. Aside from Turks, Kurds made up the other alien element in the Erzrum eyalet, living mainly in the southern districts.

\(^2\) Յակոբ Կարնեցի, Շինուած Կարնոյ քաղաքին, որ կոչեցաւ Թէուդուպօլիս, որ այժմ Արզրում վերայձայանիալ կոչի, Մանր ժամանակություններ (XIII-XVIII դդ..), աշխ. Վ.Ա. Հակոբյան, հ. 2, Երևան, 1956, էջ 550-551:

\(^3\) Izmet Miroglu, XVI. yiizyilda Bayburt sancagi [The Sixteenth-Century Baiburt Sanjak] (Istanbul: Ulper Matbaasi, 1975), s. 119, Table 10.
There were "many villages and settlements of Armenians and Kurds" in the gavar of Kghi and, to the east, in the gavar of Khnus at the foot of the Biurakn (present Bingol) Mountains. Overall, during the first half of the seventeenth century, the province of Erzrum remained relatively monoethnic. But this situation did not last for long.

In order to establish absolute rule over subjugated peoples, the sultan's government followed a policy of repopulating the conquered territories with Turkish-speaking and Iranian-speaking (mainly Kurdish) tribes. As a result of such measures, the ethnic complexion of Western Armenia gradually changed. Muslim "islands" appeared in once-monoethnic Western Armenia. Month after month and year after year, the Armenians were forced to leave their Homeland. In 1478, for example, Lala Pasha, the most ferocious general in the Ottoman army, was sent to Baberd, Sper, Tortum and other gavars in Western Armenia to put the Ottoman administrative oppression machinery in motion, including the imposition of heavy taxation. In a short time, he laid waste to hundreds of villages in Upper Armenia and Tayk and annihilated thousands of people. More than 50,000 Armenians, seeking to escape physical extermination, converted to Islam4. Mass slaughter and forced conversions increased during and after the Turko-Persian war of 1512-14. A contemporary author and witness to the events wrote: "While engaging in raids they destroyed and devastated as far as the valleys of Mush, Khnus, and Alashkert, the regions of Diadin and Khamar, Batnots, and Bayazed. They destroyed everything; women and boys were carried off into captivity. They ravaged these fertile lands in such a way that from Erzrum to Erevan only the fortresses remained intact"5. From this passage, it is seen that the gavars of Karin-Erzrum, Upper Basen, Lower Basen, Alashkert, Bayazed, and Diadin, all the way to Erevan were turned into ruins. Shortly after the Ottoman-Persian treaty in 1639, which brought to an end more than a century of warfare and resulted in a new partition of Armenia, the sultan sent Jafar Pasha, a "very unjust, vicious, and severe man" to Erzrum in 1643 to conduct a thorough census for taxation purposes. The burdens of discriminatory taxation and accompanying violence were so onerous that large numbers of Christians in the northern gavars "converted to the law of Muhammad because of great fear"6.

The brilliant historian-geographer Ghukas Intchitchian (1758-1833) described another mass forced conversion to Islam in the northern part of the province. "Being exhausted by violence and hardships they adopted the religion of the Tachiks". He added that "the inhabitants of Berdagrak were mainly Armenian, [but] then many of them converted to the Tachiks and only a few of them remained Christian"7.

5 Մանր ժամանակագրություններ, էջ 565-566:
6 Ibid., p. 554.
7 Ինճիճեան Ղ., Աշխարհագրութիւն չորից մասանց աշխարհի, հ. 1, Վենետիկ, 1806, էջ 93, 132:
These forcible conversions were accompanied by the destruction of churches or transforming them into mosques. Hakob Karnetsi has recorded that in 1662, on the initiative of a great mullah by the name of Vani and the grand vizier of the Ottoman Empire, “ten Roman [Greek] and Armenian churches were torn down and destroyed, and every Christian up to Sebastia and Tokat wore black... And taking the church within the citadel of Arzrum, they turned it into their mosque and the Armenian nation sank into great mourning”8.

Sper, another northern gavar of Erzrum, in 1723 became victim to one of the subsequent Turkish expeditions, during which more than a hundred Armenian villages were reduced to ashes9. Each such incursion was accompanied by enslavement of the Armenian population: “Tachik troops captured the Armenians and sold them or forced them to renounce Christ. Some apostatized and those who refused were killed or sold. ... So many people were carried away from Erzrum that we are incapable of describing it”10.

Aside from measures to convert and Turkify the Armenian Christian population, the Ottoman rulers implemented another means to undermine the ethnic structure of Western Armenia. From the beginning of the sixteenth century, the sultans encouraged the influx of Kurdish tribes into the Armenian Highland in order to create a military-political buffer zone. In 1515, Sultan Selim, assisted by the Kurdish chief Idrissi, brought into subjugation the nomadic Kurds of Diarbekir and the region to the south. As a reward Idrissi was granted the right to administer those regions. In cooperation with the central government he pressured many of his tribe to migrate northward into the province of Erzrum11.

In 1635 another migration of Kurdish tribes was organized by Sultan Murad, who directed them to the gavars of Erznka and Derjan. At the same time a mass migration took place to Basen and Alashkert. Writing about the Kurds in Derjan, later Armenian authors noted that they had come from Sekmanapat12.

The processes of de-Armenianization continued and intensified in the eighteenth century. If in the initial stages the Kurds moved northward just in the summer months to graze their sheep in Alpine meadows of Armenian mountains, later they settled permanently in the Armenian villages. During the entire winter the Armenian population had to provide not only for the Kurds but also for their flocks. This unbearable practice, known as gshlagh, was sanctioned by the sultan and could not but encourage a greater influx of Kurds, especially in and around the Byurakn Mountains.

Thus, between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries the Muslim elements increased throughout Western Armenia, including the province of Erzrum, as the result

8 Մանր ժամանակագրություններ, էջ 567:
9 Սպեր, Ճորոխի աւազանը, Վիեննա, 1929, էջ 110:
10 Մատենադարան, ձեռ. No. 6332, p. 552.
11 Полковник Троттер, Малоазийские курды, Известия Кавказского отдела, т. 7, Тифлис, 1873, с. 1-3.
12 Ինչիճեան Ղ., Աշխարհագրութիւն չորից մասանց աշխարհի, էջ 97:
of forced conversion, flight of the native Armenian population, and organized migrations of Turks and Kurds. Those Armenians who were forced into professing Islam did so only outwardly. The sources show that for a long time they acted as Muslims in daytime and secretly took part in Christian rituals at night. This population became known by name of "kes-kes" (half-half), that is, half Armenian Christian and half Muslim. Still, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Armenians were more numerous than any other ethno-religious group in all gavars except in some parts of Kamakh. The province as a whole had 978 Armenian villages and 14 towns with more than 400,000 Armenians, of whom 308,000 were peasants and 93,000 were urban dwellers.\(^{13}\)

The Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29 awakened among the Western Armenians hopes of liberation from oppressive rule. During the war, the Russian armies defeated the Ottoman army and entered some parts of Western Armenia, including Karin-Erzrum. But immediately after the war, news of an impending Russian retreat under the pressure of the European powers, plunged the Armenians into despair. In the months following the conclusion of the Russo-Turkish Treaty of Adrianople in September 1829, approximately 75,000 Armenians abandoned their native villages and moved to the north of the Armenian Highland, especially into Akhaltska and Akhalakalak in Javakhk, the Armenian districts that had just been taken by the Russian Empire. The emigration of these 9,600 Armenian families further altered the ethnic composition of the province of Erzrum.

From 1830 onward, a new process began that affected the demographic structure of Western Armenia. The Armenian population of various districts, mainly in the west and north, started to move to areas located near the new border with Russia, particularly to Basen, Alashkert (Vagharshakert), Nahin, and Bayazed. It was felt that there might be less oppression in districts adjacent to the Russian Empire and that at least this proximity afforded an escape hatch in case conditions became unbearable.\(^{14}\) Thus, the eastward movement of population also acquired a political implication. Even during the height of the mass emigration of 1829-30, Armenians from other districts had moved to the east and the southeast and settled in the villages that had been abandoned by those who had departed for Eastern Armenia within the bounds of the Russian Empire.\(^{15}\)

It seemed that after the exodus of 1829-30 the depopulated or thinned out villages of Erzrum would never be restored. But already in the 1830s the beginnings of a revival were noted by contemporary authors. In 1830, Eli Smith, a Protestant missionary in Western Armenia, expressed anxiety that the region was becoming so deserted that his preaching would be for naught. But in April of 1831, when Armenian re-settlers from other regions as well as some natives who decided to return from Eastern Armenia had begun to bring new life to the half-empty villages, Smith wrote with inspiration: “We

---

\(^{13}\) Մելքոնյան Ա., Երզրում. Էզրում նահանգի ազգաբնակչությունը XIX դ.. առաջին երեսունամյակին, Երևան, 1994, էջ 115-117:

\(^{14}\) Մատենադարան, Զանազան հեղինակների արխիվ, գ 54, փ. 13, թ. 23բ:

\(^{15}\) Էփրիկեան Ս., Պատկերազարդ բնաշխարհիկ բառարան, հ. 1, Վենետիկ, 1902, էջ 492:
doubt not that an Armenian population will again assemble here, and then it may be made an important center for missionary operations"\textsuperscript{16}.

During the second half of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century the deepening Armenophobia of the Ottoman rulers and Muslim inhabitants made life of the Armenians increasingly difficult in the provinces of Western Armenia. After the Crimean War of 1853-56, news that the tsar would have to restore to the sultan the territories occupied by the Russian armies led to a new wave of emigration from Erzrum, Kars, Alashkert, and Bayazed\textsuperscript{17}. Of the many thousands who crossed the frontier into the Russian Empire, one part settled in the villages of the Talin district, between Alexandropol (Gyumri) and Erevan, while others created new homes in the coastal regions of the Black Sea, in the North Caucasus, and elsewhere. Some 4,000 families settled in the region of Stavropol alone\textsuperscript{18}. At the same time, a great number of Caucasian mountaineers, especially after the capture of their leader Shamil, moved to the Ottoman Empire and occupied abandoned Armenian villages. Most of the mountaineers, known by the general name of Lezgin or Cherkez, were purposely settled by the Turkish government in the eastern districts of Erzrum province, particularly in Basen, near the frontier with Russia\textsuperscript{19}.

The table at the end of this essay reflects the number of Armenian-populated localities and individual Armenians in the thirteen gavars of the province of Erzrum. A comparison of the figures for 1809 and 1909 provides a concise picture of the demographic changes that took place during the span of one century\textsuperscript{20}. The disastrous state in which the Armenians of the province existed during one century is easily seen from the table. The number of the Armenian-populated localities fell by 58 percent, and the Armenian population decreased by 60 percent. The districts that sustained the greatest losses, Bayazed, Alashkert, Sper, and Erzrum, were located near the Russian border where the retributions following the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 and the extreme violence during the Hamidian massacres of 1895-96 were particularly demoralizing. A large proportion of the survivors emigrated to Eastern Armenia or some parts of the Caucasus\textsuperscript{21}. Meanwhile, in the northern districts of Sper, Tortum, and Baberd, the renewed anti-Armenian persecutions resulted in the further forced Turkification of Armenians. For several centuries, therefore, up to the time of the Armenian Genocide of 1915, the processes of ethnic elimination - sometimes slowly and at other times very rapidly - were uninterruptedly in motion in Western Armenia.

\textsuperscript{17} Россия, Кавказская археологическая комиссия, т. 12, Тифлис, 1904, с. 313.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 1389.
\textsuperscript{19} Մատենադարան, Զանազան հեղինակների արխիվ, գ54, փ.13, թ. 23b.
\textsuperscript{20} Մատենադարան, Մկրտիչ Խրիմեանի արխիվը, գ. 101, փ. 1, 137, 248; գ. 102, փ. 639; գ. 103, փ. 429.
The policy of de-Armenianization of the western part of the Armenian Highland from the sixteenth through the nineteenth century, to which insufficient scholarly attention has been given, is in itself strong evidence of the destructive policies of the Ottoman rulers. Bardżr Hayk, like the rest of Western Armenia, was ethnically cleansed over a long period through the genocidal policies of forced conversion to Islam, assimilation, massacre, and expulsion. The final blow was struck in 1915.

**TABLE: ARMENIANS IN THE PROVINCE OF ERZRUM, 1809 and 1909**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gavar (kaza)</th>
<th>Armenian-Populated Sites</th>
<th>Number of Armenians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Karin (Erzrum)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Derjan</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Baberd</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Erznka (Eriza with Kamakh, Chorget-“Dryriver”, Kertchans)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Kghi</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sper</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Tortum</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Basen (Upper and Lower)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Khnus</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Alashkert (with Karakilisa)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Khamur and Dutağh</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Diadin</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Kogovit (Bayazed)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>931</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

Toponyms represent persistent linguistic facts, which have major historical and political significance. The rulers of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey realized the strategic importance of the toponyms and carried out consistent policies towards their distortion and appropriation. Aiming to assimilate the toponyms of the newly conquered territories, the Ottoman authorities translated them into Turkish from their original languages or transformed the local dialect place-names by the principle of contamination to make them sound like Turkish word-forms. Other methods of appropriation included the etymological misinterpretation and renaming and displacing the former toponyms altogether. The focus of the present article is the place-name transformation policies of the Ottoman Empire and its successor, the Republic of Turkey. The decree by the Minister of War Enver Pasha issued on January 5, 1916 with the orders to totally change the “non-Muslim” place-names is for the first time presented in English, Armenian and Russian translations. The article also deals with the artificially created term of “Eastern Anatolia” as an ungrounded, politicized substitute for Western Armenia, the political objectives of the pro-Turkish circles as well as the consequences of putting the mentioned ersatz term into circulation.

In August 2009, during his visit to Bitlis, in the District of Bitlis (a formerly Armenian city Baghesh in the south-western part of Western Armenia), Turkish President Abdullah Gul said publicly that the original name of the present-day Gyouroymak province was “Norshin”, which, he claimed, was in Kurdish.¹ This statement should not be considered as a slip of the tongue; it represents traditional Turkish policies of Turkification and Kurdification of original Armenian toponyms. Norshin is purely an Armenian toponym both by its components “Nor”+”shen”, which mean “a new settlement”, and as a pattern to form place-names. All toponyms (villages, settlements, residential areas, etc.) with the component “shen” are indisputably Armenian as Martunashen, Vasakashen, Getashen, Vankshen, Hamshen, Verishen and the like.

* This is an updated version of L. Sahakyan’s article, which was first published by the ARARAT Center for Strategic Research in Armenian and Russian, respectively on September 18, 2009 (http://blog.ararat-center.org/?p=284) and November 19, 2009 (http://blog.ararat-center.org/?p=331).
It should be noted that, besides being linguistically stable phenomena, toponyms are valuable also as bearers of historical information. As such, they can have an effect on current ethnopolitical conflicts, if applied with the aim of distorting and manipulating the historical evidence. This truly strategic significance of the toponyms has not gone unnoticed: the ruling circles of the Ottoman Empire and those of its successor state, the Republic of Turkey, as once again confirmed by the recent reports in the BBC and the Turkish media, have devised and implemented consistent policies to falsify the origins and appropriate, through various ways and methods, the Armenian toponyms in the territory under their control.

The Turkic tribes invaded and settled in various parts of Armenia from the second half of the 11th century to the 15th century and later the Ottoman authorities were changing original Armenian place-names in several ways. First, they were translating their meanings into Turkish such as Tantsout (place with a lot of pear-trees) into Armoudlou, Aghbyurashen (a village of springs) into Kyankendi, Karmrik (based on the word karmir, meaning “red” in Armenian) into Kezelja, Tsaghkadsor (a ravine of flowers) into Darachichek, etc.

Second, some Armenian toponyms, which had already been transformed somewhat from their original shape under the influence of local dialects, were converted to sound like a word with Turkic roots and pronunciation, thus utilizing the principle of contamination. Thus Armtick (meaning roots in Armenian) was turned to Armoudi, Odzounkhach (a cross+snake) to Ouzounhach, Kyouropaghat (a title which goes back to Latin “curator palatii,” which was given to especially Armenian governors by the Byzantine Emperors) to Gyurbaghdi, Karhatavan (settlement where stone in cut) to Karadivan, Jeghopourkents (place with a lot of walnut-trees) to Chopurgens, etc.

Third, a widely-spread method of distortion was to give new names to old settlements in an attempt to bury their ethnic affiliation in oblivion. Even Christian Armenian sanctuaries were given new names. Thus, the famous Armenian monastery Varagavank was renamed Yedikiliseh (meaning seven churches in Turkish), while the Holy Echmiadzin, the center of the Armenian Church, where the Supreme Armenian Catholicos resided, was turned into “Ouchkiliseh” (Three churches). According to our estimates, several dozens of settlements have been named by the word “kiliseh” or “Gharakiliseh” in both Western and Eastern Armenia.

Fourth, the attempts to give Turkish etymological explanations to the Armenian toponyms represented yet another method of their appropriation campaign. Such faulty experiments were carried out, in particular, by Evliya Celebi, the Ottoman court historian of the 17th century, whose interpretations have often served as a basis for modern Turkish scholars. Here is one example. In his Book of Travels (Seyahatname), the old Armenian place-name Bayberd or Baberd (which through dialect and foreign lexical influences has undergone sound interchange and consequently was pronounced as
Baybourd) is etymologically explained as “bay” (meaning rich in Turkish) + “yourd” (settlement in Turkish)⁴. In fact, this name includes two ancient Armenian components Bay + berd, which respectively mean a den or an impregnable shelter and a stronghold or a fortress. As an ancient fortress, Baberd was mentioned by Movses Khorenatsi as early as in the 5th century⁵. Place-names with the ending “berd” have been scattered throughout all Armenia, as Tsamakaberdi, Amberd, Vznaberdi, Kharberd, Baghaberd, etc⁶.

Evlia Celebi went further to “reveal” that the original Armenian river name of Jorokh is a distorted form of the Turkish Jou-i-rouh, which according to him means “the river of the soul”⁷. In fact, the name Ճորոխ (“Tchorokh”) originates from the Armenian verb ծորել-ծորող (“tsorel”- “tsorogh”) (flowing) in which the initial ծ (“ts”) has been transformed to ճ (“tch”) through sound interchange, a phenomenon peculiar to the Armenian language, as in “tsanatsel > tchanachel”, and “tskhni > tchkhni”⁸. Evliya Chelebi links to the Persians the name of the town Zarishat⁹, which was actually built by the Armenian royal dynasty of Eruanduni (Orontids) (570 BC -200 BC). He derives the town name of “Akn” from the name of a Byzantine princess “Egin”¹⁰; however, “Akn” is a purely Armenian word meaning “eye”, “spring” and “pit”¹¹. In the place name of “Pertek”, which is a dialectal deformation of the original “Berdak” (a small fortress), Celebi tries to find the Mongolian equivalent for the word “eagle”¹².

It is irrefutable that all the above-mentioned toponyms and others in Armenia have been recorded in ancient historical sources far earlier than any Turkic and Kurdish elements appeared on the Armenian Highland, which they gradually did only from the second half of the 11th century onwards.

The “corrections” introduced by Celebi pursued far-reaching purposes of Ottomanizing the newly occupied territories. Evliya Chelebi was a state official, who in addition participated in Ottoman expansionist invasions. Thus, his etymological explanations had clear geopolitical motives.

Around the middle of the 19th century the Turkish authorities decided not only to distort or change the names of Armenian provinces, regions and villages, but also to eliminate altogether the name Armenia. This policy was pursued especially after the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-1878, when the Armenian Question was included into the agenda of international diplomacy and the European powers started exploiting it to derive various concessions from Turkey.

The government of sultan Abdul Hamid II substituted the name Armenia with such terms as “Kurdistan” or “Anatolia”, fallaciously. Starting from 1880 the name Armenia was forbidden to be used in official documents¹³. The Sublime Porte thus wanted to make everyone believe that the Armenian Question did not exist: if there was no Armenia, then there was no Armenian Question.
Historians are familiar with the plan of “solving” the Armenian Question with the assistance of England put forward by Kiamil Pasha, the pro-British Ottoman Grand Vizier and Commander-in-chief during the reign of sultan Abdul Hamid II: “If in Europe we have warmed a serpent (i.e. the Balkan peoples - L.S.) in our bosom, we should not do the same in Asian Turkey. Common sense tells us to do away with all these elements that can pose the same threats to us in the future and become the cause and a tool of foreign interference. Now, today, at least Britain’s interests demand that our territories in Asia Minor be safe from foreign meddling and all sources that may give others a pretext to meddle in our affairs. We, as well as the British not only do not recognize the word “Armenia”, but we must smash to smithereens all jaws which dare to pronounce that word. To reach our sacred goal it is therefore imperative and the state law demands [from us] to make any suspicious elements unfit, sweep forever from the face of the earth this Armenian nation, to annihilate them recklessly and for good” (the emphasis is mine - L.S.)

By deliberately distorting them, the Ottoman authorities were ascribing Armenian and Greek place-names to Turkish or Kurdish origin. At that stage, the Kurdish ethnic factor was used by the Ottoman rulers, for the Kurds were not yet viewed as a threat to the Ottoman Empire. Taking advantage of their religious fanaticism, in the 1890s sultan Abdul Hamid, who was also known as “the father of the Kurds” (Bavê Kurda)15, organized the Armenian massacres through the Hamidiye regiments formed out of Kurdish brigands and the regular Turkish army soldiers.

During Abdul Hamid’s reign all Turkish and Kurdish resettlements were given new names, which were the names of nomadic tribes or various Ottoman sultans such as Hamidiye, Reshidiye, Aziziye, Mahmoudiye, etc. This policy became especially manifest during the reign of the Young Turks (1908-1918).

The government of Young Turks also attached great importance to the changing of “non-Muslim” place-names. They replaced many toponyms, some named after the Ottoman sultans, with their own names such as Enveriye, Shevketiye, Mahmoudshevket-Pasha and the like16. The “Resolution About the Resettlement of Refugees” (“İskân-I Muhacirin Nizamnamesi”), a document adopted on May 13, 191317, served the specific Young Turk policy of total Turkification. The next step was made by Enver Pasha, the Young Turks’ Minister of War, on January 5, 191618.

Enver Pasha’s decree sent to the Turkish military-political authorities demanded that all place-names of Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian and other non-Muslim origins in the Ottoman Empire be transformed into Turkish ones19. Below is the translation of his Decree (Emirname):

DECREE
1. It is important to change into Turkish all names of provinces, regions, villages, mountains and rivers belonging to Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian and other non-Muslim
peoples. Making use swiftly of this favorable moment, we beseech your help in carrying out this order.

2. Cooperating with military commanders and administrative personnel within the boundaries of your jurisdiction, respective lists of name changes should be formed of provinces, regions, villages, etc. and be forwarded to military headquarters as soon as possible. After being studied and approved, these lists of proposed changes should be sent to the Ministry of the Interior and the Communications Ministry for generalization and implementation.

3. It is imperative that the new names reflect the history of our hard-working, exemplary and praise-worthy military. The glorified events of our present and past war experiences should, by all means, be mentioned. In case this is not possible, names of those who had highly moral principles and who have fallen rendering invaluable services to their country should be remembered; or names should be found that are appropriate to the given area’s specific crop, product, trade or geographical situation.

Last but not least, teachers at schools in different parts of our Fatherland should find appropriate topics to teach about the given territory’s glorious history, climate, crop, trade and culture. It should be borne in mind that any sudden change of a conventional name into an inconvenient or improper one may bring about the continuation of using the old name by the population. Therefore, new names should be chosen taking all this into consideration. In case such principles cannot be observed, then Ereghli, for example, should be turned into Erikli or Erakli, Gallipoli into Veliboli in order to maintain the roots of old names.

Enver, Deputy Commander-in-Chief, 23 Kanun-i Evvel, 1331 /1916/

Inspired by Enver’s decree, the prominent military officer Huseyin Avni (Alparslan) Bey, the author of several articles about the Turkish language and culture, wrote: “If we want to be the owner of our country, then we should turn even the name of the smallest village into Turkish and not leave its Armenian, Greek or Arabic variants. Only in this way can we paint our country with its colors”.

As we see, he even goes a step further than his minister by suggesting that Arabic place-names also must undergo changes. Enver Pasha’s decree mentioned only “Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian and other non-Muslim peoples”. This testifies to the fact that during the Ottoman period, when the sultan was considered the spiritual head (Caliph) of all Muslims, the Arabic and Kurdish toponyms were not yet regarded as threatening to the authorities. However, it should be remembered that the overwhelming majority of the names of places (where the Kurds infiltrated) in Western Armenia were Armenian in origin with, at times, some aspects of local dialect or foreign linguistic influences. After the Armenian Genocide, these toponyms have been attributed to Kurds.
During WWI the Armenian, Greek and Bulgarian toponyms were the first to be turned into Turkish. The Antranos caza in Bursa, for example, was turned into Orhanelli, Mikhalich was renamed Karajabey, the village Dimitri into Touran, the Rum village in Chorum into Yeni (new) Chamlejay. But a few months later, on June 15, 1916 the Ottoman Military Headquarters disapproved these changes and argued that on the new maps these new names were causing confusion in military correspondence\textsuperscript{21}.

Having been dispossessed of its original population, Western Armenia continues to lose, along with many other historical and cultural values, its millennia-old Armenian place-names. They are falsely declared Kurdish or Turkish. Haroun Tuncel, a Turkish historian, has admitted that “One cannot find in Turkey a scientific work that would deal with the origins of ancient toponyms for the simple reason that the person undertaking such an arduous task should be knowledgeable of the local dialects of several languages, including Persian, Arabic, Armenian, Zaza, Kourmanji, Assyrian-Aramaic, Sumerian and Akkadian… for any name considered Kurdish may well be either Sumerian, Akkadian or Turkish [?] and any name considered Turkish may be either Arabic, Armenian or Akkadian in its origin”\textsuperscript{22}.

In an article, titled “28 thousand toponyms were changed. Nobody knows which one comes from which language”\textsuperscript{23}, Ş. Türker has included among Kurdish names such indisputably Armenian toponyms as Van, Antep (Aintap)\textsuperscript{24}, Kharpet (Kharberd), Erzingan (<Eriza), Kilis (which is a distorted version of the word “Yekeghetsi”, meaning Church), etc\textsuperscript{25}. It remains a mystery why and how the Muslim Kurds came to name their settlements Church (Kilis)?

The process of “nationalization” of toponyms was continued by the Kemalists, who were the ideological successors of the Young Turks. It gained momentum during the Republican period. Starting from 1923 the entire territory of Western Armenia was officially renamed “Eastern Anatolia”\textsuperscript{26}. After the Kurdish rebellions in 1925, 1927 and 1936 in the eastern part of the Republic of Turkey, the Turkish authorities started renaming the Kurdish and Zaza settlements as well. As early as 1935 the Interior Minister Shukru Kayan put forward a draft resolution to rename Dersim into Tunceli. It is worth noticing that in February 2009 Sharafettin Halis, a deputy in the Turkish Parliament from the Democratic Society Party (DTP), proposed that Tunceli be granted its former name of Dersim; he argued that people cannot forget this name as it has become sacred for them and was used both in their daily lives and in their songs, tales and novels. The proposal was, however, labeled a “manifestation of separatism” by the Turkish Minister of Justice\textsuperscript{27}.

In 1940, the Turkish government issued a circular letter (No. 8589) which called for changing into Turkish all toponyms in foreign languages or with foreign roots, but the outbreak of World War II temporarily impeded its implementation.
A special article about changes of toponyms was included in the 1949 Provincial administrative law (II İdaresi Kanunu). Furthermore, a “Specialized Organization for Renaming of Toponyms” (“Ad Değiştirme İhtisas Kurulu”) was initiated in 1957. This organization renamed 653 settlements in Erzrum [Arzan (Ӧɾӡû) ar-Rum], 169 in Adana, 366 in Erzinjan (Yerznka<Eriza), 224 in Adyaman, 70 in Moughla, 88 in Afion, 70 in Eskishehir, 297 in Moush, 374 in Aghre (Ararat), 279 in Gaziantep, 24 in Nevsehir, 99 in Amasia, 167 in Giresoun (Kersoun), 647 in Nigdeh, 193 in Ankara, 343 in Gyumushkhaneh, 134 in Ordou, 168 in Antalya, 128 in Hakkari, 105 in Rizeh, 101 in Ardvin, 117 in Hatay (Alexandretta/Iskenderun), 117 in Sakaria, 69 in Ayden, 185 in Sparta, 110 in Balekesir, 112 in Ichel, 392 in Siirt (Sghert), 32 in Bilejik, 21 in Istanbul, 59 in Sinop, 247 in Bingyol (Byurakn), 68 in Izmir (Smyrna), 406 in Sivas (Sebastia), 236 in Bitlis, 398 in Kars, 19 in Tekirdagh, 182 in Bolou, 295 in Kastamonu, 245 in Tokat (Eudokia), 49 in Bourdour, 86 in Kayseri (Cesaria), 390 in Trebizond, 136 in Boursa, 35 in Krklarel, 273 in Dersim, 53 in Chanakkaleh, 39 in Kershehir, 389 in Shanli Ourfa (Ourha), 76 in Chankere, 26 in Kojayeli, 47 in Oushal, 555 in Chorum, 217 in Malatia, 156 in Zongouldak, 20 in Edirne, 647 in Mardin, 555 in Diarbekir, 83 in Manisa, 383 in Elazegh (Kharberd), and 105 in Kahraman Marash.

After research work on 75,000 toponyms, the “Specialized Organization” changed 28,000 names, among which 12,000 were village names. According to H. Tunçel’s estimates, 12,211 villages were renamed during the period of 1940-2000, which constitutes approximately 35 per cent of the villages.

Turkish historian Ayse Hyur writes that during the reign of the Democratic Party ugly, humiliating, insulting or derisive names, even if they were Turkish, were subjected to changes. Village names with lexical components meaning red (kizil), bell (çan), church (kilise) were all changed. To do away with “separatist notions”, the Arabic, Persian, Armenian, Kurdish, Georgian, Tatar, Circassian, and Laz village names were also changed. From 1981 to 1983, the names of settlements on the Eastern and Western parts of the Black Sea also underwent changes.

Bilir, the author of “Let Tunceli Be Named Dersim”, in an article published in the August 19, 2009 issue of “Bir Gun” daily, noted that besides giving new names to the settlements, the Turkish authorities altered also the phonetic pronunciations of those old names to make them sound like Turkish words, as, for instance, Chinchiva to Shenyouva. This method of changing a toponym, as has already been mentioned previously, was suggested by Enver Pasha as early as 1916: “...change Ereghli into Eriklı or Eraklı, Gallipoli into Velipolou in order to maintain the old name roots”. This phenomenon, however, has deeper roots. Similar cases of Ottomanization-Turkification of Armenian toponyms were present in the 16th century Ottoman Geographical Registers. It is ironic to note that in the ongoing process of turning the so called Kurdish toponyms into Turkish ones some toponyms have been restored to their
imaginary “old” Turkish versions, which are actually ancient and medieval Armenian place-names. Thus Pertag (Berd+ak) has been renamed Pertek, allegedly its “old” Turkish name, Esper (Sper)>Ispir, Erdekhan>Ardahan, Shakh>Shatakh, Kers>Kars, Zedkan> Elishkirt, which is the phonetically deformed variant of Alashkert<Vagharsh+a+kert, Geghi>Keghi, in both of which we have the word Gyugh-Gegh meaning village, Guimguim>Vardo, etc33.

Modern Turkish historiography has greatly contributed and supported this systematic program of changing, distorting and appropriating “non-Muslim” toponyms in Turkey. Upon the publication of the works of chroniclers and archival materials of the earlier period of the Ottoman Empire, Turkish historians have made use of their rich stock of falsifications and have distorted Armenian toponyms en masse34. Armenia or Ermenistan have been coarsely and retroactively replaced with “Eastern Anatolia”35. The following highlights one such example. In his “Jihan Numa” Kyatib Celebi, a famous Ottoman chronicler of the 17th century, had a special chapter, titled “About the Country Called Armenia”. When, however, this book was republished in 1957 its modern Turkish editor H. Selen changed this title into “Eastern Anatolia”36. The fact, however, is that Armenia together with its boundaries was unequivocally mentioned in the works of Ottoman historians and chroniclers. An excerpt from the said chapter of Kyatib Celebi’s Jihan Numa illustrates clearly the falsifications of modern Turkish historians.

“Hamdullah says. The Armenia vilayet consists of two parts - Great and Minor. …Great Armenia extends well into Iran and is known by the name of Touman Akhlat. It borders Armenia Minor, Rum, Diarbekir, Kurdistan, Azarbaijan (Atropatene)37 and Aran. Its length covers the area from Erzen-el-Rum (Erzrum) to Salmas, while its width - from Aran to the end of Akhlat vilayet. Its capital is Akhlat. In my opinion Great Armenia at present consists of the Van and Erzrum vilayets, while Armenia Minor - of Adana and Marash eyalets. In the Takvim-el-Bouldan38, the following cities are mentioned in Armenia: Elbistan39, Adana, Arjesh, Bitlis, Bara, Bilekan, Tiflis, Akhlat, Debil, Sultaniye, Sis, Tarsus, Malatia, Van, Vostan, Moush, Erzen-el-Rum and Malazkert”40.

While Celebi mentioned only part of the territory of Armenia41, the fact that the Ottoman historian admitted the existence of Armenia as a country speaks for itself. Armenia is referred to by other Ottoman authors of the 17th century as well. The official court historian Evliya Celebi mentions it as Armenistan42. Munejjim Basi43, another Turkish historian of the same century, also wrote about the vast country of Armenia, including into it the cities of Kherd Bert (i.e. Kharberd - L.S.), Erzinkan, Moush, Egin (Akn), Melazjerd (Manazkert), Bitlis, Akhlat, Arjesh, Vostan, Shirvan and the capital Debil (i.e. Dvin)44. From the descriptions of these historians, it becomes evident that in the 17th century official Ottoman historiography recognized the existence of the occupied Great Armenia, and acknowledged it by its internationally accepted name of
Armenia (Ermenistan). While Cilicia with its Adana and Marash eyalets was recognized by them as Armenia Minor. Thus, in the 17th century when the Armenian Question was not as yet included into the agenda of international diplomacy, the terms Anatolia or Eastern Anatolia were never used to indicate Armenia. Furthermore, the “Islamic World Map” of the 16th century and other Ottoman maps of the 18th and 19th centuries have clearly indicated Armenia (Ermenistan) on a specific territory as well as its cities.

Armenia (ارمنستان) and Anatolia (عثمان) are clearly differentiated in the map published in Constantinople in 1803-1804. The Ottoman authors were using the term Armenia till the end of the 19th century. One example is Osman Nuri, the historian of the second half of the 19th century, who mentions Armenia repeatedly in his three-volume “Abdul Hamid and the Period of His Reign”.

It is more than obvious that the Ottoman historians and chroniclers in contrast to the modern Turkish ones, knew very well Armenia’s location and did not “confuse” it with Anatolia.

The word Anatolia means “sunrise” or “east” in Greek. This name was given to the Asia Minor peninsula approximately in the 5th or 4th centuries B.C. During the Ottoman Empire the term “Anadolou” included the north-eastern vilayets of Asia Minor with Kyotahia as its center. The numerous Armenian, European, Ottoman, Russian, Persian, Arabic, Georgian and other primary sources did not confuse the term Armenia with Anatolia. This testifies, inter alia, to the fact that even after the loss of its statehood the Armenian nation still constituted a majority in its Homeland, which, up to the end of the 19th century, was recognized by the Ottoman occupants as well.

Conclusion

The Turkish authorities realize that Armenian toponyms are the product of the several millennia civilization and vivid evidence of the indigenous presence of Armenians in Western Armenia. The extermination of the native population, however, did not stop

* Therefore, at present Ronald Suny (and some others) wrongly substitute the term Western Armenia with that of the ersatz “Eastern Anatolia” (Ronald Grigor Suny, Looking Toward Ararat: Armenia in Modern History, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1993, pp. 7, 18, 67, 106 The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times, vol. 1, New York, St. Martin’s Press, 1997, pp. 22, 228, 320, vol. II, pp. 127, 136; Ayvazyan A.: The History of Armenia as Presented in American Historiography, a critical survey, Yerevan, 1998, pp. 37-40). Even if this ersatz term of “Eastern Anatolia” has somehow been put into circulation in Western scientific circles under the influence of systematic Turkish lobbying and falsifications and at times also due to the lack of knowledge, it is unacceptable for us, because the substitution of Western Armenia with the term “Eastern Anatolia” would mean voluntary renunciation of our Homeland, rejection of our centuries-old historical and cultural heritage, denial of the Armenian Genocide, burial into oblivion of its consequences and, last but not least, rendering support to the Turkish negationist position towards the rights of the Armenian nation to Western Armenia (Refer to Armen Ayvazyan’s “Western Armenia vs. Eastern Anatolia”, Europe and Orient (Journal of the Institute Tchobanian, Paris), No. 4, 2007).
with the Armenian Genocide; it was followed by the destruction of Armenian historical and cultural heritage, including the Armenian toponyms. The policy of Turkification of toponyms in the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey has gone through several stages:

1. Up to the end of the 19th century, Turkish officials and historians still continued to use the names “Armenia” or “Ermenistan”. At the same time, they were appropriating and changing the place names of occupied territories.

2. After the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, when the Armenian Question became an international issue, the Turkification of Armenian as well as other Christian toponyms has been carried out more consistently.

3. This process intensified during the Young Turks and the Kemalist regimes, when a full-scale Turkification policy of toponyms targeted all non-Turkic nations.

4. During the present stage, decades after eliminating Western Armenia of its native Armenian population, falsification of toponyms still remains an important constituent part of Turkish demographic policies.

Toponyms are not only linguistic facts, but also accurate and objective historical evidence. The ancient Armenian place-names are explicit and emphatic linguistic evidence, which reveal the entire truth about the true native owners of the Armenian Highland. This is why the protection, maintenance and restoration of Armenian toponyms have invaluable strategic significance today.
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POLITICAL SCIENCE
AND INFORMATIONAL SECURITY
On April 24, 2015, all Armenians throughout the world are going to commemorate one-and-a-half million innocent victims of the Armenian Genocide\(^1\). On this day the progressive people of the world will be standing next to us - Armenians, for whom the year of 1915 and April 24 have turned into the symbol of condemnation and prevention of the greatest crime against humanity and civilization\(^2\) - the genocide. The Genocide against the Armenians\(^3\) started by the Ottoman Empire long before World War I and vigorously culminated during the Young Turks’ regime and was continued by the Republican Turkey.

The Armenian Genocide remains a bleeding wound for Armenians. It will remain fresh as long as the perpetrators go unpunished, as long as the criminal does not face universal condemnation, does not repent and return to Armenians what they took from them by committing genocide.

On the eve of the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide we draw attention to some facts which make more holistic the scale of the territorial and human losses of the genocidal crime. The principal conclusion of this analysis stems from the concept according to which the widely held and publicized formula “The Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire in 1915-1923” does not fully reflect the factual and political content of this crime.

The formulation under discussion connects the crime only with the Ottoman Empire, despite the well-known and irrefutable fact that Turkish regimes (of the sultan, after his removal from power, the Young Turks and the Kemalists) pursued the policy of extermination of Armenians in Western Armenia and other parts of the Empire, as well as outside the latter’s bounds, namely in some regions and towns of Eastern Armenia.

\(^1\) Pan-Armenian Declaration on the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide - http://www.genocide-museum.am/eng/29.01.2015-hrchakagir.php

\(^2\) The Governments of France, Great Britain and Russia made a declaration, on 28 May 1915, denouncing the massacres of the Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire as “crimes against humanity and civilization” for which all the members of the Turkish Government would be held responsible, together with its agents implicated in the massacres. http://www.genocide-museum.am/eng/1948.php; http://www.genocide-museum.am/eng/1948.php#sthash.inzY6hW.dpuf

\(^3\) In Armenian: Հայոց Մեծ Եղեռն (Hayots Meds Yeghern) Armenian Great Yeghern.
(Nakhijevan, Shushi, Shirak, etc.) and Eastern Transcaucasia (to the east of the Kura River up to the Caspian western coastal zone, including the Apsheron peninsula) and north-western parts of Iran.

For decades the West has been seeking to free its military ally - Turkey, from the burden of the crime committed at the beginning of the 20th century leaving it only to the Ottoman Empire. On the other hand, the fact was also overlooked by the Bolshevik leaders who, hoping to export the “Red Revolution” to the Muslim East, saw Turkey and Soviet Azerbaijan as the pioneers of this revolution.

In the 60s of the 20th century when the taboo on the issue of the Armenian Genocide was removed, Moscow allowed the circulation of the mentioned formula, watching carefully that the Armenian massacres in Nakhijevan and Eastern Transcaucasia are not referred to, since it would undermine the realization of the political myth of “Lenin friendship” between Armenians and “Caucasian Tatars” (from the mid-1930s they have been renamed “Azerbaijanis”). This is how the massacres of the Armenians in Transcaucasia committed by the Ottomans and Kemalists (that invaded the region in 1918 and 1920) escaped the corpus delicti of the crime of the genocide and only the above-mentioned formulation (“the Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire”) was put into circulation in media and literature.

It is high time to speak out and tell the world that the Armenian Genocide in Western Armenia, Nakhijevan and Eastern Transcaucasia includes different stages of the same genocide. The same is the criminal and the same is the victim. This obvious fact is left unnoticed when it can serve as the key evidence of the real scale of the Armenian Genocide. So far the key argument of the Turkish denial of the Armenian Genocide with which Ankara reverses the charge is that the Turks did not have a pre-planned program of genocide. Rather, they displaced Armenians because of their being unreliable for the Ottoman empire which was at war at that time. The “accidents” that happened to the caravans as a result of the attacks by “mobs” on the way, as claimed by official Ankara, cannot be labeled as genocide. Contrary to this fraud, along with the undeniable facts of the realization of the genocidal program against Armenians in the Ottoman Empire and Western Armenia4, massacres in Nakhijevan and Eastern Transcaucasia reveal the Turkish falsehood once and for all5.

In 1918 it was not the Turkish and Kurdish mob but the Turkish army and the squads of Tatar-Musavatists that burnt down Armenian settlements and killed the innocent inhabitants along the way to Baku and then in Baku, as well. This fact, well-grounded and confirmed by numerous testimonies and documents does not leave room for the false claims of “the unreliability of Armenians” in the Turkish file on the

---

4 Safrasyan R.A., Ottoman Empire: the genesis of the program of genocide (1876-1920), Yerevan, 2011.
5 Danielyan E.L., Armenian Civilizational heritage versus Turkish-Azerbaijani falsification of history and historical geography, Լրաբեր հասարակական գիտությունների, 2014, 1, p. 49.
“justification” of the displacements. A part of the documents was presented in a collection of documents: “The Massacres of Armenians in the provinces of Baku and Elizavetpol in 1918-1920”. The Armenians living in their historical lands in Nakhijevan and Eastern Transcaucasia for centuries were not Ottoman citizens and thus could not be labeled as unreliable. They did not expose any threat to the empire or Turkey, either. They were not displaced, but were slaughtered on the spot for only one reason - they were Armenians.

It is necessary to note that the policy of genocide was not stopped in Turkey in 1923 as is presented in the above mentioned formulation. The century-long attempts to push the crime out of the pages of world history and to deny it, the defalcation of the territory and properties of the victims, the tactics of stifling the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic in a circle of blockade, the defalcation and destruction of the millennia-old Armenian cultural heritage, the forceful conversion and Islamization of the survivors of the Armenian Genocide, all these are the continuation of the policy of the Ottoman empire that has been adopted and consistently pursued by the Republican Turkey since the very first day of its foundation, a state that was established by the political forces directly involved in the Genocide.

The people that had adopted the culture of “massacre” and “theft” and established the state based on the conquered peoples’ plunder and enslaving, could not have a historical prospect. In the 19th century it became evident that the Ottoman Empire owing to its economic backwardness had not only fallen behind of the general flow of civilization but hindered it, too.

6 Հայերի կոտորածները Բաքվի և Ելիզավետպոլի նահանգներում 1918-1920 թթ. (փաստաթղթերի և նյութերի ժողովածու), կազմողներ՝ Ս. Միրզոյան, Ա. Ղազիյան, Երևան, 2003:
7 Along with their authorities the Turks have equally been responsible for the massacres since they equally participated in the crime. They inherited their behavior in international issues from their ancestors - the nomadic Seljuk and Oghuz Turks who invaded some lands of Western Asia and, particularly, Asia Minor since the second half of the 11th century. They savagely seized the fertile fields and lands displacing the native population by killing them, destroying their settlements and robbing them. This was the sole method applied by them which was practiced by the whole Turkish tribe - male and female, old and young. This bloody genocidal lifestyle was still in use after they established medieval state formations and later after capturing and destroying Constantinople (1453), an empire, based on the blood of subjugated peoples. The Turkish authorities and the Turkish mob, in the manner inherited from the times of raids, remained consistent in robbing native nations (with different religions and high culture) oppressed by the empire, in exploiting and killing them and settling in their lands. The mob remained a key phenomenon characterizing the Turkish tribal behavior which reflects the unity of the Turkish authorities and the Turkish mass in their policy against the “others”.
At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, during the state crisis, the lifestyle, formed on the basis of the merciless exploitation and plunder of the peoples and the rules empowered by the authorities, resulted in a genocidal behavior the bearers of which were not a small group of state officials or a thin layer of the society. The true criminals acting against Armenians, Greeks and Assyrians comprised a huge social layer holding the spheres of state authority both in the Ottoman Empire and in Republican Turkey. It keeps on reproducing itself in all layers of Turkish society starting from the state elite, lower administrative circles to the “ordinary Turk”. Today it is this mass and not the sparse opposing layer that dictates the state policy of Turkey’s denial of the Armenian Genocide. Such a situation sums up the responsibility of the Turkish people as it was during the Ottoman Empire, as well as republican Turkey in committing the crime against humanity. It is this very consequence that brings together the notions of “genocidal Turkey” and “genocidal Turk”9 which the peoples living in the region and beyond its borders perceived as synonyms and endorsed it in the widely used expressions “Turks went through there”10, “The Turk never changes”11.

As far as the Turkish case is concerned, the formulation stating that genocide is a state policy is evidently incomplete because of the mass involvement of Turks in it. This truth is rarely voiced because of the unnecessary expression of hypocrisy and tact whereas the mere acknowledgement of it would help the Turks to get to know themselves better and shrug off the burden of the sin. Genocide will remain a characteristic feature of the Turkish identity and statehood as long as the deniers of the crime form a majority in the society and dictate the state policy of the country. That is why the claims to recognize the Armenian Genocide that are addressed to Turkey, are in fact addressed to all Turks.

In the 20th century the Turkish genocidal nature manifested itself not only in the Ottoman empire but also later, beyond its borders, trying to continue annihilation of Armenians, Greeks and Assyrians and to establish “states” as a continuation of the same genocidal crime. The first Turkish-plan-based state was the so-called “Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan” which was established in Baku by the Turkish forces who brutally massacred Armenians in September 1918. Decades later took place the Turkish invasion and occupation of Northern Cyprus, and establishment of the unrecognized “Turkish Republic” of Northern Cyprus through the genocide of Greeks and their

10 Recalling the massacres and destruction during the 1820's Greek war of independence from the Ottoman Empire, later Victor Hugo wrote, “the Turks have passed by here All is in ruins and mourning”. (Eric Margoli, “America’s Bulldozer Ready to Roll”) http://www.lewrockwell.com/2013/09/eric-margolis/ruins-and-mourning/
culture. Moreover, the impact of the Turkish political line of genocide is more than evident in the current situation in the Middle East.

From the end of the second decade of the 20th century the metamorphosis of the artificially formed state bearing the plundered (from Iranian Atropatene-Adarbaygan, Adarbayjan or Azarbaijan) name “Azerbaijan” have not brought any change in the historically inherited genocidal behavior of the part of the ethnic group of Turks who held power in the Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan, then Soviet Azerbaijan and present-day Azerbaijan. The Bolshevik center that was a hostage to Stalin’s plan of forming a new “Azerbaijani nation” in the Soviet times turned a blind eye upon the Baku policy of annihilation of the Armenians who lived in the republic. This had already caused the violent mass deportation of Armenians from Nakhijevan in the 70s and in 1988, starting from Sumgait, turned into genocidal actions against Armenians in the Azerbaijan Republic. Not only Armenians were the target of genocidal policy in the Ottoman Empire, Republican Turkey, as well as in the Republic and Soviet Azerbaijan. The authorities pursued the policy of forced assimilation also of native Islamic nations. The only way to resist was to shut oneself in a unique national shell as most of the Lezgi, Talish, Tat and other native peoples have done. During the last years of the Soviet Union, all the Islamic nations that had been converted into “Azerbaijanis” by force vanished from the ethnic map of the once multi-ethnic Soviet Azerbaijan. All these happenings in the Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan that was established by the Turkish army, continued in Soviet Azerbaijan founded by the XI Red Army, and all that has happened presently. The Republic of Azerbaijan is not at all different from the previous and current regimes in Turkey.

The notorious formula of Heidar Aliev - the President of the Post-Soviet Azerbaijan “One nation, two countries” came to prove that the assassinator is the same Turk both in Ankara and in Baku. It comes to endorse the common characteristics that unites the Turks in Turkey and Eastern Transcaucasia, where disguising themselves as Muslims, Caucasian Tatars or Azerbaijanis they persistently pursue the policy of annihilation of other nations living in the captured territories.

It is not a mere chance that the blockade of the Republic of Armenia and NKR is imposed by Turkey and the Republic of Azerbaijan together. It is no less accident that during the war unleashed against Mountainous Arstakh, Turkey and Azerbaijan


\[14\] Turks, but not Tyurks. This making more exact is very important, because the Ankara and Baku theorists often try to make accomplices of the genocidal crime committed by them also other Tyurkic peoples, falsely affirming that charges presented to Turks, in the question of the genocide, are insulting for “Tyurkic ethnos”.
bombarded Armenian settlements as the main targets. It is no accident, either, that the criminals of the Sumgait pogrom in the Republic of Azerbaijan and savage Ramil Safarov, who had axed in sleep Armenian officer Gurgen Margaryan in Budapest, are idolized in the same way as the principal perpetrators of the Armenian Genocide - Talaat and Enver Pasha are in Turkey.

The Genocide of the Armenians in Nakhijevan and Eastern Transcaucasia is the manifestation of the same Turkish policy of the Armenian Genocide that was carried out by the states bearing the label “Azerbaijan”, the last of which is the current Republic of Azerbaijan.

In May, 1915 Russia, France and Great Britain came up with a joint statement qualifying the atrocities against the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire as “new crimes against humanity and civilization” and agreed that the Turkish government must be punished for those crimes. It seemed that the great powers were to administer the punishment to prevent a possible recurrence of the crime. It seemed that the international community realized the hazard that this crime contained against humanity and civilization. It turned out to be a misbelief. The threat of the Turkish germ of genocide, practically lethal for civilization, was literally ignored. The West preferred to use the dubious plan of using Turkey against the Soviet Russia and in 1923 it threw away the Treaty of Sèvres that it itself had adopted. The Treaty (it was signed also by the representatives of the First Republic of Armenia) envisaged the restoration of the Armenian statehood in certain regions of Western Armenia, thus it stated that the international community defended the legal right of Armenians to restore statehood in their own historical Homeland. However, the great powers failed to make the smallest move in Lausanne in 1923.

The Bolshevik leadership was no less different from the West. In 1921 in an attempt to entice “the anti-imperialist Turkey”, Moscow presented Turkey with Kars, Ardahan, Surmalu, Mount Ararat-Masis, that had never belonged to the Ottoman empire before. This was followed by still new donations. On demands from Turkey, the Soviet Bolsheviks forcibly broke away from the Armenian Motherland Nakhijevan and Mountainous Artsakh and placed it within the borders of Soviet Azerbaijan. In 1921 some more Armenian lands were left to Turkey - the perpetrator of the Armenian Genocide.

The crime was not only left unpunished, but was encouraged, instead. What is more, while “forgiving” (actually encouraging) Turks for some political considerations for decades, the superpowers became participants of the Turkish plan to keep the fact of the Armenian Genocide under lock and key and to erase the tragic events from the pages of the history. It was Adolf Hitler who broke the silence in 1939 asking “and who remembers

15 Shabas W.A., Genocide in International Law, Cambridge, 2000, p. 16.
it” not for condemning the Turks, but for copying them. It seemed that Turkey, the ally of the Nazi Germany would face a severe punishment after World War II. However, universal human interests and values were sacrificed once again - this time in the political games between the Soviet Union and the West. Turkey, a Nazi ally, left the war with no losses. The Armenian lands were left occupied by it this time, as well.

The collapse of the Soviet Union provided the West with yet another chance to adopt a clear-cut position over the prevention and rejection of genocides from the practice of national relations, the condemnation of genocidal acts and the punishment of genocidal governments and states. It seemed that the genocidal actions against Armenians in Nakhijevan, Sumgait and several other places committed one after another by Azerbaijanis\(^{17}\) would leave no doubts for the West to qualify the tragic events as the criminal acts of genocide. However, the leading western capitals avoided principle qualifications and ended up with standard statements. What is more, they, who since 1988 had acted as moral supporters of Artsakh (Karabakh), which had launched a liberation struggle against the perpetrator of the genocide, demanded the Soviet leadership to find a solution that would be in the interests of the Armenians in Artsakh, changed their attitude in 1991 when the break-up of the USSR was deemed unavoidable. It turned out that they had encouraged the Artsakh (Karabakh) movement only to dissolve the USSR, foreseeing the possibility of turning it into a weapon for the imminent collapse of the Soviet super power. It also turned out that the plan to break the USSR into union states there had been on the agenda since 1988. The Republic of Azerbaijan (where the non-Turk Islamic peoples had been forcibly assimilated, and Armenians - massacred or deported) was recognized with the illegal borders of the former Soviet period including occupied Nakhijevan and Artsakh that never had belonged to it; the Artsakh native Armenians stood up for their independence. On September 2, 1991 the Artsakh Armenians proclaimed the Artsakh Republic (NKR).

The Western attitude not only betrayed the democratic ideals proclaimed by itself, but encouraged the criminal and instigated the Artsakh (Karabakh) war authorizing Baku to wage a war against the freedom-loving native Artsakh Armenians for the lands which never belonged to artificially formed Azerbaijan, using the principle of territorial integrity as a means to hide the genocide.

Baku was pardoned from committing explicit violations of the international law and universal moral norms; the West completely ignored the genocide against the Armenians in Azerbaijan, and all this was done for the oil and gas that it could receive more easily from Azerbaijan which should have been punished for the genocide of Armenians, and the native peoples of Eastern Transcaucasia would be freed from national and racial oppression and persecutions.

\(^{17}\) The organization that led the mob committing massacre was called “Popular Front party”, the name of which was a proof of unity of the Turkish mass with authorities in the question of the massacres.
Yeghern is a concept meaning killing a nation in its Homeland. Without doubt, it fully corresponds to the internationally recognized definition of the concept of genocide. In content it embraces the common features that are typical for various genocidal acts.

Holocaust as a type of genocide underlines the means of eradicating people belonging to the same nation or community by burning them in gas chambers. The Armenian Genocide has its specific feature - native Armenians were massacred and dispossessed of their Homeland, as a result of the crime committed by Turks. These characteristics of the Armenian Genocide are reflected in the concept of Yeghern and it is high time that the conceptual meaning of genocide of a nation in its Homeland becomes a universal concept finding its place in international documents.

One of the basic characteristics of the Armenian Genocide was the fact that the crime was committed against the background of an international political system which, in fact, had sufficient potential to prevent the atrocities or to punish the criminal: the victorious Great Powers who had won World War I were really capable of doing that. But the Great Powers responsible for the international security failed to realize the fatal mistake they made when restrained from the punishment of the crime of the Armenian Genocide after 1915. It was not an ordinary mistake, but rather a criminal indifference toward the responsibility that history had granted them. They not only forgave the murderer, but encouraged him as well, silencing the crime and upsetting the ready plan of the Armenian nation to restore the Armenian statehood also in the western part of its Homeland - Western Armenia. This was sure to affect the entire international system of security and the future course of history. It was sure to have consequences for both the criminal and his supporters.

The Turks have acquired the complex of impunity and over-permissiveness. Moreover, they have become confident that genocide, violence, impunity could be applied in international relations as ordinary, and in fact, legal tools of political practice. The Turkish precedent of the gravest crime against humanity that was committed and was left unpunished provided grounds for the imitation of the crime by all the forces that were inclined to solve problems in a similar way. The epidemics of genocides, terrorist acts, violence is becoming more and more rampant in the contemporary world, and one must be blind in mind to fail to notice that they have the Armenian Genocide as their source in modern history - the crime against humanity and civilization that has not received its due punishment so far. In its estimates of impunity and over-permissiveness, international terrorism is the transformation of genocide. Northern Cyprus, Azerbaijan, Rwanda, Kamboja….. New York 9/11, Paris January 7 - Charlie Hebdo… these are the destructive boomerangs that the Great Powers threw into history at the outset of the previous century. Today, they are back to hit themselves and the entire humanity - that is the suicide road of mankind.
Whether or not the world superpowers will change their attitude to the issue, each and every reasonable person, alone or with supporters, should do his utmost to build a genocide-free world, a world where genocide has no place. It is important that on March 3, 2015 the European People’s Party (EPP) adopted a resolution recognizing and condemning the Armenian Genocide, appealing to international organizations, especially the European Union, as well as Council of Europe member states to restore historical justice and pay tribute to the victims. The resolution, in particular, stated that the EPP condemned the genocidal acts against the Armenian people, planned and continuously perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire and various regimes of Turkey in 1894-1923, dispossession of the Homeland, the massacres and ethnic cleansing aimed at the extermination of the Armenian population, the destruction of the Armenian heritage, as well as the denial of the genocide, all attempts to avoid responsibility, to consign to oblivion the committed crimes and their consequences or to justify them, as a continuation of this crime and encouragement to commit new genocides. Then it follows: “We commemorate the one-and-a-half million innocent victims of the Armenian Genocide in 1915 and bow in gratitude to those martyred and surviving heroes who struggled for their lives and human dignity. Moreover, we recognize that the genocide resulted in the death and dispossession not only of Armenian people but also extended to the Pontic Greek and Assyrian peoples, and we commemorate them as well. We join and strongly support the commitment of Armenia and the Armenian people to continue the international struggle for the prevention of genocides, the restoration of the rights of people subjected to genocide and the establishment of historical justice... It also invites the European Union, its Commission, Council and Parliament, and the international community as a whole, in assessment of the honoring of commitments and obligations undertaken by Turkey, to accord continued attention to the recognition, restoration, and restitution of our shared heritage as herewith tendered, and hereafter officially to commemorate April 24 as a day to remember and condemn the Armenian Genocide and man’s inhumanity to man...”

18 http://armenianweekly.com/2015/03/03/epp-genocide-resolution/
ARMENIAN CIVILIZATIONAL HERITAGE VERSUS TURKISH-azerbaijani FALSIFICATION OF HISTORY AND HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

E. DANIELYAN

Armenia’s strategic position, rich natural resources, military-economic might, high level of cultural achievements greatly contributed to the development of Armenian civilizational values, owing to more than five millennia-old ethno-spiritual, cultural and social-political roots of the Armenian statehood in the Armenian Highland, attested to by the archaeological and architectural monuments, and town building, cuneiform, ancient and medieval written and other historic sources.

Armenia is the cradle of the Armenian nation and world civilization, according to the historical archaeological and ethno-cultural investigations1. The French exegete Rev. Père Dom Augustin Calmet wrote: “L’Arménie revendique pour elle l’honneur d’avoir été le pays choisi par Dieu pour y créer l’Eden; aux sources de ces quatre fleuves... Noé sortit de l’arche et descendit jusqu’au pied du mont Ararat... L’Arménie doit être considérée comme le berceau du monde”2.

While visiting the Armenian Congregation of the Mkhitarists on St. Lazarus Island in Venice, George Gordon Byron being inspired by Armenian culture and in particular its literary heritage, began to learn the Armenian language. Lord Byron wrote about Armenians and Armenia: “Whatever may have been their destiny - and it has been bitter – whatever it may be in future, their country must ever be one of the most interesting on the globe; and perhaps their language only requires to be more studied… It is a rich language… If the Scriptures are rightly understood, it was in Armenia that Paradise was placed... It was in

2 Dictionnaire historique, archéologique, philologique, géographique et littéral de la Bible par le Rêv. Père Dom Augustin Calmet (1672-1757), quatrième édition, publiée par M. l’abbé Migne, tome premier, Paris, 1846, p. 590. The Portuguese poet Luís de Camões (1524-1580) in a poetic spirit of the Bible’s perception wrote:
...And those who cultured fair Armenia’s lands
Where from the sacred mount two rivers flow,
And what was Eden to the Pilgrim shew..."

(Luís de Camoens, The Lusiad; or the Discovery of India. An epic poem, transl. from Portuguese by W. J. Mickle, London, 1877, p. 118). Luís de Camoens was referring to the Paradise, sacred Mount Ararat and headwaters of the Euphrates and the Tigris rivers.
Armenia that the flood first abated, and the dove alighted”.

S. N. Glinka comprehended the ancient history of Armenia in the context of spiritual perception of the cradle of mankind “on the summits of the Armenian mountains according to the Biblical and folk traditions”.

David Marshall Lang wrote in the same spirit: “The ancient land of Armenia is situated in the high mountains... Although Mesopotamia with its ancient civilizations of Sumeria and Babylon, is usually considered together with Egypt as the main source of civilized life in the modern sense, Armenia too has a claim to rank as one of the cradles of human culture. To begin with, Noah’s Ark is stated in the Book of Genesis to have landed on the summit of Mount Ararat, in the very centre of Armenia.... Again, Armenia has a claim on our attention as one of the principal homes of ancient metallurgy, beginning at least five thousand years ago. Later on, Armenia became the first extensive kingdom to adopt Christianity as a state religion pioneering a style of Church architecture which anticipates our own Western Gothic. Among the best five monuments of Armenian architectural art included in the list of world architectural masterpieces Charles Diehl mentioned the churches of Sourb Khatch (the Holy Cross) on the island of Aghtamar, St. Hripsime in Ejmiatsin, St. John the Baptist of Gandzasar, the Haghpat monastery and the Cathedral church of Ani.”

In the concept of civilization a paramount significance is attributed to culture. According to O. Spengler: “Every Culture has its own Civilization... The Civilization is the inevitable destiny of the Culture...”. More complete meaning of civilization has been defined by W. Durant: “Civilization is social order promoting cultural creation. Four elements constitute it: economic provision, political organization, moral traditions, and the pursuit of knowledge...”.

---

3 Lord Byron’s Armenian Exercises and Poetry. Venice: in the Island of St. Lazzaro, 1870, pp. 8, 10-12.
4 Глинка С. Н. Обозрение истории армянского народа, ч. II, M., 1832, с. III.
6 David M. Lang. Armenia Cradle of Civilization. London, 1970, p. 9. Since the 18th century the term civilization has been brought into scientific use at the junction of economic, spiritual-cultural and social concepts in the general system of philosophy with reference to the certain epochs of the history of mankind (Marquis de Mirabeau. L’amis des hommes, ou Traité de la population, tome premier. Hambourg, 1767, pp. 2, 311, 357, et al). A.V Smirnov noted that it is wrong to translate the Arab word umran (used by Ibn-Khaldun, 1332-1406) in the meaning of “civilization” or “culture”, “as it is accepted in foreign and partially our literature”. He offered to translate it as “обустроенность” (Смирнов А. В. Ибн Халдун и его “новая наука” (Историко-философский ежегодник 2007, М., 2008, с. 159-186) - “necessary facilities”.
7 Թորամանյան Թ., Կարապ բնագիտության դարաշրջանները բազմազանության համար. Ե., 1948, էջ 25.
and arts. It begins where chaos and insecurity end”⁹ A. Toynbee noted: “The cultural elements are the essence of a civilization”¹⁰.

Cultures, as important constituents of civilizations bridge them due to their immanent creative potential¹¹. Meanwhile, according to some modern theories, the increase of the conflict of cultures together with the tendency of turning into the clash of civilizations is taking place in the world¹². But as follows from the critical approach of H. Köchler, “the notion of a clash has been deliberately conjured to enable the centres of power in the West to preserve and perpetuate their hegemony”¹³.

In contrast to creative and constructive elements of civilization, destructive forces have blackened the history of mankind, reversing the idea of the world civilizational progress and having damaging consequences for civilization¹⁴. It is necessary to take into consideration that the deep-rooted cultures do not come into collision with each other, but enriching mutually, contribute to the treasury of world culture¹⁵. It is possible to speak about competitiveness of cultures due to diversities in their originalities and specifics, but cultures, as basic ingredients of civilizations do not initially contain the elements of clash or destruction. The states which choose the way of aggression, conquest, and colonization, extremely politicize ideological processes, falsify history, violate, deform, and destroy the field of cultural creation. Consequently the expansionist policy determines violent exploitation and disablement of cultural spheres resulting in “Cultural Extinction/Ethnocide: forced assimilation by prohibition of mother tongue, religion and cultural ways of expression, and denial of the existence of whole peoples in the public life of a state”¹⁶. Thus, in such conditions destructive forces appear because of lack of cultural factors. The destruction of the Armenian masterpieces of architecture in Western Armenia

⁹ Durant W., op. cit., p. 1.
¹¹ It is observed that the road to peaceful future of peoples lies through cultural creation and cooperation along with preservation of national originality (see: Yakunin V. I., Chandra J. K., Papanicolaou N., Dialogue of Civilizations in the Contemporary Epoch, Englewood, NJ, 2008, p. 23). The study of the main components of civilization allows to consider dialogue of civilizations in the context of contemporary tendencies of geopolitical processes (Danielyan E. L., Civilization’s Theory in Geopolitical Conceptions, – 21st CENTURY, N1, 2009, pp. 57-72).
and Armenian Kilikia (Cilician Armenia) is continuation of the Armenian Genocide.

France, Great Britain and Russia asserted in their joint declaration, dated 24 May 1915, that “... in the presence of these new crimes of Turkey against humanity and civilization, the Allied Governments publicly inform the Sublime Porte that they will hold personally responsible for the said crimes all members of the Ottoman Government as well as those of its agents who are found to be involved in such massacres …”17.

The nomadic Turks had no idea about homeland in the lands occupied by them. In 1913, a series of conferences was organized “to imbue citizens” with “Ottoman patriotism” by fabricating the idea of “homeland” (“vatan”)18. The Turkish expansionist-genocidal policy had already been in the process19 of committing the Armenian Genocide in western parts of the indigenous Armenian people’s Homeland – Western Armenia and Kilikia (Cilicia).

On 11 January 1917, the Allies in their reply to President Woodrow Wilson recalled “the massacres of hundreds of thousands of inoffensive Armenians…” and claimed “the liberation of peoples lying beneath the murderous tyranny of

---


the Turks, and expulsion from Europe of the Ottoman Empire, which has proved itself radically alien to Western civilization\(^{20}\).

Continuing the Ottoman, Young Turk and Kemalist genocidal policy Turkish state-sponsored “research centres” falsify world history and particularly the history and the historical geography of Armenia. Falsification of the history of Armenia constitutes part of desperate attempts to deny the Armenian Genocide by successive regimes in Turkey. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide adopted by the U.N. General Assembly on December 9, 1948\(^{21}\) is a very important international document the vision of which Turkish rulers view with horror. They are scared of the recognition of the Armenian Genocide and the Armenian demand for the restoration of historical justice and the return of native lands - Western Armenia and Kilikia (occupied by Turkey). In relation to the Armenian Genocide reparations and restitutions\(^{22}\) A. de Zayas noted: “The Turkish State remains liable for the crimes committed by the Ottoman Empire... the obligation of the genocidal State to make reparation, does not lapse with time”\(^{23}\).

The Atatürk sanctioned forgery “Turkish History Thesis”\(^{24}\) - a fabrication of non-existent “ancient Turkish history” by misrepresentation of archaeological materials and consequently, complete distortion of ancient world history has been erroneously attributed to the so-called “nation-building projects”\(^{25}\).

---


\(^{23}\) A. de Zayas, op. cit., pp. 12, 41.

\(^{24}\) Manvel Zulalyan demonstrated complete bankruptcy of Turkish falsification of the history of ancient and medieval Armenia Մարգարյան Վ., Հայոց պատմության խեղաթյուրումը արդի թուրք պատմագրության մեջ (հին և միջին դարեր), Ե., 1995. Clive Foss disclosing the fact of absolute distortion of world history by “Turkish History Thesis”, noted: “This might seem to be manifest nonsense, especially as it was obvious that Chinese and Indians were not Turks... Atatürk’s accomplishments... owe much to the previous discredited regime, the CUP, the “Young Turks” who ran the country from 1908 until the end of the First World War” [Clive Foss. “When Turks Civilized the World” (History Today, Vol. 55, 2005, pp. 13, 16)].

\(^{25}\) Contrary to the Turkish propagandists’ exaltations on behalf of “the efforts of the Republican elite for nation-building” to implant the “sense of Turkishness to its citizens” (Nesim Seker. Vision of Modernity in the Early Turkish Republic: an Overview (Historia Actual Online,
influenced by “dominant ideologies of nationalism”\textsuperscript{26}. But in reality it was in line with the genocide ideology, because all the tricks with “Turkish state-building” have been motivated and led by discriminatory, violent and illegal actions prompted by the Turkey’s criminal attempt to deny the Armenian Genocide. Implementation of the idea of the formation of “the Turkish nation” in the fabricated “vatan” has become a Pan-Turkic ideological false report of the state policy of Turkey by distortion of history and historical geography. In continuation of the genocidal occupation and re-divisions of Western Armenia and Kilikia the present-day administrative division of Turkey had been established by the state-sponsored “First Geography Congress” in 1941\textsuperscript{27}, in line with implementation of the plan to cover up the Armenian Genocide. Another example of genocidal “territorial appropriation” propagandized in Turkey is the program of the “Turkish Geographical Society. Activity Report, 2010” which included a “three year plan” (2010-2013) of activities “in the homeland - Internal and East Anatolian, Black Sea Region Fieldwork”\textsuperscript{28}. It is seen that Western Armenia is presented falsely as “East Anatolian…”.

The negative characteristics given by European intellectuals\textsuperscript{29} to Turks the present-day Turkish revisionists of history and their supporters try to present merely as a consequence of religious hatred, thus disguising all the atrocities inflicted upon the subjugated peoples by the Ottoman, the Young Turk and the Kemalist regimes and their followers.

The European Parliament in 1987 adopted the “Resolution on a political solution to the Armenian question” and recognized the Armenian Genocide, particularly noting: “The Turkish Government, by refusing to recognize the genocide of 1915, continues to deprive the Armenian people of the right to their own history, whereas the historically proven Armenian genocide has so far neither been the object of political condemnation nor received due

\textsuperscript{26} Asli Gür. Political Excavations of the Anatolian Past: Nationalism and Archaeology in Turkey (Controlling the Past, Owning the Future: The Political Uses of Archaeology in the Middle East, Tuscon, 2010, p. 73).

\textsuperscript{27} http://www.turkeyforyou.com/travel_turkey_geographical_regions


\textsuperscript{29} It will suffice to remember the lines by Victor Hugo (“Les Turcs ont passé là: tout est ruine et deuil” (Victor Hugo. Œuvres complètes. Poésie I. Paris, 1985, L’enfant, p. 476) and Mark Twain (“Abdul-Aziz, the representative of a people by nature and training filthy, brutish, ignorant, unprogressive, superstitious and a government whose Three Graces are Tyranny, Rapacity, Blood” (Mark Twain. The Innocents Abroad, New York, 1964, p. 75).
compensation…”30. Especially since the 1980s the Turkish authorities while spending efforts to enter the European Community have been trying to change the extremely negative impression of the image of Turks. There are even attempts to look for the so-called “intellectual roots” of anti-European sentiments in Turkish politics and “finding” them in radical Turkish nationalism31. But, in reality, it is necessary to talk about the genocidal roots.

Turgut Özal during his premiership (1983–1989)32 personally became busy with the publishing of a politicized and falsified history book33. Campaigning actively to bring Turkey into the European Community Özal surprised the world with his pseudo-historical book, which, as S. Vryonis remarked, “was not initially intended to recover, reconstruct, and explain history, but rather it is agonistic and aims to persuade Europe to accede to Turkey’s political and economic goals and desires. The work is hardly documented, and in the few instances where there is rudimentary documentation of sorts, they are bizarre and can best be described as distorted. The lack of scholarly documentation harmonizes with the fact that the book, which carries the name of Mr. Turgut Özal, then the prime minister of Turkey, is in effect a semi-official, state and party pronouncement on what the history of the Turks has been, is now, and will be in the future”34.

R. W. Smith, Eric Markusen, Robert Jay Lifton noted: “From 1915 to 1917, the Young Turk regime in the Ottoman Empire carried out a systematic, premeditated, centrally-planned genocide against the Armenian people… Despite the vast amount of evidence that points to the historical reality of the Armenian genocide – eyewitness accounts, official archives, photographic evidence, the reports of diplomats, and the testimony of survivors – denial of the Armenian genocide by successive regimes in Turkey has gone on from 1915 to the present”35. Gregory Stanton wrote: “Denial, the final stage of genocide is

31 Nergis Canefe and Tanil Bora, Intellectual Roots of Anti-European Sentiments in Turkish Politics: The Case of Radical Turkish Nationalism (Turkish Studies, Volume 4, Issue 1, 2003, p. 137).
32 In December 1986 the Turkish police arrested H. Potoğlu. S. Vryionis noted: “H. Potoğlu, the publisher of the Turkish edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, was arrested and charged in the courts as a propagandist who intended to destroy Turkish national sentiment. The prosecutor of the State Security asked for a penalty of between seven and one-half to fifteen years imprisonment. Her crime? An entry in the English version of the Encyclopaedia Britannica carried a footnote that read: “During the Crusades the mountainous region of Cilicia was under the hegemony of the Armenian Cilician kingdom” (Speros Vryonis Jr. The Turkish State and History: Clio Meets the Grey Wolf, New York, 1993, pp. 107-108).
34 Vryonis S., op. cit., pp. 2-3.
Armenian civilizational heritage versus Turkish-Azerbaijani falsification of history…

best overcome by public trials and truth commissions, followed by years of education about the facts of the genocide, particularly for the children of the group or nation that committed the crime…"36.

The embodiment of fraud and ignorance the “Turkish History Thesis” has gained adherents among the centers and researchers cooperating with Turkey. For example, interpretations of archaeological materials are distorted by falsified toponymic terminology in some pseudo-scientific works, thus historic heritages of Western Armenia and Asia Minor ascribing to non-existent “ancient Turkey”37.

The most overwhelming contradictions in abortive attempts of the Turkish falsifiers and their accomplices to “revise history” in accordance with their maniacal “visions” are determined by the fact that the ancestors of Turks, Seljuk and Oghuz Turic nomadic tribes38 from the trans-Altai and trans-Aral regions (the second half of the 60s of the 11th c.-12th c.) had violently invaded some territories of Western Asia, thus they had no relation to the ancient and medieval history and original toponymy of the western part of the Armenian Highland, Asia Minor, the territories on the left bank of the Kura40 and other neighbouring lands. Since the beginning of their invasions until the present devastations, plunder and annihilation of Armenian historical monuments have been carried out on the lands occupied by those savage Turkic nomads and their

---

36 G. Stanton, The 8 Stages of Genocide. http://www.genocidewatch.org/images/8StagesBriefingpaper.pdf. G. Stanton sharply criticized “the Turkish government’s proposal to set up an “historian’s commission” with half of the members appointed by the Turkish government and half by the government of the Republic of Armenia to “study” the facts of what occurred in 1915 – 1923. The problem with this proposal is that the Armenian genocide has been thoroughly documented and studied by genocide scholars, many of whom are not Armenian, and the historical record is unambiguous. In 1997, The International Association of Genocide Scholars declared unanimously that the Turkish massacres of over one million Armenians was a crime of genocide” (G. Stanton, The Cost of Denial. - Genocide Watch. The International Alliance to End Genocide, http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutus/thecostofdenial.html).


38 A. Palmer noted: “Originally the Turks were nomadic horsemen from Central Asia…” (Alan Palmer. The Decline and Fall of the Ottoman Empire, New York, 1994, p. 2). From the 14th century appeared “Osmanlı” (corrupted into “Ottoman” in the languages of western Europe) dynasty (Ibid.). Their “eponym, ‘Osmân, was the son of a certain Erktoghrul who had led into Anatolia (Asia Minor - E. D.) a nameless band of Turkish refugees: an insignificant fragment of the human wreckage…” (Toynbee A., op. cit., p. 151).

39 Voltaire (1694-1778) wrote: “If you have nothing to tell us except that one barbarian succeeded another on the banks of the Oxus and Jaxartes, what is that to us?” (Toynbee A., Study of History, vol. I, pp. 114-115).

40 In ancient and medieval times, the boundary between Great Armenia and proper Aluank (the name is of the Armenian origin; in Greek and Latin sources is in the form of “Albania”) was along the Kura River (“Η Μεγάλη Άρμενια περιορίζεται από μέν άρκτως τω της Κολχίδος μέρε και Ίθημα και Άλαντα κατά την εκτεθειμένη δία Κύρου του ποταμού γραμμήν” – ΚΑΛΛΙΔΟΥ ΠΟΛΙΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΓΕΩΓΡΑΦΙΚΗ ΥΦΗΛΗΣΙΣ, Parisis, M DCCCXI, V.12.1; cf. The Geography of Strabo, Cambridge, Mass., London, in eight volumes, vol. V, 1954, XI, 14.4).
descendants. Özal was aware of the fact that Seljuks were invaders ("The advance of the Seljuks into Anatolia after the battle of Malazgirt (1071)..."), but, demonstrating the Turkish falsified approach to geographic names, he, on the one hand, without differentiating the Armenian Highland from Asia Minor wrongly applied only the term “Anatolia”, and, on the other hand, used in distorted form (Malazgirt) the ancient Armenian city-name Manazkert (“built by Manaz” [abbreviated form of the name of Manavaz, the son of Haik Nahapet (Patriarch)]).

Turkish falsifiers distort and eradicate Armenian geographical terms and toponyms, “plagiarize” concepts that have no relation to their nomadic predatory past (which is full of the blood of millions of innocent victims), thus putting into circulation a fake “concept” of the Turkish “historical-civilizational role” contrary to their destructive role in world civilization. Özal, crushing all professional-historical and ethical-scientific conventions and rules, absurdly and ignorantly wrote: “In looking at our history as insider of Anatolia, we can claim to have lived on this land since the beginning of the Anatolian civilizations, for both culturally and demographically the preceding civilization has each time been carried over, at least to a certain extent, into the succeeding one. It was we, therefore, who brought about the Neolithic revolution. The Sumerians were also a people whose language was agglutinative like ours and had the most important word, namely God, in common with us...”. Turkey’s monstrous ambitions obsessively expressed by Özal in the field of appropriation of the roots of European civilization are as follows: “European civilization was born in Anatolia, which is Turkish, and therefore Europe is morally obliged to acknowledge its Anatolian-Turkish origins and by extension to include Turkey, the cradle of Western Civilization, as a full member of the European Community.” “The Greek Revolution in 1820 prompted European historians to regard mainland Greece as the starting point of their civilization, overlooking the cradle of the miracle...”,– Özal arrogantly continued,– “No one in Western Europe can claim to be as Aegean as ourselves. To accept this fact, however, means that one first has to give up an ethnocentric perspective of history... A Europe capable of accepting Turkey as a full member of the Community will have risen above ethnocentrism... She will understand how illogical it is for a

---

41 The Armenian Architecture: a Cultural Genocide, Montreal: ANC of Canada, 2005 (photo documentary). Evidence of continuation of the programmed annihilation of the Armenian cultural heritage (by the sanctions of the criminal Turkish authorities) in Western Armenia are the turning of Surb Arakelots (Holy Apostles) Armenian Church into a mosque (http://news.am/eng/news/-136463.html#), the destruction of the old Armenian houses in Mush (in Taron gavar) in 2013 (http://armenpress.am/eng/news/724842/historical-armenian-houses-of-mush-are-being-destroyed.html), etc.

42 Özal T. Turkey in Europe and Europe in Turkey, pp. 77, 110, 115.

43 Urnako Manku, Մովսէս Խորենացի, Պատմութիւն Հայոց, Ե., 1991, էջ 38.

44 Özal T., op. cit., p. 346.

45 Translated into English by S. Vryonis (op. cit., p. 4) from the French edition of Özal’s book.
Europe not to include Anatolia, the cradle of civilization in the northern Mediterranean.\(^{46}\)

The idea of civilization is completely alien to Turkey. The evidence of that are the Armenian Genocide, destruction and ruins of historical-architectural monuments, cultural-educational centers and cities, towns and villages in Western Armenia, Cilician Armenia and Armenian Mesopotamia as a result of military campaigns, conquests and genocidal actions organized and realized by the Ottoman, the Young Turk, the Kemalist regimes and their successors.

At the end of the 20\(^{\text{th}}\) century, R. D. Kaplan travelling in Western Armenia, reached Trapezunt. He wrote that except for an occasional ruin “every trace of Armenian civilization has been erased…”\(^{47}\).

An obvious case of the anti-civilizational two-faced policy of Turkey\(^{48}\) in international affairs is the destruction of cultural-historical monuments in the occupied northern part of Cyprus. “Lobby for Cyprus”\(^{49}\) published the following statement: “There is irony in the fact that while Istanbul basks in the limelight as Europe’s City of Culture for 2010, Turkey, an aspiring EU member, continues to vandalize and destroy Europe’s cultural and Christian heritage in Cyprus”\(^{50}\).

Turkish prime minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan in his opening statement at the Second Forum of “The Alliance of Civilizations” on April 6, 2009 in Istanbul (Constantinople), completely falsifying historic facts said: “… let me state with great happiness that this land has been rather the home of peace, tolerance, a culture of coexistence, mutual compassion and respect. Istanbul is the most obvious example of this. Istanbul not only connects two continents, namely, Europe and Asia; Istanbul is not only located at the intersection of Asia, Europe and Africa; Istanbul has also its proper place in the world as a city which embraces and harmonizes cultures, civilizations, races, religions and languages in the melting pot of history. Istanbul, named as the 2010 European Capital of Culture, continues to convey messages of compassion and tolerance throughout the world, as it has always done in history… The Hagia Sophia\(^{51}\) in

\(^{46}\) Özal T., Turkey in Europe and Europe in Turkey, pp. 347, 356.

\(^{47}\) Kaplan R. Eastward to Tartary, New York, 2000, p. 318.

\(^{48}\) Contrary to fraudulent efforts of Turkey to deny the Armenian Genocide, on 28 February 2002 “European Parliament condemned the Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Turkey in 1915. The fifteen European Union member countries confirmed that Turkey followed a genocidal policy directed against the Armenian population early last century. The deputies of the European Parliament voted for the resolution passed earlier condemning the Armenian Genocide in Ottoman Turkey in 1915… The resolution new version contains a call on Turkey to lift the blockade against Armenia as well as to undertake other actual moves for joining the European Union” (http://www.panarmenian.net/eng/news/3954/).

\(^{49}\) It is a non-party-political human rights NGO based in the UK with the aim of reuniting Cyprus. It was formed in 1992 and since its inception has campaigned against the invasion, occupation, ethnic cleansing and destruction of the cultural heritage of 37 per cent of the Republic of Cyprus by Turkey http://www.lobbyforcyprus.org/aboutus.aspx

\(^{50}\) http://www.lobbyforcyprus.org/statement.aspx?id=870

\(^{51}\) After closing (October 2011) to the public for several days “Hagia Sophia was reopened
Iznik, House of the Virgin Mary in Izmir, considered among the most holy places of Christianity, and the St. Nicholas Church in Antalya are but a few living examples of our 2,000-year culture of coexistence…”

Lies and falsifications in Erdoğan’s speech demonstrably exemplified his goal: to use the podium of “the Alliance of Civilizations” for Turkish political purposes. The name “Istanbul” had neither ancient, nor medieval application. Erdoğan did not mention the name Constantinople (it officially was renamed “Istanbul” in 1930). His lie about “Istanbul” (as if “embracing and harmonizing cultures, civilizations, races, religions and languages in the melting pot of history”) bursts like a soap bubble. In reality, after the battle of Manazkert nomadic Turks’ conquests had disastrous consequences. Contrary to Erdoğan’s speech, from the beginning of the conquest of Constantinople the city was drowned in blood by Turks. A monastic scribe in Crete wrote with horror about the capture of Constantinople in 1453 by the Turks: “There never has been and never will be a more dreadful happening.” Centuries later, on April 24, 1915 Constantinople was turned into a scene of total carnage: thousands Armenian intellectuals (poets, musicians, publicists, editors, lawyers, doctors, deputies, community leaders, clergymen, teachers) were put under arrest by the Turkish government’s order and sent into exile and were horrifically slaughtered. There were also many Armenians tortured and killed in the streets of the city. Contrary to Erdoğan’s delirious declaration that Istanbul, as “the melting pot of history”, continuously conveys “messages of compassion and tolerance throughout the world, as it has always done in history”, it became known as the genocidal city. The anti-Armenian actions continuously have been taking place there up to the present. There was no “2,000-year culture of


56 In January 2007 Armenian journalist Hrant Dink was assassinated in Istanbul. “This was shortly after the premiere of the genocide documentary Screamers, in which he is interviewed about Turkish denial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915 and the case against him under Article 301” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hrant_Dink). “In recent years there have been several attacks against Armenians in Turkey. Earlier in December, another Armenian woman was brutally attacked and robbed. Months earlier, an Armenian woman was called an infidel and attacked in a cab by the driver himself...” (http://www.armenianweekly.com/ 2013/01/06/funeral-of-murdered-armenian-woman-in-istanbul-evokes-memories-of-earlier-cover-ups/).
coexistence” of Turks with indigenous Christians, because there were no Turks in those times. Later, after the nomadic Turkic invasions the periods of devastations, plunder and massacres followed each other culminating in the genocidal actions. Erdoğan turning upside down all these facts completely falsified history to cover up Turkey’s genocidal crimes. From the very beginning of their rule the Kemalist leaders and their accomplices and followers used the Ottoman and the Young Turk regimes’ genocidal experience of falsification of the history and toponyms of Armenia.

With regard to the distortion of the history of Armenia by Esat Uras, Christopher Walker in his review unveiling the fallaciousness of his book, noted: “Uras shows no understanding of the history or even the reality of Armenia”. Uras denies the Armenian Genocide by falsifying Armenian history and historical geography.

Turkish and Azerbaijani falsifications in archaeology may be exemplified by the following spurious publication with a completely erroneous title: “Azerbaijan - Land between East and West. Transfer of knowledge and technology during the “First Globalization” of the VIIth - IVth millennium BC”. Without mentioning the name of Armenia its archaeological sites have been falsely “located” in “Eastern Anatolia” and “Azerbaijan” by the Turkish and Azerbaijani falsifiers. But, in reality, on the one hand, the term “Eastern Anatolia” has nothing to do with the territory of the Armenian Highland, which is to the east of Asia Minor (Anatolia) and, on the other hand, the name of “Azerbaijan” historically corresponds only to the Iranian province of

---

57 Contrary to the Turkish denial efforts, since the 1965 until now 21 countries and many international organizations and regional governments and parliaments have recognized the Armenian Genocide as the first genocide of the 20th century.

58 Danielyan E. Turkish – Azerbaijani Falsifications of the Armenian Toponyms as an Indication of the Genocidal Policy (Բանբեր հայագիտության, N 1 (1), 2013, p. 159-179).


60 The following statement by Uras may serve as a proof of his complete ignorance: “At the outbreak of the War, there was very great tension between the Armenians and the Turks. During mobilization, Soviet-made guns were discovered in the possession of many Armenians... It was under these circumstances that the Armenian rebellion broke out in April 1915” (Esat Uras. “The Armenians in History and the Armenian question”, An English transl. of the revised and expanded second edition, Ankara, 1988, p. 884). But it is the total absurd to write about “the rebellion” with “Soviet-made guns” in 1915, because there was no Soviet power in Russia before November 1917 (Սահակյան Ռ. Արևմտահայության ցեղասպանություն և ինքնապահության 1915թ.-ի արձանք, Երևան, 2005, էջ 154, 256). On the other hand, after the request-letter (April 26, 1920) of Mustafa Kemal (who offered to fight together is if “for the sake of all the oppressed” against the world imperialism) to Lenin (Международная жизнь, 1963, N 11, c. 147-148), the Soviet government criminally supplied the Turks with arms and gold, who launched an aggression in the autumn against the Republic of Armenia.


62 In the second half of 1918, it was stolen from the Iranian north-western province of Azerbaijan and given to artificially formed “Eastern-Caucasian Muslim Republic” (Արևմտահայության
E. Danielyan

Atropatene-Adarbaigan-Azerbaijan. According to Strabo, ancient Atropatene was located to the south-east of the Kingdom of Great Armenia. According to Strabo, ancient Atropatene was located to the south-east of the Kingdom of Great Armenia. According to Strabo, ancient Atropatene was located to the south-east of the Kingdom of Great Armenia. According to Strabo, ancient Atropatene was located to the south-east of the Kingdom of Great Armenia.

Turkish falsifiers (with expansionist purposes) trying to obliterate historic memory, destroy and “appropriate” the Armenian historic heritage of Western Armenia, including Armenian Cilicia and Armenian Mesopotamia by falsification and destruction of Armenian cultural monuments. They encroach also on “the Silk Road Integral program” initiated by UNESCO. Contrary to their efforts the well-known civilizational contribution of Armenia to the history of the Silk Road is of special importance. The King of Kings of the Armenian Empire, Tigran the Great (95-55 BC) took under his protection the Silk Road’s branches in Western Asia realizing civilizational activities; centuries later the capital of the Armenian Bagratuni Kingdom (885-1045 AD), Ani (from 961 AD) prospered as a political, cultural, commercial centre and the junction of great international trade routes, etc. In order for the Silk Road International programme to be really truthful, the historic-cultural heritage of the Armenian people (in Eastern and Western Armenia) must be presented in a holistic territorial context - the Armenian Highland (Great Armenia and Armenia Minor), Cilician Armenia and Armenian (Northern) Mesopotamia.

Falsification of the history and historical geography of Armenia, especially, distortion of the toponymy of Western Armenia and Cilician Armenia are used...
for denial of the Armenian Genocide by the Turkish government. But precisely because of irrefutable facts of the history of Armenia and the spiritual power of the Armenian historical heritage, Turkish efforts to deny the Armenian Genocide are doomed to failure.

Thanks to the heroic struggle of the Armenian freedom fighters in the Artsakh Liberation war (1991-1994), aggressive Azerbaijan was defeated and the native Armenian population and Armenian historic monuments were protected in the Artsakh liberated lands. The guarantors of the protection of the Armenian civilizational heritage are the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic (the NKR). The Artsakh glorious victory – a token of future victories – has proved the importance of spiritual potential of the Armenian civilizational heritage in protection of the value foundations of national security of the Motherland based on more than five millennia old Armenian holistic cultural creativeness and freedom-loving traditions.

70 Turkish rulers have committed their vile, filthy schemes by destruction and desecrating historical monuments in the occupied territories of Western Armenia, Cilician Armenia, Armenian Mesopotamia, falsification of the history of Armenia, and spending huge amounts of money for denial of the Armenian Genocide.

71 At the beginning of the 21st century, the remaining groups of tens of thousands (demolished during previous decades) Armenian khachkars (cross-stones) were annihilated in the Armenian Cemetery of Hin (Old) Jugha (Julfa. The Anihilation of the Armenian Cemetery by Nakhijevan’s Azerbaijani Authorities, Beirut, 2006) after complete destruction of Armenian historic monuments (churches and monasteries, et al) of Nakhijevan by the sanctions of the defeated aggressive Azerbaijan’s authorities.

գնահատել համաշխարհային մշակույթի և գիտության անվանի գործիչները:
Շարունակելով օսմանյան, երիտթուրքերի ու քեմալականների ցեղասպան քաղաքականությունը՝ Թուրքիայի պաշտոնական շրջանակները և նրանց կողմից հովանավորվող «հետազոտական կենտրոնները» նենգափոխում են համաշխարհային և հատկապես Հայաստանի պատմությունը և պատմական աշխարհագրությունը:
Հայաստանի տարածքների վերադարձի արդար պահանջատիրությունից խուսափող Թուրքիան Հայոց ցեղասպանությունը ժխտելուն ուղղված հուսահատ ճիգեր է գործադրում: Արցախի Հանրապետության դեմ պատերազմ սանձազերծած և ջախջախիչ պարտություն կրած Ադրբեջանի վայ- պատմաբանները շարունակում են զբաղվել Հայոց պատմության և պատմական աշխարհագրության կեղծարարությամբ: Թուրքիայի ցեղասպան հանցագործությունները զրկվում են Արևմտյան Հայաստանի, Կիլիկիայի, Հայոց Միջագետքի օկուպացված տարածքներում հայկական պատմական հուշարձանների ոչնչացման, Հայոց պատմության կեղծարարության և ցեղասպանության ժխտման համար հսկայական ֆինանսական ծախսերի միջոցով (Արեւմտահայ Հայաստանի, Պատմական Հայաստանի, անհերքելի փաստերի և պատմական ժառանգության հոգևոր ուժի ծանրության տակ, Թուրքիայի` իր ցեղասպան հանցագործությունները քողարկելու ճիգերը (Արևմտյան Հայաստանի, Կիլիկիայի, Հայոց Միջագետքի օկուպացված տարածքներում հայկական պատմական հուշարձանների ոչնչացման, Հայոց պատմության կեղծարարության և ցեղասպանության ժխտման համար հսկայական ֆինանսական ծախսերի միջոցով) պաշտպանում են ձախողման: Նման վախճան է սպասվում նաև Ադրբեջանին:
Հայաստանի Հանրապետությունը և Արցախի Հանրապետությունը հայ- կական քաղաքակրթական ժառանգության պաշտպանության երաշխավորն են: Արցախյան փառահեղ հաղթանակը, որպես ապագա հաղթանակների գրավական, ապացուցեց Հայոց ամբողջական քաղաքակրթական ժառանգության հոգևոր ներուժի կարևորությունը Հայրենիքի ազգային անվտանգության արժեքային հիմքերի պաշտպանության գործում:

АРМЯНСКОЕ ЦИВИЛИЗАЦИОННОЕ НАСЛЕДИЕ ПРОТИВ ТУРЕЦКО-АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСКОЙ ФАЛЬСИФИКАЦИИ ИСТОРИИ И ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЙ ГЕОГРАФИИ

ДАНИЕЛЯН Э. Л.

Резюме
Стратегическое положение Армении, ее богатые природные ресурсы, военно-экономическая мощь, высокий уровень духовной и материальной культуры являлись основой развития системы армянских цивилизационных ценностей. Этнодуховные, культурные и социально-политические корни армянской государственности на Армянском нагорье, засвидетельствованные археологически и архитектурными памятниками, градостроительством, клинописными, антич-
ными и средневековыми письменными и другими историческими источниками, насчитывают более 5000 лет. Согласно историко-археологическим и этнокультурным исследованиям, Армения является колыбелью армянского народа и мировой цивилизации. Значимость армянских культурных и цивилизационных ценностей отмечена видными деятелями мировой культуры и науки.

Продолжая османскую, младотурецкую и кемалистскую геноцидальную политику, официальные круги Турции и спонсируемые ими “исследовательские центры” фальсифицируют мировую историю и, в частности, историю и историческую географию Армении. Турция, во избежание справедливого требования возврата армянских земель, тщетно проводит политику отрицания геноцида армян. Фальсификацией истории и исторической географии Армении продолжают заниматься также псевдоисторики Азербайджана, потерпевшего сокрушительное поражение в им же развязанной войне против Республики Арцах. Именно в силу неопровержимости фактов истории Армении и духовной мощи армянского исторического наследия попытки Турции скрыть свои преступления (посредством уничтожения армянских исторических памятников на оккупированных территориях Западной Армении, Киликии, Армянской Месопотамии, фальсификации истории Армении и огромных финансовых затрат, направленных на отрицание геноцида армян) обречены на провал. Последний неизбежен и для Азербайджана.

Гарантами защиты армянского цивилизационного наследия являются Республика Армения и Республика Арцах. Победа в Арцахской войне как залог будущих побед доказала важность духовного потенциала армянского цивилизационного наследия в защите ценностных основ национальной безопасности Родины.
ARMENIAN STUDIES IN THE SYSTEM OF INFORMATION SECURITY

Harutyunyan G. A.
Executive Director of Noravank Scientific Educational Foundation

Armenian studies constitute a certain sphere of academic researches. Branches of Armenian studies - history, literature, architecture, etc., are manifestations of our civilizational identity, which in turn had brought new content to our system of values (and continue doing so), which are the basic components of the national security system. Thus, Armenian studies are essentially a national civilizational and state-building discipline guaranteeing national information security with cognitive means.

Admittedly, such interpretation of Armenian studies suggests a deeper application of the discipline’s concepts and results in education system, as well as practical/political affairs\(^1\), which may have a positive impact in the area of modern national political thought. This cause-and-effect relationship explains the fact that to date there are only few interdisciplinary researches juxtaposing and combining the fields of Armenian studies (or for that matter, any other scientific disciplines) and politics. Yet this would have allowed not only uncovering the commonalities between the fields, but also developing their complementation mechanisms and application formats in the aspect of information security.

Given the challenges that Armenian society has to face\(^2\), such statement of problem appears quite critical. With the mentioned realities in mind some observations of the said problems are presented here below, with a prior brief deliberation on some of the modern and significantly expanded views on national security.

In the area of security the highest priority is currently assigned to the safety, effective setup and development of the society’s spiritual/intellectual resources. In this context the traditional approaches to and definitions of warfare have changed: presently the politics and strategies are carried out mainly through the so-called “soft power” and “information warfare” which is part of the former. It has to be noted in this regard that spiritual/cultural issues are encompassed in the information security, which in turn is a component of the national security.

\(^1\) Հարությունյան Գ., Հայագիտության ազգային ռազմավարության որոշ դրույթներ, Գլոբուս, 2007, 1(9), էջ 3:

\(^2\) Both Armenian states - the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic - are in no war, no peace situation; Armenian communities in the Near East are at the verge of extinction due to geopolitical developments and generally there are many problems in Diaspora.
It is known that the theory of information warfare and methods employed in it have qualitatively evolved in the recent period. Armenia and the Armenianity are involved in such warfare for some well-known reasons, and in these terms are in the risk zone. In such conditions our intellectual and political elite must develop a strategy adequate to the existing challenges, which should take into account the following circumstances.

Security doctrines usually assign key importance to the protection of so-called “critical infrastructures”, construed as the most essential military/political, socio-economic and information structures, incapacitation of which leads to a failure of the whole security system. We contend that the status of “critical infrastructure” must be assigned to the systems and structures that safeguard spiritual/intellectual development, as their failure may lead to demoralization of the society. Such approach is currently gaining ground in the world and it appears, such an approach may be used in Armenia as well.

Informational factor has acquired a decisive role in almost all fields of activity of an individual, society, state and nation. In the rapidly changing world only the one having information has a chance to follow be adequate and respond to the new realities. Today various informational activities and informational warfare have moved to political plane and are one of the main geo-ideological tools in geopolitical and geo-economical spheres.

The perception of the system of values in the society is not a static category, since it changes depending on the historical, military/political developments, as well as evolutionally or revolutionary ones. Today it is substantially influenced by printed and electronic mass media through widely spread, targeted and/or supposedly chaotic information flows, which to a considerable extent form the global community’s way of thinking, mindset and hence, also the system of values.

In terms of informational organization of Armenianity the following favourable fundamental factors exist:

The idea of the Motherland and the existence of the Republic of Armenia (RA) and the Artsakh Republic (NKR);

---

3 The so-called “second generation” network information warfare is worth mentioning, which pursues the following main objectives: 1. to disintegrate the adversary’s social/moral bases and the system of values; 2. to impose own cultural code in the consciousness of the adversary’s (or sometimes even the ally’s) society through manipulative technologies.


The idea of the Armenian unique civilization
The memoires of the Armenian Genocide and the Hay Dat (Armenian Cause).

The number of Armenians living abroad twice outnumbers those living in the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic, that’s to say, the information support problem of all the Armenians is a bigger problem than the one of Armenia. At the same time, an important positive factor to boost the Armenian information security system is the development of information and communication technologies.

An important role in the national identity is attached to the informational factor. Today, global information flows, which are not controlled by the given society-nation-state, generally constitute a threat to the identity.

It has to be noted that study of the problems in this area requires consideration of certain peculiarities of our history of the last hundred years.

The Armenian Genocide and loss of the Western Armenia have deeply and tragically impacted the psychology and worldview of our society, especially the Diaspora. The Diaspora part of the Armenians is also characterized by the fact that they undergo not only intra-ethnic or global influences, but also national/civilizational ones specific to the countries of their residence.

As a result of geopolitical processes of the last two centuries the Armenians of Eastern Armenia has changed the socio-ideological environment of its social being several times. This has led to considerable, sometimes controversial, substantive transformations in the approaches to the society’s system of values.

The study of the public’s system of values is currently viewed as a crucial matter, and for example, World Values Survey (WVS), an international organization, conducts extensive studies around the world. The research outcomes are used in making both economic and political decisions and particularly, the so-called “color revolution” technologies are anchored on knowledge of socio-psychological characteristics of a given society. The research conducted by the mentioned organization suggests that the population of Armenia is in the cultural domain of the countries, where traditional and survival values prevail. Currently studies of values system in Armenia are conducted by the Chair of Psychology at the Yerevan State University. Also, impacts of the information environment on the system of values are studied at the Noravank Foundation.

However, it is evident that the activities implemented in this area are not sufficient and furthermore, are far from gaining applied significance. Such situation often causes

---

7 As a simplest example of the informational war against Armenia and Armenians the following example is presented. “On February 23 the Turkish network resource Takvim.com.tr spread information that 100 outstanding US businessmen, including Bill Gates and Warren Buffett had send a letter to George W. Bush with an appeal not to recognize the Armenian Genocide. The article was presented only in Turkish. Later the Turkish Daily News reprinted the material in English. Soon the Azeri network mass media put the “news” into circulation, thereafter it was presented by the whole Armenian press without checking the sources. As a result the Armenian office of Microsoft Company had to make an official denial” (Martirosyan S., Some Issues of Informational Security of Armenia, 21-st CENTURY, 2008, 1(3), p. 69).

8 See http://worldvaluessurvey.org

9 See, for example, Իդեոլոգեմները ՀՀ տեղեկատվական տարածքում, Երևան, «Նորավանք» ԳԿՀ, 2013.
controversial comments in the political-information arena, which in no way contributes to the establishment of an effective national security system and implementation of relevant political strategies\(^\text{10}\).

It must be especially emphasized that a closer relationship between Armenian studies and the policies, as well as their practical use seem impossible without an appropriate information policy, and this is applicable also to other problems unrelated to the system of values.

It is obvious that the Armenian information security system must include the complex of information problems concerning not only Armenia [this concept, in terms of information, assumes the Republic of Armenia, the Artsakh Republic and Javakhh], but also Armenians living all over the world - in Diaspora\(^\text{11}\). Thus, the Armenia’s and Armeniancy’s information security functions, naturally, are interconnected and must be at least mutually complementary and what is more desirable - dwelled on synergetic principle.

From the standpoint of organization and security of the Armeniancy this new political and informational situation implies both challenges and new opportunities. At present development and competitiveness of nations, states and civilizations are unambiguously conditioned by the level of their conceptual approaches to national security.

According to experts, the concept of national security is a single whole of three constituent parts - military-political security, social and economic security and informational security. In their turn the above mentioned fields are independent and each of them is a unity of several other interlinked component parts. Particularly, informational security is an extensive and pithy conception, which includes not only the security problems of informational-technical systems but also everything concerning civilization, cultural, spiritual, psychological, intellectual, cognitive and organizational fields, which are the objects of Armenian studies in Armenian reality. It can be stated that the notion information security is noticeably connected with human, public and national factors than the other components of national security.

Coordination and assessment of national resources are one of the key functions of the national and, particularly informational security system. Among them are strategic resources, important for the Armeniancy’s security:

- Civilizational resources,
- Technological resources (human, intellectual, creative, scientific, technical, and purely information resources),

---

\(^{10}\) Հարությունյան Գ., Ինտեգրացիայի որոշ հիմնախնդիրների մասին արժեքային համակարգի համատեքստում, Գլոբուս, 2013, 4(37), էջ 20:

- Material (enterprising, production - trading, financial and other entrepreneurial capacities),
- Organizational, meaning self-organizational capacities, ability to create structures necessary to display tenacity (including the state, community, political, public, economic institutional organizations and formats), and carry out national functions and programs through such structures.

Solution of organization problems firstly supposes clarification and systematization of Armeniancy’s information security’s problems. It is necessary to single out the following:
- Assessment of information resources of Armeniancy and creation of new resources;
- Development of a system for their efficient and safe functioning;
- Providing Armeniancy with all the necessary information on Armenia and Armeniancy based on Armenian studies and adequate spheres of research;
- Development of infra-Armenia and external propaganda concepts and technologies and their practical implementation, working out elements of contemporary information policy (public policy, noo-politics, mediapolitics, mobile politics) and implementing them to address Armeniancy’s political, economic, cultural and other issues;
- Implementation of educational, academic, political and other Pan-Armenian programs;
- Conceptual elaboration of Pan-Armenian net-centred organizational system and by means of it shaping the joint information field of Armeniancy, etc.

Numerous issues require joint political/governmental and academic/expert discussions aimed to find solutions for the problems under consideration.

Obviously, the Armenian system of values with its civilizational traits is one of the cornerstones that has ensured our national/historical continuity. For example, the Armenian Army, which being based on the millennia-old Armenian military art and the best patriotic traditions, has been restored during the heroic battles of the victorious Artsakh liberation war.

From the point of view of information security Armenian studies are important in research, elaboration and systematization of millennia-old Armenian civilizational and national values based on creative activities of the Armenian people and their application in cultural and educational, political and governmental spheres in the Republic of Armenia and the Artsakh Republic on the benefit of the national security of the whole Armenian nation.
More than five millennia-old ethno-spiritual, political and cultural roots of the Armenian statehood in the Armenian Highland are attested to by the archaeological and architectural monuments, petroglyphs, cuneiform, ancient and medieval written and other historic sources. Historical truth is the backbone and informational defensive shield of the national security of Armenia.

Turkey and its pan-Turkic project - artificially formed Azerbaijan use disinformation and manipulations in information warfare being unable to overcome the truths about the past and the present of Armenia (the Armenian Highland, the Armenian nation, Western Armenia, the Republic of Armenia, the Artsakh Republic, etc). Falsifications of the history and historical geography of Armenia constitute part of Turkish-Azerbaijani frantic and maniacal attempts to deny Armenians' historic and legal hereditary rights to the western (Western Armenia, Kilikian Armenia which underwent the Armenian Genocide devastation) and eastern (particularly liberated lands of Artsakh, and awaiting their liberation Northern Artsakh, Utik and Nakhijevan) parts of the Armenian Homeland. Turkish-Azerbaijani deceptive methods with a stillborn outcome are
crushed against the strongholds of Armenia’s history and the civilizational value system. Those engaged in deceptive information operations display aggressive fallaciousness, as is the case with the Turkish authorities who are scared of the recognition of the Armenian Genocide, territorial reparations, the Armenian demand for the restoration of historical justice and the return of native lands [13, Էջ 76-86; 14, Էջ 475; 15; 10, pp. 12, 41].

Examining the formation of the concept of information warfare and the increasingly dominant role that deception is taking within its framework, W. Hutchinson noted: “The concept of information warfare began as a technology oriented tactic to gain information dominance by superior command and control... Information warfare in the Information Age is about controlling the ‘infosphere’. It includes perceptions and information flows at the tactical, operational and strategic level in times of peace, tension, and war. As such, it means controlling sources and the dissemination of information... By definition, information warfare is about using and protecting information... The defensive side of information warfare is concerned with the protection and integrity of

1The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide adopted by the U.N. General Assembly on December 9, 1948 is a very important international document the visions of which Turkish rulers view with horror.

2The Turkish state genocidal policy and actions intensified in the late 19th c. (the massacres of more than 300,000 Armenians in Western Armenia and other areas occupied by the Ottoman Empire [1, pp, 83-98; 2]) and the early 20th c. (1909, Kilikia: 35,000 Armenians were massacred in and around Adana [3, Էջ 81; 4, pp. 5-6]) culminating in the Armenian Genocide (more than 1.5 million Armenians were killed and eight hundred thousand deported) of 1915-1923 in Western Armenia, Kilikia, the Armenian-populated areas of Asia Minor, some regions of Eastern Armenia [5; 6; 7; 8, p. 90; 10, pp. 24-25; 11, pp. 133-142; 12, c. 28, etc.].


4Analyzing the principles of deception for propaganda purposes Scot Macdonald noted: “The goal of the deceiver is to make an adversary perceive reality in a way that will help the deceiver by making the deceived do something the deceiver desires” [16, p. 83].
data, people within the systems”... [17, pp. 213, 220]. “The philosophical and political foundations of falsification of fundamental historical questions of the 20th century” were discussed at the meeting of the International Youth and Students for Social Equality (the Humboldt University, Berlin, 12 February 2014). Some special problems of general methodological significance were touched upon. For example, Sven Heymanns noted that “lies about politics and history have wide-ranging implications... The tools of the historian are access to the archives and the evaluation of sources, but not falsifications and lies”.1

Turkish propagandists have been busy with fabrication of “history” particularly since the 1930s - the Atatürk-sanctioned forgery (“Turkish History Thesis”)2 for non-existent “ancient Turkey” by mis-representing archaeological materials and consequently complete distortion of ancient world history.

Methodologically approaching to the criteria of scientific studies, W. Weber noted: “Historical truth had to be defended as a basic principle of scientific research”.3 The “Turkish History Thesis” was criticized sharply by Armenian and foreign historians. Manvel Zulalyan demonstrated its complete bankruptcy in falsification of the history of ancient and medieval Armenia [19]. In western historiography the “Turkish History Thesis” was most fundamentally criticized by Clive Foss. Unmasking the pan-Turkic motives of Kemal’s fraud, Foss wrote: “This might seem to be manifest nonsense, especially as it was obvious that Chinese and Indians were not Turks... Atatürk’s accomplishments..."

---
2 It was a total fake, having a huge impact on the Turkish falsifications of history. Erik J. Zürcher critically presented the principles of Kemalism’s ideology as the backbone of formation of “the personality cult around Mustafa Kemal during and even more after his lifetime... it is still very much part of the official culture of Turkey”. At the same time Zürcher sharply criticized the Atatürk sanctioned “Turkish History Thesis” [18, pp. 190, 199-200].
owe much to the previous discredited regime, the Committee of Union and Progress, the “Young Turks” who ran the country from 1908 until the end of the First World War” [20, pp. 13, 16]. It is obvious that he meant the Young Turks’ genocidal crimes.

R. W. Smith, Eric Markusen, Robert Jay Lifton wrote: “From 1915 to 1917 the Young Turk regime in the Ottoman Empire carried out a systematic, premeditated, centrally-planned genocide against the Armenian people… Despite the vast amount of evidence that points to the historical reality of the Armenian genocide – eyewitness accounts, official archives, photographic evidence, the reports of diplomats, and the testimony of survivors – denial of the Armenian genocide by successive regimes in Turkey has gone on from 1915 to the present” [21, pp. 2-3]. In this regard Gregory Stanton noted: “Denial, the final stage of genocide is best overcome by public trials and truth commissions, followed by years of education about the facts of the genocide, particularly for the children of the group or nation that committed the crime…”.

Especially since the 1980s in their efforts to enter the European Community, the Turkish authorities have been trying to change the extremely negative impression of the image of Turks. Turgut Özal during

---

1 Gregory Stanton. The 8 Stages of Genocide. This article was originally written in 1996 and was presented as the first Working Paper (GS 01) of the Yale Program in Genocide Studies in 1998. http://www.genocidewatch.org/images/8StagesBriefingpaper.pdf “In 1997, The International Association of Genocide Scholars declared unanimously that the Turkish massacres of over one million Armenians was a crime of genocide” (G. Stanton, The Cost of Denial. – Genocide Watch. The International Alliance to End Genocide, http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutus/thecostofdenial.html).

2 It will suffice to remember the lines by Victor Hugo (“Les Turcs ont passé là: tout est ruine et deuil”) [22, p. 476] and Mark Twain (“Abdul-Aziz, the representative of a people by nature and training filthy, brutish, ignorant, unprogressive, superstitious—and a government whose Three Graces are Tyranny, Rapacity, Blood”) [23, p. 75]. France, Great Britain and Russia asserted in their joint declaration, dated 24 May 1915, that “… in the presence of these new crimes of Turkey against humanity and civilization, the Allied Governments publicly inform the Sublime Porte that they will hold personally responsible for the said crimes all members of the Ottoman Government as well as those of its agents who are found to be involved in such massacres …” [24, p. 35; 25, p. 16]. Clive Foss noted: “The Europeans, however, traditionally took a dim view of the Turks, formerly seen as cruel and violent conquerors, ‘the Terrible Turk’, and more recently the ‘Sick Man of Europe’. The Turks themselves were confused about their identity…” [20, p. 11].
his premiership (1983–1989) became personally involved with publication of a politicized and falsified history book [28; 29]. Campaigning actively to bring Turkey into the European Community Özal surprised the world with his pseudo-historical book, which, as S.Vryonis remarked, “was not initially intended to recover, reconstruct, and explain history, but rather it is agonistic and aims to persuade Europe to accede to Turkey’s political and economic goals and desires. The work is hardly documented, and in the few instances where there is rudimentary documentation of sorts, they are bizarre and can best be described as distorted. The lack of scholarly documentation harmonizes with the fact that the book, which carries the name of Mr.Turgut Özal, then the prime minister of Turkey, is in effect a semi-official, state and party pronouncement on what the history of the Turks has been, is now, and will be in the future” [26, pp. 2-3].

Turkish falsifications of history have gained adherents among the centers and researchers cooperating with Turkey. For example, interpretations of archaeological materials are distorted by falsified toponymic terminology in some pseudo-scientific works, thus the historic heritages of Western Armenia and Asia Minor are ascribed to non-existent “ancient Turkey” [31; 32; 33, etc.]. The most overwhelming contradictions in abortive attempts of the Turkish falsifiers and their accomplices

1 In December 1986 the Turkish police arrested H. Potuğlu. S. Vryonis noted: "H. Potuğlu, the publisher of the Turkish edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, was arrested and charged in the courts as a propagandist who intended to destroy Turkish national sentiment. The prosecutor of the State Security asked for a penalty of between seven and one-half to fifteen years imprisonment. What was her crime? An entry in the English version of the Encyclopaedia Britannica carried a footnote that read: “During the Crusades the mountainous region of Cilicia was under the hegemony of the Armenian Cilician kingdom” [26, pp. 107-108]. In the late 1980s expressing the Turkish government’s policy of the denial of the Armenian Genocide and the avoidance of responsibility for it, Turgut Özal stated that “modern Turkey was not responsible for the events of the Ottoman era” [27, pp. 46-47].

2 E.g., “Eastern Anatolia” is wrongly used instead of Western Armenia, etc. It is noted that “maps like speeches and paintings, are authored collections of information and are also subject to distortions arising from ignorance, greed, ideology or malice” [30, p. 2].
to “revise history” in accordance with their maniacal “visions” are determined by the fact that the ancestors of Turks, Seljuk and Oghuz Turkic nomadic tribes1 from the trans-Altai and trans-Aral regions2 had violently invaded some territories of Western Asia (in the second half of the 11th century). Thus they had no relation to the native history and original toponyms of the western part of the Armenian Highland, Asia Minor, the left bank of the Kura River3, etc. Since their invasions and till the present, devastations, plunder and annihilation of Armenian historical monuments have been carried out in Western Armenia and Kilikia occupied by savage Turkic nomads and their descendants4. Recent evidence of continuation of the programmed annihilation of the Armenian historic heritage in Western Armenia are the turning of the Armenian Church of Surb Arakelots (Holy Apostles, 930-942 AD) [40, էջ 192] into a mosque5, the destruction of the historic Armenian houses in Mush (in Taron gavar) in 20136, and other anti-Armenian provocative actions, such as Turkey’s involvement in the attack on the Armenian-populated Kessab7. On March 21-22, 2014 the Turkey-supported armed gangs openly passed through

1 A. Palmer noted: “Originally the Turks were nomadic horsemen from Central Asia… “. From the 14th century appeared “Osmanli” (corrupted into “Ottoman” in the languages of western Europe) dynasty [34, p. 2]. A. Toynbee wrote: “Their “eponym, ‘Osmãn, was the son of a certain Ertoghrul who had led into Anatolia (Asia Minor - E.D.) a nameless band of Turkish refugees: an insignificant fragment of the human wreckage... “ [35, p. 151].
2 Voltaire (1694-1778) noted: “If you have nothing to tell us, but that on the banks of the Oxus and Jaxartes, one barbarian has been succeeded by another barbarian, in what respect do you benefit the public?” [36, p. 70].
3 In ancient and medieval times the boundary between Great Armenia and proper Albania (in Armenian sources) (“Albania” in antique sources) was along the Kura [37, V.12. 1, cf. 38, XI, 14. 4].
4 The destruction of Armenian historical monuments is continuation of the crime of genocide – genocide of culture or cultural genocide [39].
5 http://news.am/eng/news/136463.html
7 From ancient times Armenians have lived in that region: it was within the Armenian Empire of Tigran II the Great (95-55 BC) and centuries later on the southern borders of the Armenian [the Princedom (1080-1197)] Kingdom (1198-1375) of Kilikia (Cilicia).
Turkish military barracks, crossed the Turkish-Syrian border, and attacked the town of Kessab. Snipers targeted the civilian population and launched mortar attacks on Kessab and the surrounding villages in the Northwest of Syria. Aram I, the Catholicos of the Great House of Cilicia, responding to the Kessab tragedy, said: “The same genocide-committed Turkey uses the chance to strike on the Armenian people.” Some 700 Armenian families were evacuated by the local Armenian community leadership to neighboring Basit and Latakia [part of them found refuge in the Armenian Church of Surb Asdvadsadzin (St. Virgin)]. On March 23, the attacking groups took the remaining Armenian families hostage, desecrated the Kessab’s three Armenian churches, pillaging local residences and occupying the town and surrounding villages. On March 24 President of the Republic of Armenia Serzh Sargsyan, who was in Netherlands at the Hague Nuclear Security Summit, expressed deep concern over the events in Kessab. He reminded that during the first scourge in April 1909, when the Turkish armed detachments invaded Kessab, burnt and looted the houses, Armenians found refuge in Latakia. After returning to Kessab they reconstructed their houses. In 1915, “when the Kesab population also experienced migration and exiles of the Armenian Genocide, Armenians of Kessab were exiled in two directions: to Der Zor and to the south up to Jordan. Thousands died en route, the majority perished in the desert of Deir ez-Zor. The third deportation of Kessab Armenians today is a serious challenge to ethnic minority rights’ protection mechanisms of the 21st century. I think that everyone should realize that these parallels should sober all the sides... I have already instructed the diplo-

---

http://civilnet.am/kesab-chronicle-historic-town-under-siege/  
matic missions at the UN Headquarters in New-York and Geneva to raise the issue of ensuring the security of the Armenians in Kessab and their safe return to their permanent places of residence at the structures dealing with human rights and ethnic minorities,” said President Serzh Sargsyan. On March 24 in a telephone conversation with the Catholicos of the Great House of Cilicia Aram I, the Catholicos of All Armenians Garegin II “expressed his concern about the recent events and condemned the terrorist actions of Turkey-supported extremists against the peaceful Armenian population of Kessab.”

U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Robert Menendez was joined by Congressional Armenian Caucus Co-Chairs Frank Pallone and Michael Grimm, Armenian Genocide Resolution Lead Sponsors David Valadao and Adam Schiff and Representatives Brad Sherman, Jim Costa and James McGovern “in condemning the recent attacks against the historically Armenian city of Kessab, Syria, urging the State Department to investigate the incursion and take immediate action to safeguard the vulnerable population.” “We would like to thank Chairman Menendez and the many other Congressional defenders of human rights who have stepped forward to call the world’s urgent attention to the attacks against the predominantly Armenian population of Kessab,” said the Armenian National Committee of America Executive Director Aram Hamparian. In a joint letter to President Obama, Representatives Pallone, Grimm, Valadao and Schiff noted: “When coupled with a mass exodus of the Armenian community, these events are far too reminiscent

3 On March 27/28 it became known that the Turkish tanks and helicopters crossed the Turkish-Syrian border to support the attackers in the area of Kessab (http://armenpress.am/eng/news/755776/militants-establish-control-over-kesab-baghjaghas-armenian-village.html).
of the early days of the Armenian Genocide, which took place nearly 100 years ago in Ottoman Turkey under the cover of World War I.”

“During a daily briefing in Washington on March 28 U.S. Department of State deputy spokesperson Marie Harf said the United States is deeply troubled by recent fighting and violence that is endangering the Armenian community in Kessab, Syria, and has forced many to flee... The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia issued a statement strongly condemning the attacks on Kessab and the acts of terrorism and other crimes against civilians that it said were conducted with the artillery support, including the use of tank guns from the territory of Turkey.”

Turkish falsifiers distort and eradicate Armenian geographical terms and toponyms, “plagiarize” concepts that have no relation to their nomadic predatory past (which is full of the blood of millions of innocent victims), thus putting into circulation a fake “concept” of the Turkish “historical-civilizational role” contrary to the evil role of Turks in the destruction of world civilization. Turgut Özal absurdly and ignorantly wrote: “In looking at our history as insider of Anatolia, we can claim to have lived on this land since the beginning of the Anatolian civilizations, for both culturally and demographically the preceding civilization has each time been carried over, at least to a certain extent, into the succeed-

---

1 Members of Congress Condemn Kessab Attacks. 31/03/2014 http://hayernaysor.am/en/ufu-o6lnujhplnp-juumuuupuaj-lii-huwpau/ Commenting on blocking Twitter by the order of Erdogan and the Kessab tragic events, H.Sassounian noted: “What do these two seemingly unrelated events have in common? Erdogan himself indirectly answered this question, during a campaign rally on March 20: “We will wipe out Twitter. I don’t care at all what the international community says. Everyone will see the power of the Turkish Republic...”. Sassounian concluded his article with the following remark: "On the eve of the Genocide Centennial the Turkish government and its allies are directly or indirectly embarking on a new campaign of exterminating Armenians in Syria" (Harut Sassounian: What Should Armenians Learn from Prime Minister Erdogan? http://www.armenianweekly.com/2014/03/25/sassounian-what-should-armenians-learn-from-prime-minister-erdogan/).

ing one. It was we, therefore, who brought about the Neolithic revolution…” [29, p. 346]. Turkey’s enormous ambitions obsessively expressed by Özal are as follows: “European civilization was born in Anatolia, which is Turkish, and therefore Europe is morally obliged to acknowledge its Anatolian-Turkish origins and by extension to include Turkey, the cradle of Western Civilization, as a full member of the European Community”. Özal, “teaching” the European Community “a lesson” of broad-mindedness, arrogantly continued: “No one in Western Europe can claim to be as Aegean as ourselves. To accept this fact, however, means that one first has to give up an ethnocentric perspective of history… A Europe capable of accepting Turkey as a full member of the Community will have risen above ethnocentrism… She will understand how illogical it is for a Europe not to include Anatolia, the cradle of civilization in the northern Mediterranean” [29, pp. 347, 356].

The idea of civilization is completely alien to Turkey. The evidence of that is the Armenian Genocide, destruction and ruins of historical-architectural monuments, cultural-educational centers and cities, towns and villages in Western Armenia, Kilikian Armenia and Armenian Mesopotamia in result of military campaigns, conquests and genocidal actions organized and realized by the Ottoman, the Young Turk, the Kemalist regimes and their successors. At the end of the 20th century R. D. Kaplan witnessed the complete destruction of the Armenian civilization in Western Armenia, where he traveled, reaching Trabzon. He wrote that except for an occasional ruin “every trace of Armenian civilization has been erased…” [41, p. 318]

---

1 This citation has been translated into English by Speros Vryonis [26, p. 4] from the French edition of Turgut Özal’s book [28].

2 About reopening of the church of Surb Khach (the Holy Cross, built in 915-921) on Aghtamar Island in Lake Van” (http://www.armenianow.com/news/20176/aghtamar_reopens) R. Safrastyan noted (21.12.09) that it was “a formal gesture”. Thousands of Armenian churches have been systematically destroyed and desecrated in Western Armenia and their destruction and desecration by the sanctions of Turkish authorities continues up to now.
An obvious case of the anti-civilizational hypocritical policy of Turkey in international affairs is the destruction of cultural-historical monuments also in the occupied northern part of Cyprus. “Lobby for Cyprus” published the following statement: “There is irony in the fact that while Istanbul basks in the limelight as Europe’s City of Culture for 2010, Turkey, an aspiring EU member, continues to vandalize and destroy Europe’s cultural and Christian heritage in Cyprus”.

Prime Minister of Turkey Recep Tayyip Erdogan in his opening statement at the Second Forum of “The Alliance of Civilizations” (6.04.2009) in Istanbul (Constantinople), completely falsifying historical

---

1 In contrast to fraudulent attempts of Turkey to deny the Armenian Genocide, on 28 February 2002 “European Parliament condemned the Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Turkey in 1915. The fifteen European Union member countries confirmed that Turkey followed a genocidal policy directed against the Armenian population early last century. The deputies of the European Parliament voted for the resolution passed earlier (1987) condemning the Armenian Genocide in Ottoman Turkey in 1915… The resolution’s new version contains a call on Turkey to lift the blockade against Armenia as well as to undertake other actual moves for joining the European Union” (http://www.panarmenian.net/eng/news/3954/).

2 It is a non-party-political human rights NGO based in the UK with the aim of reuniting Cyprus. It was formed in 1992 and since its inception has campaigned against the invasion, occupation, ethnic cleansing and destruction of the cultural heritage of 37 per cent of the Republic of Cyprus by Turkey (http://www.lobbyforcyprus.org/aboutus.aspx).

3 It is well known that in 1974 Turkey carried out an illegal invasion of Cyprus, as a result of which virtually all Greek Cypriots in the north of the island were ethnically cleansed and driven out of their homes…. This Christian heritage, Europe’s heritage, has been systematically desecrated since 1974 … Every attempt has been made to obliterate the rich Greek and Christian heritage of the northern areas of Cyprus. Even today, archeological sites are being bulldozed to make way for militaristic statues and monuments to bolster the existence of the illegal regime in the occupied area…” (http://www.lobbyforcyprus.org/statement.aspx?id=870). Adopting from Turkey the same “bulldozing method” of destruction of historic monuments, after innumerable assaults of the previous decades, ethnic purges against Armenians and total destruction of Armenian historic monuments in Nakhijevan, the surviving clusters of about ten thousand Armenian cross-stones (khachkars) in the Armenian Cemetery of Hin (Old) Jugha (in the ancient Armenian gavar Goghtan to the south-east of the Nakhijevan gavar) were destroyed by the sanctions of the criminal Azerbaijani authorities at the dawn of the 21st century [42].

facts said: “… let me state with great happiness that this land has been rather the home of peace, tolerance, a culture of coexistence, mutual compassion and respect. Istanbul is the most obvious example of this. Istanbul not only connects two continents, namely, Europe and Asia; Istanbul is not only located at the intersection of Asia, Europe and Africa; Istanbul has also its proper place in the world as a city which embraces and harmonizes cultures, civilizations, races, religions and languages in the melting pot of history. Istanbul1, named as the 2010 European Capital of Culture, continues to convey messages of compassion and tolerance throughout the world, as it has always done in history… The Hagia Sophia in Iznik2, House of the Virgin Mary in Izmir3, considered among the most holy places of Christianity, and the St. Nicholas Church in Antalya are but a few living examples of our 2,000-year culture of coexistence…”4

Lies and falsifications in Erdogan’s speech demonstrably exemplified his goal: to use the podium of “the Alliance of Civilizations” for Turkish political purposes. Contrary to his lies, the fact is that after the battle of Manazkert (1071 AD) nomadic Turks’ conquests had disastrous consequences [44, S. 1010]. From the beginning of the conquest of Constantinople (1453) the city was drowned in blood by Turks. A monastic scribe in Crete wrote with horror about the capture of Constantinople by the Turks:

---

1 Erdogan did not mention the original medieval name of the city – Constantinople, which was violently changed to “Istanbul”: "Constantinople officially was renamed Istanbul in 1930" [43, p. 177].
2 And yet in October 2011 “the Hagia Sophia of Iznik was closed to the public for several days of construction work by the Directorate General of Foundations, a department of the prime minister’s office in Ankara which manages historical buildings around the country… The Hagia Sophia was reopened for service as a mosque” (Susanne Gusten. The Church That Politics Turned Into a Mosque http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/09/world/middleeast/the-church-that-politics-turned-into-a-mosque.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0).
3 A Greek heritage site in Asia Minor, the House of Virgin Mary is in the ancient city of Ephesus, which is at a distance of 81 km from Smyrna (modern Izmir).
“There never has been and never will be a more dreadful happening” [34, p. 1]. Centuries later, on April 24, 1915 Constantinople was turned into a scene of total carnage: thousands of Armenian intellectuals (poets, musicians, publicists, editors, lawyers, doctors, deputies, community leaders, clergymen, teachers) were put under arrest by the Turkish government’s order and sent into exile and were horrifically slaughtered; there were also many Armenians tortured and killed in the streets of the city [45].

Erdogan’s lie about Istanbul bursts like a soap bubble. Contrary to his delirious declaration that Istanbul continuously conveys “messages of compassion and tolerance throughout the world, as it has always done in history”, it became known as the genocidal city. Anti-Armenian actions continuously have been taking place there up to the present, as it is noted: “The funeral of 84-year-old Marissa Kuchuk, who was brutally murdered in her apartment in Istanbul, was held on Jan. 5, 2013 amid fears that violent acts against the country’s Christian minorities will continue to be swept under the rug… In recent years there have been several attacks against Armenians in Turkey. Earlier in December (2012), another Armenian woman was brutally attacked and robbed. Months earlier, an Armenian woman was called an infidel and attacked in a cab by the driver himself…”

There was no “2,000-year culture of coexistence” of Turks with indigenous Christians (as Erdogan tried to assure in his speech), because there were no Turks in those times. Much later, starting with the nomadic Turkic invasions, the periods of devastations, plunder and massacres followed one after another, culminating in the genocidal acts. Er-

1 Ayse Gunaysu. Funeral of Murdered Armenian Woman in Istanbul Evokes Memories of Earlier Cover-Ups http://www.armenianweekly.com/2013/01/06/funeral-of-murdered-armenian-woman-in-istanbul-evokes-memories-of-earlier-cover-ups/ In January 2007 Armenian journalist Hrant Dink was murdered in Istanbul. “This was shortly after the premiere of the genocide documentary Screammers, in which he is interviewed about Turkish denial of the Armenian Genocide of 1915 and the case against him under Article 301” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hrant_Dink).
dogan completely falsified historic facts in order to disguise Turkey’s genocidal crimes. From the very beginning of their rule the Kemalist leaders, their accomplices and followers used the Ottoman and the Young Turk regimes’ genocidal experience of distortion of the history of Armenia and falsifications of the Armenian toponyms to cover up the Armenian Genocide.

Turkish and Azerbaijani falsifications in archaeology may be exemplified by the following spurious publication with a completely erroneous title: “Azerbaijan - Land between East and West. Transfer of knowledge and technology during the “First Globalization” of the VIIth - IVth millennium BC”. Without mentioning the name of Armenia its archaeological

---

1 A detailed analysis of genocidal crimes can be found in the book by Alex Alvarez, where some conclusions are based on the facts of the Armenian Genocide [46].

2 Turkish leaders and pseudo-historians are on very bad terms with historical facts. With regard to falsification of the history of Armenia by Esat Uras [47], Christopher Walker in his book-review unveiling the fallaciousness of Esat’s book, noted: “Uras shows no understanding of the history or even the reality of Armenia” [48, p. 166]. Uras denies the Armenian Genocide by falsifying the Armenian history and historical geography. The following forgery is an example of the false information fabrication by Uras: “At the outbreak of the War, there was very great tension between the Armenians and the Turks. During mobilization, Soviet-made guns were discovered in the possession of many Armenians… It was under these circumstances that the Armenian rebellion broke out in April 1915” [47, p. 884]. But it is the total absurd to write about “the rebellion” with “Soviet-made guns” in 1915, because there was no Soviet power in Russia before November 1917 [49, 154, 256]. On the other hand, after the request-letter (April 26, 1920) of Mustafa Kemal (he offered to fight together allegedly “for the sake of all the oppressed against the world imperialism”) to Lenin [50, c. 147-148], the Soviet government criminally supplied the Turks with arms and gold, which launched the aggression in the autumn against the Republic of Armenia [9, p. 90].

3 Contrary to the Turkish authorities’ efforts, 21 countries and many international organizations and regional governments and parliaments have recognized the Armenian Genocide as the first genocide of the 20th century. Genocide Scholars Association Officially Recognized Ottoman Genocides Against Armenians, Assyrians, Greeks, and other Christians (http://itwasgenocide.armenica.org/IAGS_1915_genocide_recognition.pdf). The State Duma of the Russian Federation particularly stated (April 14, 1995) that the Armenian Genocide was committed in the Armenians’ historic homeland territory of Western Armenia http://www.anca.org/genocide_resource/recognition.php#Russian
1In reality archaeological sites of Mush, Van, Kharberd are in Western Armenia, and Nahchijevan, Shamkhor/Shamkir (in Utik), Askeran region (in Artsakh) are in Eastern Armenia. The Turkish and Azerbaijani falsifiers used the Armenian toponyms’ distorted forms (Elazığ, Naxçivan, Shamkir).
3In the second half of 1918 this name was stolen from the Iranian northwestern province of Azerbaijan and with Pan-Turkic purposes given to artificially formed “the Tartar Republic of Azerbaijan” (H. Nahapetyan, Publications in American Periodicals Concerning Nagorno-Karabakh in 1918-20, http://www.noravank.am/eng/articles/detail.php?ELEMENT_ID=3534) or “Eastern-Caucasian Muslim Republic” [53, էջ 285], then it was applied to “Azerbaijan SSR” (again aiming to annex Iranian Azerbaijan) [54, էջ 703, 775-776]. Thus, what is today “the Republic of Azerbaijan” has no historic-legal rights over the Armenian regions of Artsakh, Utik and Nakhijevan and their historical heritage.
4But it is well known, that Nagorno-Karabakh is the modern name of the mountainous part of the Armenian region of Artsakh. In ancient and medieval times Artsakh was the 10th province of Great Armenia [56, էջ 110].
5Falsely presenting territorial situation, Özkan wrote: “There had been tensions and concerns especially among the Karabakh Armenians since 1923, when Soviet leadership created the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast within the territory of Azerbaijan” [55, p. 580]. But Artsakh has never been “within the territory of Azerbaijan”, because artificially formed in the second half of 1918 “Azerbaijan” had nothing to do with millennia-old Armenia’s eastern territories - Artsakh, as well as Utik and Nahchijevan.
ping the fact of the forced and illegal decision of the Caucasian Bureau (1921). The native Armenian Artsakh population never accepted that unlawful decision and struggled for reunification with the Motherland.


So it has not been “the contested territory” conflict as if sanctified by “ethnocracies utilizing religious myths”, as Özkan tries to present, but the process of reestablishment of the natural and legal rights of the Armenians of Artsakh in their Homeland by legal actions and liberation struggle.

Azerbaijan, as a defeated aggressor, has only one way out in the existing situation – it must sign the capitulation act and pull its troops out of occupied territories of Northern Artsakh as well as Utik and Nakhijevan.

Özkan distorting facts, wrote: “Both sides of the conflict instrumentalised history as it played an important role in strengthening the collective identity. Furthermore, history is manipulated to justify the

---

1 On July 5, 1921 the Caucasian Bureau of the CC of RCP-B made a completely unjust and annexionist decision to transfer Nagorno Karabakh (NK) (the mountainous part of Artsakh) to Soviet Azerbaijan. Even some of Mountainous Artsakh’s districts together with its lowland areas were cut off from it in 1923 when was formed the Autonomous Oblast of NK, which was renamed NKAO in 1936 [57, c. 13, 61; 58, pp. 19-20]. The leadership of Azerbaijan SSR systematically violated the rights and interests of the Armenians in NKAO and Nakhijevan [as a result of the unjust and illegal Soviet-Turkish treaties of Moscow (March 16) and Kars (October 13) signed in 1921] in social-economic, political, demographic and cultural spheres.

2 In 1988-1990 contrary to the legal self-determination demand of the Armenian population of NKAO, the Baku authorities committed genocidal actions in Sumgait, Gandzak (Kirovabad), Baku and other places and forced deportation of Armenians from there. On September 2, 1991 the Artsakh Armenians proclaimed the NK Republic (the Artsakh Republic) and on December 10 declared Independence of the NKR by the referendum. The NKR Supreme Council (December 28) adopted (January 6, 1992) the Declaration of the State Independence. From December 1991 the Azerbaijan’s authorities and military launched large scale aggression against Artsakh, but were crucially defeated. Armenian liberating forces had been moving victoriously in the eastern direction to the natural historical border of Armenia along the Kura. Azerbaijan’s leadership was in panic. According to Russia’s top negotiator Vladimir Kazimirov: “In April-May 1994 Baku thought only how… to prevent Armenians from reaching the Kura River” (http://www.regnum.ru/news/id -abroad/armenia/1345943.html). Armenian freedom-fighters liberated many territories of Artsakh, but Azerbaijani army regiments occupied Shahumyan region and Getashen sub-region in the north, and the eastern parts of Martakert and Martuni regions of the NKR. The ceasefire was signed in May 1994. Currently it is regularly violated by the defeated Azerbaijan’s snipers and raiding bands, which are decisively repulsed by Armenian border troops.
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claim of ‘we were on this territory first’ to exclude ‘the other’ from the constructed mythical space of home-land” [55, p. 584]. But it is obvious that only the Azerbaijani falsifiers and their Turkish supporter Özkan are busy with manipulations. Despite Özkan knows that “Azerbaijani” is an invented term, yet neglecting historical facts, he threw into the scale, on the one hand, the truthful history of Armenia and, on the other hand, false history of non-existent “Azerbaijan”. Özkan’s anti-scientific method is based on negation of the truthful history from the present-

1 Falsely interpreting historic data [without considering the real causes of the Armenian Genocide, territorial reparations (Western Armenia and Kilikian Armenia), as well as the self-determination of the Artsakh Armenians], Özkan presented historical and present-day facts in a distorted form [55, p. 585], in line with the Turkish-Azerbaijani anti-Armenian propaganda.

2 He wrote: “When the Soviet Azerbaijan was established, the people of the republic were called Turks. During the Stalin era in 1937, this was changed to Azerbaijani, which included Kurds, Talishs and other ethnic groups...” [55, p. 588]. But “when the Soviet Azerbaijan was established” not all people “were called Turks” there. According to “the calculation of 1/1 1925” and “All Union Population Census of 1926”, “Turks”, Russians, Armenians (including AONK and Nakhijevan ASSR), Talishs, Lezgins, Tats, Kurds, Ukrainians, Jews, Germans and others were mentioned in Azerbaijan SSR (in TCSFSR) (Большая советская энциклопедия, т.І. – М., 1926, с. 641, Всесоюзная перепись населения 1926 г., т. XIV, ССФСР, Аз.ССР, М., 1929, с. 12, 72). In the Russian Imperial (the second half of 19th- the beginning of the 20th cc.) and then the Soviet official documents (until the 1930s) the alien Turkic elements in the Cis-Caspian region were called “Tatars”, “Caucasian Tatars”, “Turks”. The falsified term “Azerbaijani(s)” officially started to be used in the USSR since the end of the 1930s (Всесоюзная перепись населения 1939г. Основные итоги, М., 1992, с. 71).

3 From the standpoint of general methodological approaches to the field of scientific research, Imre Lakatos warned that for centuries “wisdom and intellectual integrity demanded that one must desist from unproven utterances and minimize, even in thought, the gap between speculation and established knowledge” [59, p. 8].

4 In the same way Özkăn distorted the truth about real causes of the Sumgait tragedy, and “concentrating attention” to “ethnic hatred”, “housing shortages” and “confiscating Armenians’ properties”, wrote: “Most analyses about the violence in Sumgait reflect it as a primordial ethnic hatred and revenge. However, severe housing shortages, in a city where the population increased four times in the last thirty years, played an important role in the killings of Armenians to confiscate their properties” (55, p. 578). But the real causes were connected with the right to self-determination of the Artsakh Armenians and the aggressive terroristic response of official Baku to it. As follows from the NKР MFA Statement (2013.02.27) on Sumgait massacre: “… Dozens of killed, hundreds of maimed and thousands of Armenians expelled from Sumgait (27-29, 02. 1988) became the first victims of Azerbaijan’s policy of terror aimed at the Armenians of Karabakh who in the preceding week had officially declared their intention to exercise their right to self-determination. In spite of the peaceful and legitimate nature of those manifestations in Nagorno Karabakh, Azerbaijan from the very beginning rejected dialogue, resorted to the language of threats and intimidation and pursued policy of violent oppression of the free will of the people of Artsakh...” (http://www.nkr.am/en/news/2013-02-27/502/).
day politicized position of Turkey and Azerbaijan coming from falsification of history. Thus misrepresenting historical facts, he wrote: “Armenian national discourse employed religious narratives like “the first Christian nation, and a chosen people” to justify the claims on territories that once belonged to ancient Armenia as a matter of divine truth” [55, p. 585]. Özkan is ignorant of ancient and medieval Armenian and other historical sources, otherwise he would now that Armenia had been known in ancient world long before the proclamation of Christianity as the state religion (301 AD), as it follows from the 3rd - the first half of the 1st millennia BC cuneiform [Sumero-Akkadian\(^1\), Assyrian, Biainian (Ararat-Urartu) and Persian (520/519 BC)], ancient Greek and Latin, as well as medieval written sources.

Completely in line with Azerbaijan’s disinformation propaganda Özkan placed aggressive (Azerbaijan) and defensive (Artsakh) sides on the same level, and presented Armenian liberated territories in a hostile and biased wording: “December 1991, full-scale war started between the two sides. Within three years, Armenian forces occupied the entire territory of Nagorno-Karabakh and the surrounding Azerbaijani districts… Today 14.5 percent of the Azerbaijani territory is still under Armenian occupation…” [55, pp. 577, 587]. But there has been no “Azerbaijani territory” out of Iranian Azerbaijan (ancient Atropatena to the south-east of Urmia Lake).

\(^1\)Wrongly considering Armenia as a country in the Caucasus, Özkan wrote: “The outcome of ethnic conflicts is the formation of mono-ethnic countries in the Caucasus. Armenia has become one of the most mono-ethnic countries in the post-Soviet space” [55, p. 594]. But it is well-known that Armenia is in the Armenian Highland (to the south-east of the Black Sea and south-west of the Caucasus, east of Asia Minor, north of Mesopotamia and Iranian plateau. Armenia is a mono-ethnic country owing to the fact that Armenians are the indigenous nation of the Armenian Highland. In the 3rd millennium BC Armenia was mentioned in cuneiform inscriptions as Aratta, Armanum [60, c. 64; 61, c. 32; 74, pp. 62, 275; 75, pp. 59-83]. It’s interesting that in the same sources apricot is named armanu (cf. Lat. armeniaca) [62, p. 136; 63, pp. 105, 113, 116-117], because its home-country is Armenia. Later an anthropological type was called Armenoid [64, pp. 228, 240-244; 65, c. 7; 66, c. 25]. The Republic of Armenia, along with the Republic of Artsakh continue to have largely mono-ethnic population.
An artificial formation “Azerbaijan” has not got any legal right to challenge the historic and legal rights of the Artsakh Armenians – native inhabitants of the eastern regions of their Motherland – Armenia. Thus, Armenians have not occupied “14.5 percent” of the falsely called “Azerbaijani territory”. Armenians liberated eastern territories of their Motherland!

Turkish falsifiers try to obliterate historic memory, destroy and appropriate the Armenian historic heritage of Western Armenia, including Kilikia and Armenian Mesopotamia by falsifications and destruction of Armenian cultural monuments. They encroach also on “the Silk Road Integral program” initiated by UNESCO.

Contrary to their efforts, the well-known civilizational contribution of Armenia to the history of the Silk Road is of special importance [67; 68; 69, c. 292-311]: the King of Kings of the Armenian Empire, Tigran the Great (95-55 BC) took under his protection the Silk Road’s branches in Western Asia carrying out civilizational activities [71, էջ 3-12]; centuries later the capital of the Armenian Bagratuni Kingdom (885-1045 AD), Ani (from 961 AD) prospered as a political, cultural, commercial centre and the junction of great international trade routes [72], etc. In order for the Silk Road International programme to be really truthful, the historic-cultural heritage of Armenia must be presented in a holistic territorial coverage – the Armenian Highland (Great Armenia and Armenia Minor), Kilikia and Armenian Mesopotamia.

2 http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001591/159189e.pdf etc.
3 Along with the newly-built capital Tigranakert and other cities in different parts of the Armenian Empire, Tigran the Great founded two more cities named after him in Artsakh and Utik (Eastern regions of Great Armenia) [70, էջ 125], on a branch of the Silk Road.
4 The holistic historical heritage of the Armenian people territorially includes Eastern and Western Armenia, Kilikia and Armenian (Northern) Mesopotamia, but at present only the territory of the Republic of Armenia has been presented in the sharply politicized international projects implying the Silk Road http://www.traceca-org.org/ru/traseka/istorija-traseka/; http://www.blackseasilkroad.com/; http://www.tacentral.com/bsrc/sites/armenia-AMAP-ASPB-bsrc-sites.pdf; http://www.tacentral.com/bsrc/maps/Armenia%20Route-high.jpg etc..
Turkey and Azerbaijan are absolutely unable to contend against Armenia in history, historical geography and civilizational contribution to the world treasury of culture, so they wage information warfare by means of disinformation and manipulations.

Turkish government wages information warfare\(^1\) against the memory of the Armenian Genocide martyrs and the legal rights of the survived Armenians and their generations living in the Armenian Diaspora and the Republic of Armenia. Turkey is escalating the wide dissemination of disinformation by means of blocking, degrading, falsifying or forging information. It is well known that, on the one hand, Turkey spends millions to cover up the Armenian Genocide\(^2\) [21, pp. 4-5], and, on the other hand, Azerbaijan is handing out millions of petrodollars for its propagandistic lies\(^3\).

Armenian Defense Minister, Seyran Ohanyan, pointing to the significance of the victory in Artsakh Liberation war against aggressive Azerbaijan, said that the “anti-Armenian campaign and distortions in

---

\(^1\) Contrary to Turkey’s provocative policy of genocide denial, the Armenian Genocide issue was put on the agenda of the UN Security Council on January 29, 2014 (Harut Sassounian, Armenia Challenges Turkey’s Genocide Denial at the UN Security Council, http://www.armradio.am/en/2014/02/18/armenia-challenges-turkeys-genocide-denial-at-the-un-security-council/). “German Chancellor Angela Merkel scolded Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan over Turkey’s continued denial of the Armenian Genocide and urged the Turkish leader to “face its history” (Feb 7, 2014, http://www.topix.com/forum/world/germany/T3ROP327SRTIU5FI1/p6). “Erika Steinbach, a member of Angela Merkel’s Christian Democratic Union Party urged Turkey to apologize for the Armenian Genocide. The call came ahead of Erdogan’s visit to Germany, Bild reports. “I urge Erdogan to stop denying the genocide of Armenians and Assyrians by the Young Turk government of the Ottoman Empire 99 years ago,” adding that “it is high time for Turkey to apologize to the descendants of the victims of the first genocide of the 20th century. It is Erdogan’s duty to face the truth nearly 100 years after that terrible crime and ensure that the Turkish textbooks do not distort this part of Turkish history,” said Steinbach (Feb 3, 2014, http://eupolitics.einnews.com/news/erika-steinbach).


the research and cultural fields realized by the Azerbaijan propaganda state machine make it imperative to disclose these falsifications and expose their threats not only for Armenia but also for the whole region.\(^1\)

The Armenian Defense Minister stressed the importance of Armenia’s overwhelming priority on the moral-spiritual and cultural front in information warfare against Azerbaijan’s hostile propaganda\(^2\).

Analyzing the informational data concerning information warfare waged by Turkey and Azerbaijan and their allies against the NKR, Gagik Ter-Harutyunyan noted: “Analysis of information flows give the impression that the Azerbaijani structures waging information warfare get certain, in particular methodological support of the specialists from Turkey and other ally states of Azerbaijan. It is also not excluded the participation of experts of big energy companies based in this country in information operations against the NKR.”\(^3\)

Employing creative methods, providing deeply rooted analyses for fundamental issues of history and politics are important from the aspect of Armenian national security. Considering the role of the media from the point of view of national security, it is noted: “Today there is a direct relationship between media and national security. National security issues can be investigated in relation to secure and unsecure factors, a distinction that helps to clarify the relation between internal security and communications, on the one hand, and the effects of new communication media on external dimension, on the other hand. New media in the information era challenge many previous assumptions and principles concerning national security” [73, p. 37].

\(^1\) http://old.armradio.am/arm/news/?part=pol&id=42227


\(^3\) Gagik Ter-Harutyunyan, Information Warfare and Nagorno-Karabakh Republic, 23.06.2008
http://www.noravank.am/eng/articles/detail.php?ELEMENT_ID=3556
The enormous efforts and huge amounts of money that Turkey and Azerbaijan spend on information warfare against the Republic of Armenia, the Artsakh Republic (the NKR) and the Armenian Diaspora are doomed to fail, because of irrefutable facts of the history of Armenia and the spiritual power of the Armenian historical heritage, as a proof of irresistible force of historical truth revealed through the history of Armenia and historical justice crowned with the Artsakh victory.
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The Armenian people suffered a great tragedy and tremendous losses at the end of the 19th century and the first two decades of the 20th century. The Hamidian massacres of 1894-96 were followed by mass extermination of Armenians programmed and committed by the Young Turks. It was an unprecedented intentional genocide in the 20th century world history, an attempt at physical annihilation of a whole nation and total destruction of its culture. Those bloody events deeply shocked both the contemporaries and the next generations of Armenians who survived the Genocide. They were reflected not only in official documents, the press, documentary films and in the memoirs of Genocide survivors, but also in literature and art, including painting. Throughout decades many of the painters and sculptors living in Armenia and the Diaspora created hundreds of paintings, graphic works, easel sculptures and monuments covering the massacres and deportation of Armenians through which they expressed their pain and wrath, presented their remonstrances and demands, at the same time preaching great humanitarian ideas.

It is evident that within the framework of one scientific report it is impossible to restore and depict the complete picture of the reflection of the above-mentioned theme in Armenian painting. It is material for a separate voluminous work. Hence we have set ourselves a more modest task to be limited to the works created by Armenian artists in the years of the Hamidian massacres and the Armenian Genocide, from 1894 to 1923, especially since most of them are not only pieces of art having great value but also factual evidence based on the direct memories and impressions of the authors and their interviews with witnesses - Armenian deportees and refugees, as well as accurate press information, following the recent events, and photographs.

In the mid-1890s one of the first Armenian artists, who reacted to the massacres of Armenians, the destruction, burning and desecration of Armenian spiritual and cultural centers in Western Armenia, Constantinople and other cities of the Ottoman Empire with a large the Armenian population, was the famous painter of marine themes, Hovhannes Aivazovski (1817-1900). At the end of his life, in 1895-1897, he created a

---

1 A report delivered at the Annual General Meeting of NAS RA, Division of Armenology and Social Sciences, April 2, 2015.
number of canvasses and graphic works, some of which have been preserved and others which are known through photographs. The artist’s spiritual emotions were expressed in the large canvas, “The Massacre of Armenians in Trabzon in 1895” (1896, location unknown), as well as in the oil paintings completed a year later: “Night: A Tragedy in the Marmara Sea” (Beirut, Armenian school), “Peaceful night: Armenians thrown into the sea” (Moscow, in a private collection), “The Loading of Ships” and “The Turks sink the Armenians in the Marmara Sea”. The sketches of the last two works were published in the same year in Moscow on the initiative of Grigor Janshyan’s (publicist, literary and public figure) in a voluminous collection of works: “Fraternal Support to the Armenians who Suffered in Turkey”2. Armenian artists Vardges Surenyants, Grigor Gabrielyan and Poghos Ter-Asatryants participated in its artistic design and illustration works.

At the same time as Hovhannes Aivazovski, Vardges Surenyants also referred to the Armenian massacres in the Ottoman Empire. The oil paintings of Surenyants on this topic that have reached us are: “The Deserted” (1894), “Violated Sanctuary” (1895), “The Massacre of Virgins” (1899) and “The Dishonored” (1899); and to this series is also included the small tempera painting “Come Unto Me, All Ye That Labour”, completed in 1894. This work, which is in the National Museum of Armenia, as well as the above-mentioned drawings by Hovhannes Aivazovski, were included in the same collection by Grigor Janshyan3.

Together with the forced deportations and mass exterminations of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, the Turks also destroyed the proofs of the spiritual and cultural heritage of the Armenian people in Western Armenia, Cilicia and other places: they destroyed and robbed the churches and monasteries, tore apart and burnt manuscripts (decorated with highly artistic specimens of miniatures), precious samples of decorative and applied art. The mentioned paintings by Vardges Surenyants tell us about all this with sorrow and deep wrath. Besides, the lost painting of the same author “Moaning towards the Sky” (or “The Year of 1896”) is also famous and we have addressed it with a report in the scientific conference dedicated to the 150th anniversary of the artist4.

In 1915 Surenyants came to Ejmiatsin, stayed there for about half a year and saw the miserable state of the refugees from Van who had survived the Genocide and was delighted with their national costumes. The drawings, gouaches and temperas he made in Ejmiatsin were exhibited in Petrograd in autumn, 1916. Hakob Genjyan (Kara-Darvish) provides interesting information on that in the illustrated weekly journal

---

2 Братская помощь пострадавшим в Турции армянам (Литературно-научный сборник), Москва, 1897, с. 74-75, 80-81 (Второй отдел).
3 Ibid, p. III (Первый отдел).
4 Աղասյան Ա., Վարդգես Սուրենյանցի մի անհայտ կտավի մասին, Վարդգես Սուրենյանց-150: Հոբելյանական գիտաժողովի զեկուցումների ժողովածու, Երևան, 2011, էջ 77-83.
“Армянский вестник” (“Armenian Herald”) published in Moscow. In the same and following issues of the journal were republished Surenyants’ pencil drawings “The Refugees Standing in Queue” and “A Group of Armenian Refugees”. Most of the above-mentioned works were bought from the exhibition and presented to the Armenians of Petrograd by Arakel Tsaturyan, a large oil producer from Baku, born in Shushi. Among Surenyants’ graphic works we can distinguish the patriotic poster made in 1915, “Petrograd to the Armenians”.

On the cover of an edition of the “Armenian Herald” was republished painter Karapet Petrosyants' (who lived in Moscow) allegoric picture, “The Armenian Woman's Dream”, where he depicted the crescent symbolizing the Ottoman Empire in the claws of a two-headed eagle pecking at it. The two-headed eagle symbolized free and independent Armenia. The picture depicted also the summits of Mt. Ararat and the old Armenian church and memorial stone seen at a distance.

The fate of his compatriots suffering under the heavy Turkish yoke in Western Armenia deeply moved the founder of Armenian landscape painting, Gevorg Bashinjaghyan. “The Refugees’ Road” (1915), “In Western Armenia” (1915), “Fire in an Armenian Village” (1919) and “The Escape of Armenians from Erzrum” (1920) are his thematic paintings reacting to the Armenian Genocide. Bashinjaghyan's undated oil painting, “Sunset: Ani”, is characterized with inner trepidation, strained with a restless range of colors.

Not only the Genocide's horrors, but also the selfless struggle of Armenians against the Turkish hordes were reflected in the art of Panos Terlemezian, one of the leaders of the defense of Van devoted to the national liberation movement from a young age, persecuted and condemned to death in absentia by the Ottoman authorities. Among his paintings depicting the Hamidian massacres and the Armenian Genocide are “The Refugee” (1901), “The Horrors of the War” (1916 and 1929), “Armenian Refugees Grieve for Their Motherland” (undated) and “Mother Looking for Her Son among the Corpses” (undated). These works that are in the National Museum of Armenia are mainly in red-brown dark colors and leave an oppressive, nightmarish impression. Unfortunately the painter's oil painting, «The Massacre of Armenians» (1916), has not reached us. Both chalk painted portraits of Soghomon Tehlerian (1923) and Commander Andranik (1925) were also among the works of Terlemezian.

The trips made to Armenia in the 1900s had a great significance for the creative orientation of Arshak Fetvatchian born in Trapezunt, during which he got acquainted with the Motherland's nature as well as architectural monuments of Ani and adjacent

6 “Армянский вестник”, Москва, 1916, 20, с. 11, 21, on the cover.
7 Этюды художника Суренянца. - “Армянский вестник”, Москва, 1917, 1, с. 21:
districts. As a result dozens of water paintings and hundreds of pencil paintings were created (“The Church of Holy Redeemer. Ani” (1901), “The Church of Holy Trinity of Tekor” (1906), “The Church of Saint John the Baptist” (1907), etc., that have great historical and cultural value since many of the monuments depicted in them were later ruined and destroyed by the Turks.

Of particular interest also is Fetvatchyan’s water painting “The Armenian Woman from Sasun” (1903), filled with patriotic feelings, romantic and heroic and speaks not only of the patriotic struggle and self-sacrifice of Armenian men but also of Armenian women. With its character content and overall iconography this work by Fetvatchyan reminds an undated painting. “The Heroine from Sasun Rolls Down” by the Italian-Armenian photographer, graphic artist and carver, Simon Nahapetian published in Venice. The same year it was reprinted in one of the issues of the illustrated Armenian newspaper “Geghuni” (“Գեղունի”/“Beautiful”. The scene depicted refers to the Armenian massacres that started in Turkey in 1894. Arshak Fetvatchian was the author of the cover picture of the literary collection «Dziteni» (“Ձիթենի”/“Olive”), published in Tiflis (Tbilisi) in 1915, where he depicted a woman crying for the death of an Armenian soldier fallen in the battlefield; and he designed the cover of the book, “Armenian volunteers: 1914-1916” (published in Tiflis a year later) with the collective image of the Armenian people who were persecuted and deprived of the Motherland, but undaunted and fighting.

During the same years were created the paintings by Yeghishe Tadevossian “To the Pilgrimage” (1985) and “Moonlit Night: on the Shores of Beirut” (1915) where in the first case the artist depicted the broken-hearted images of the refugee Armenians, a father and son, bidding farewell to the graves of their relatives in an Armenian cemetery, and in the other case he addressed the history of the Musaler battle impressed by the refugees that found salvation on board of a French steamship, but were obliged to leave their Motherland in the dark night.

In his works created after 1915 (“Splash”, “Troubled Cost”, “The Black Sea” (1921), etc.) the painter of marine themes, Vardan Makhokhian, who lived and worked in Germany and France, reflected the grievous state of mind of the painter that had lost his relatives and was constantly thinking over the tragic fate of the Armenian people. Similar emotions fill the piece, “Armenia’s Mourning”, composed by Makhokhian for the violin and piano, which first, was first performed in Monte Carlo on January 13, 1919 and then in Monaco and Nice.

The topic of the Genocide found its unique expression in the works of painters Hmayak Artsatpanyan and Avag Hovhannisyan who lived in New Nakhijevan and Rostov-on-Don.

---

9 See the republication “Geghuni”, Venice, 1903, 1-10, p. 9. From the same edition of the Armenian newspaper (p. 5) we find that the original of the above-mentioned water painting by Simon Nahapetyan was presented to the editorial office of “Geghuni” by a Tabriz resident, M. Khan Yeremyan. Unfortunately the further fate of the work is unknown.

Several years ago one of the first works (the multi-figure large canvas “From Century to Century”, completed in 1915) by Avag Hovhannisyan referring to the Armenian Genocide was found in the Armenian Museum of Rostov-on-Don. In the painting he expressed his protest against the genocidal crimes committed by Turks. The painting had been taken out of the frame, rolled and neglected for a time, thus it was damaged. Later it has been restored by the specialists of the National Museum of Armenia and will soon be presented in the exhibition dedicated to the Centennial of the Armenian Genocide. Then it will be returned to Rostov-on-Don where it will exhibited in the Museum of Armenian-Russian friendship. The thrilling oil painting, “The Mother” (or “Horror”), belonging to the Museum of Art of Rostov-on-Don is also one of Avag Hovhannisyan’s works.

Sargis Khachaturyan is the author of numerous works depicting the Armenians who had found refuge in Ejmiatsin. For the painter who had lost his mother and brother in the days of the Genocide the year of 1915 was crucial. The artist who had come to Constantinople from Munich and hoped for the opportunity of teaching painting in the Sanasaryan college in Karin, could hardly escape the danger of being recruited and becoming the victim of World War I and the Armenian Genocide. He went to Tiflis and created the series of paintings dedicated to the Armenian refugees (1915-1921). The paintings were presented in his personal exhibition opened in 1915, then in the exhibitions of the newly-created Union of Armenian Artists in Tiflis, Yerevan and Constantinople through 1917-1921. He depicted the grave state of the refugees, their life full of hardships in the paintings, “The Despaired”, “Suffering”, “Thirst”, “The Battle of Life”, “Orphans”, “The Fugitive Spouses” (1915), “Refugees” (1915), “The Refugee Woman with Children” (1916), “The Armenian Orphans in the Desert” (1920), “The Orphaned Children” (1921) and others. One of the most thrilling works of Khachaturyan, the canvas “Deir ez-Zor” was created in the same years. There he depicted a naked Armenian woman dancing forcibly under the threat of the Turkish yataghan at the background of the sanguineous sky. Unfortunately the fate of the canvas “Deir ez-Zor” is unknown. After seeing those works the painter was described as “the singer of the Armenian grief”, and Hovhannes Tumanyan exclaimed: “Sargis jan, what you gave with your brush, we cannot give with our pen. Your works are the best means of telling the foreigners about the horrible history of our suffering”\(^\text{10}\).

\(^{10}\) See Սփյուռքահայ արվեստի հարցեր (Արտասահմանյան մամուլի էջերից), Հայագիտությունը արտասահմանօտ, Գիտա-ինֆորմացիոն բյուլետեն, Երևան, 1977, 1(22), էջ 4.
Harutyun Shamshinyan, Sargis Yerkanyan, Levon Kyurkchyan, Aram Bakalyan, Hrant Atyanak and others also created paintings on the topic of the Hamidian massacres and the Armenian Genocide.

The following graphic works created during the same period are noteworthy: the water painting series, “The Deportation of Armenians” by Yervand Demirchyan, the etching, “Armenian Orphans” by Edgar Shahin (1910), the gouaches by Melkon Qepaptchian, particularly the symbolic and small-sized abstract pictures, “The Refugees” (1915), “The Road of the Blood of the Armenian” (1915), “The Mourning of the Armenian Mothers” (undated) and “The Record of Unburied Armenian Martyrs” (undated). The drawings made in Yerevan in 1918 were included in the creative heritage of Vano Khojabekyan, a painter of scenes of everyday life of Old Tiflis, namely “The Refugees in the Station”, “The Refugees in the Queue for Dinner”, “The Orphans in a Yerevan School Yard”, etc. Through 1915-1917 were created Michael Khununts’s graphic sheets of paper condemning the Turkish authorities and depicting the refugees from Van.

On the pages of Armenian satirical journals and newspapers [“Annamus”/«Աննամուս», “Aptak” («Ապտակ»), “Avel” («Ավել»), “Zurna” («Զուռնա»), “Khatabala” («Խաթաբալա»), “Motsak” («Մոծակ»), “Sa-da-na” («Սա-դա-նա»), “Saprich” («Սափրիչ»), etc.] published during those years in Tiflis, Baku, Saint Petersburg, Athens, London, Cairo and elsewhere we see pictures condemning the violations that were taking place in Western Armenia and other places of the Ottoman Empire populated with Armenians. Their authors were Petros Marimyan, a member of the Hnchak party, born in Trabzon who perished there in spring, 1915; Dancho (Eghiazar Gabuzyan) a participant of the defense of Van, writer Vahram Alazan’s elder brother who found refuge in Yerevan in 1915; painters Alexandr Mirzoyan, Stepan Akayan, Vrtanes Akhikyan, David Okroyants, Garegin Yeritsyan, Vahram Manavyan, Grigor Mkhitaryan, architect Philip Arpiaryan, et al. Among foreign painters living and working in Tiflis who often referred to the inconsolable condition of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire were permanent employees of the illustrated satirical weekly newspaper, “Khatabala” - Genrikh Grinevski, Iosif Rotter and Oscar Shmerling. And since we touched upon the works of the few foreign artists referring to this topic published in the Armenian press during that period, we cannot but mention the color painting “The massacre of Armenians in Turkey” by D. I. Arkhipov, a self-educated

11 Iosif Rotter, born in Germany and a graduate of the Academy of fine arts of Munich, was also one of the painters of the children’s journal “Hasker” («Հասկեր») edited by Stepan Lisitsyan. I. Rotter’s and O. Shmerling’s caricatures that were included in the weekly journal “Khatabala” and in the Armenian press of the Caucasus in general, are particularly mentioned in one of the articles of the French-Armenian historian Claire (Seda) Muradian (see Mouradian Claire; Caricature in the Armenian Press of the Caucasus, Armenian Review, Winter 1991, Cambridge, vol. 44, 4/176, pp. 14-22).
painter from Baku, a Russian soldier of the Caucasian army. This work, unnoticed by Armenian specialists, is unique in its kind and its black-and-white republication was presented to the readers in one of the editions of the Moscow weekly journal, “Армянский вестник” in 1917\(^{12}\). This valuable documentary painting is a testimony of a foreigner, an impartial man who saw the atrocities of the Turks towards the Armenians with his own eyes.

In the Armenian sculpture of the same period the Hamidian massacres and the Genocide were hardly referred to. Exceptions are Hakob Gyurjyan’s bas-relief, “The Refugee Armenian Woman with Her Child” (1910) and a group of small-sized sculptures “The Escaping Armenian Woman with Her Children” (or “Escape”, 1912). One of Gyurjyan’s good works is Commander Andranik’s bust (1916), which has not been preserved.

Among Armenian masters of the Diaspora surviving the Genocide who referred to the topic were talented painters and sculptors Onik Avetisyan, Armis, Jirayr Oragyan, Byuzand Topalyan, Arshile Gorky, Ashot Zoryan, Levon Tutunjyan, Carzou, Zareh Mutafyan, Khoren Ter-Haroutyan, artists of the next generation Jansem, Richard Jeranyan, Kajaz, Paul Kirakosyan, Shart et al.

As to the painting of Soviet Armenia, in the conditions of Stalin’s censorship, ideological and strict political control, the topic of the Armenian Genocide was condemned to silence. Unique exceptions are Edvard Isabekyan’s oil paintings, “In Western Armenia” (1940) and “Abduction” (1941). Only after Khrushchev’s “thaw”, especially in the spring of 1965, after the crowded demonstrations in Yerevan during the days of the 50th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, the topic of the Genocide was finally allowed and gradually spread in Soviet Armenian painting.

One of the first steps towards this was the famous painting by Sargis Muradyan “Komitas: the last night” (1956). During the same years and later the gravest tragedy of the Armenians was referred to by Simon Galstyan, Hrachya Rukhkyan, Hovhannes Zardaryan, Suren Pipoyan, Mkrtich Sedrakyan, Hakob Hakobyan, Suren Safaryan, Valentin Podpomogov, Grigor Khanjian, Minas Avetisyan, Ruben Avdalyan, Edward Artsrunyan, Zulum Grigoryan, Gayane Khachatryan in painting; Van Khachatur, Ara Harutyunyan, Artashes Hovsepian, Arto Chakmakchyan, Levon Tokmajyan, Benik Petrosyan, David Yerevantsi, Hovhannes Muradyan, Ara Shiraz, Yuri Petrosyan, Getik Baghdasaryan in sculpture and others. The topics and persons connected with the Armenian massacres and the genocide do not cease to agitate young artists of the period of independence and we are sure they will interest and inspire the painters and sculptors of the coming generations as well, since they have forever been imprinted on the historical memory and the collective consciousness of the Armenian people.

*Translated from Armenian by S.E. Chraghyan*

\(^{12}\) See Армянский вестник, Москва, 1917, 21, с. 8.
Hovhannes Aivazovski, The Massacre of Armenians in Trapezunt in 1895, canvas, oil painting, 1897, place unknown

Hovhannes Aivazovski, Night. A tragedy in the Marmara Sea, canvas, oil painting, 1897, Beirut, Armenian school
Hovhannes Aivazovski, Peaceful Night. Armenians Thrown into the Sea, canvas, oil painting, 1897, Moscow, in a private collection

Hovhannes Aivazovski, The Loading of Ships, paper, pen, 1897, place unknown
Hovhannes Alivazovski, The Turks Sink the Armenians in the Marmara Sea, paper, pen, 1897, place unknown

Vardges Surenyants, Violated Sanctuary, canvas, oil painting, 1895, NGA

Vardges Surenyants, After the Massacre (The Massacre of Virgins), canvas, oil painting, 1899, NMA
Vardges Surenyants, **The Dishonored Sanctity**, canvas, oil painting, 1899, NGA

Vardges Surenyants, **COME UNTO ME, ALL YE THAT LABOUR**, paper, cardboard, tempera, 1894, NGA
Vardges Surenyants, A Group of Armenian Refugees, paper, pen, 1916

Gevorg Bashinjaghyan, Fire in an Armenian Village, canvas, oil painting, 1919, NGA
Gevorg Bashinjaghyan, Sunset. Ani, canvas, oil painting, undated, NGA

Panos Terlemezian, The Horrors of War, canvas, oil painting, 1929, NGA
Panos Terlemezian, Armenian Refugees Grieve for Their Motherland, undated, NGA

Panos Terlemezian, A Mother Looking for Her Son Among the Corpses, undated, NGA
Arshak Fetvatchian, The Church of Holy Redeemer. Ani, paper, water painting, 1901, NGA

Arshak Fetvatchian, The Church of Holy Trinity, Tekor, paper, water painting, 1906, NGA
Arshak Fetvatchian, The Armenian Woman from Sasun, paper, water painting, 1903, NGA

Simon Nahapet (Nahapetian), The Heroine from Sasun Rolls Down, paper, water painting, undated
Arshak Fetvatchian, cover picture of the literary collection «Dziteni», 1915

Yeghishe Tadevossian, To the Pilgrimage, canvas, oil painting, 1895, NGA

Yeghishe Tadevossian, Moonlit Night on the Shores of Beirut, canvas, oil painting, 1915, NGA
Hmayak Artsatpanyan, The Burning of the Armenian Village, canvas, oil painting, 1915, NGA

Hmayak Artsatpanyan, Massacre, paper, water painting, 1918, NGA
Hmayak Artsatpanyan, The Brutalities of Turks, canvas, oil painting, 1919, NGA

Akim Avanesov (Avag Hovhannisyan), The Mother ("Horror"), canvas, oil painting, 1917.
The Museum of Art of Rostov-on-Don
Sargis Khachatryan, Orphans, paper, gouache, undated, NGA

Sargis Khachatryan, The Fugitive Spouses, paper, water painting, 1915, NGA

Sargis Khachatryan, Refugees, canvas, oil painting, 1915, NGA
Sargis Khachatryan, *The Fugitive Woman with Children*, paper, water painting, 1916, NGA

Sargis Khachatryan, *The Orphaned Children*, canvas, oil painting, 1921, NGA

Sargis Khachatryan, *The Armenian Orphans in the Desert*, canvas, oil painting, 1920, NGA
Yervand Demirtchyan, The Deportation of Armenians, paper, water painting

Yervand Demirtchyan, The Deportation of Armenians, paper, water painting

Edgar Shahin, Armenian Orphans, etching, gouache, 1910, place unknown
Melkon Qepaächtian, The Mourning of the Armenian Mothers, paper, gouache, 1915, NGA

Melkon Qepaächtian, The Road of Blood of the Armenian, paper, gouache, 1915, NGA
Melkon Qepaptchian, The Record of Unburied Armenian Martyrs, paper, gouache, NGA

Vano Khojabekyan, The Orphans in a Yerevan School Yard, paper, pencil, 1918, NGA
Khatabala - 1
Arkhipov D. I. The Massacre of Armenians in Turkey, 1915-1917
Hakob Gyurjyan, The Fugitive Armenian Woman with Her Child, bas-relief, gypsum, 1910, NGA
Hakob Gyurjyan, The Escaping Armenian Woman with Her Children (Escape), gypsum, 1912, NGA
Edward Isabekyan, In Western Armenia, canvas, oil painting, 1940, property of the painter's family

Edward Isabekyan, Kidnapping, cardboard, oil painting, 1941, property of the painter's family
Sargis Muradyan, Komitas: the Last Night, canvas, oil painting, 1956, HGA
ON POSSIBLE ARMENIAN NATURE OF INTRODUCTORY FORMULAS IN URARTIAN INSCRIPTIONS*

The following types of stereotyped formulas are given usually at the beginning of Urartian inscriptions and their separate parts:

1. D'Haldini kuruni D'Haldini GIŠšurii(i) kuruni(e)…
2. D'Haldinini ušmašini/alsuišini/baušini (someone) alie…
3. D'Haldini uštabi masinie GIŠšure…

These formulas are usually translated by Urartologists as follows:

1. God Haldi is mighty; God Haldi’s weapon (sword) is mightier
2. By the power/the sublimity/the order of God Haldi (someone) says
3. God Haldi took the field with his weapon (sword)\(^1\)

As a result of long-term study of Urartian inscriptions we have come to the conclusion that the vocabulary and the structure of the mentioned formulas have Armenian nature and they may in fact be regarded as the first written texts in the Armenian language.

The cuneiform expression of Armenian words and word forms certainly had its peculiarities. Particularly, frequent expression of the weakened final vowels by “\(i\)” or “\(e\)”, and the diphthong “\(ia\)” - by “\(i\)”, etc. is presumable\(^2\).

The words \(kuruni\) and “\(šuri\)” of the first formula are the initial forms of later \(Դինունու\) [gen. - \(Դինուն), pl. nom. - \(Դինուներ\)] and \(ունու\) [gen. \(ունուն\)] probably because of a situation when the stress was on penultimate syllable and there already was some weakening of

---

\(*\) Ջահուկյան Գ., Ուրարտական արձանագրությունների ներածական բանաձևերի հնարավոր հայկական բնույթի մասին, Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես, 2000, 1, էջ 124-129:

\(^1\) Cf. Меликишвили Г. А., Урартские клинообразные надписи, Москва, 1969, с. 94-95.

\(^2\) Cf. Хачикян М. Л., Хурритский и урартский языки, Ереван, 1985, с. 30.
the unstressed vowels of the last syllable. This circumstance has repeatedly been mentioned in the comparative studies of the Armenian language\(^3\). Thus, the reconstructed form of the word կոռն should have been  *

cոռուն [cf. pl. nom. կռունք, where ու has been preserved due to the stress], and that of the word սուռ - սու՛րո [cf. Georgian ღინი “ღია” (wine) which has quite probably been borrowed from Armenian before the drop of the nominative ending -ո (-o)]. These two forms in the above-mentioned formula are expressed with the writings kuruni and “șuri”.

Taking into consideration that the Armenian preposition ի would not be written separately in cuneiform texts, the first formula mentioned above would look (D and GIŠ determinatives are omitted) in Old Armenian as follows:

Խալդին (կամ խալդեան) կոռն

It should be noted that both կոռն and սուռ are native Armenian words with quite reliable Indo-European (further IE) parallels\(^4\). Different usages of those two words in the Urartian cuneiform inscriptions coincide with different semantic manifestations of the Armenian words quite well.

The interchangeable word forms ւսմաշին, ալսիշին and բաւին of the second formula version are interpreted as the instrumental case forms of the words ւսմաշ - “might”, ալսիշ(-е) - “greatness” and “բաւ” - “word, order” in the Urartological works. Meanwhile, in fact, they can be regarded as the ablative forms of the Old Armenian -ն(-n) declension nouns, especially if we assume that the preposition ի (i) at that time had not yet become an inseparable part of the ablative case. Those words are rarely used without -n and we can say that there are forms similar to the ablative case of words like անձն- (յ)անձէ for which preforms like *(յ)անձէ can be reconstructed (without a preposition in that period). Thus, the forms “վեմաշին”, “ալսիշին” and “բաւին” can be the canonical cuneiform reflections of ablative preforms. If we take into account that a lot of bases with -ն in Old Armenian originate from bases not with -ն, and that bases not ending with -ն are also declined with the ո -declension, it can be inferred that the process of formation of future bases with -ն is expressed in the discussed formulas.

As far as it concerns the mentioned bases, it is possible to assert their IE origin, i.e. the probability of their being native Armenian.

The apparent common origin of Urartian բաւ and Arm. words պաւ, պաւբ, պաւ has been denoted in the works devoted to Urartian-IE parallels (as well as in our works).

---

\(^3\) See Meillet A., Esquisse d’une grammaire compare de l’arménien classique, Vienne, 1936, p. 19. According to our work «Հին հայերենի հոլովման սիստեմը և նրա ծագումը» (Երևան, 1959) (“The Declension System of Old Armenian and Its Origin”, Yerevan, 1959) this phenomenon had a special morphological conditionality: mainly the bases were stressed, and the endings were unstressed.

\(^4\) Pokorny J., Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. I. Bern und München, 1959, S. 397-398, 542; Ջահուկյան Գ., Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն, Երևան, 1987, էջ 126, 131:
The Armenian words originate from the IE root *bha- “speak” and for the forms bauše/baušini the preform բաւսն բան` խոսք, հրաման (word, order) can also be suggested. After making this reconstruction we noticed that the root զբաւս, զբօս coincides with it and the forms զբաւսնուլ, զբաւսանիլ speak in favor of the initial -n (z) base. The initial meaning of this root should be considered “word, conversation”, from which originated the meaning “talk, converse, pass time speaking”, which can be found in some early usages of the word զբաւսանք. Here is what is said in Pilon’s work «Լինելութիւն խնդոց և լուծմանց» (Questions and solutions on Genesis): «Զերկայն խաւսս և զճառսն սովորեցան կոչել զբաւսանս»⁵: It is very probable that the meanings “pastime doing something”, “ponder over something”, “be engaged in something”, “to have a good time” originated as a result of expansion of this meaning.

 qpwu apparently consists of the preposition-prefix q (z) And the word pu probably originated from the root *bha- (speak) compounded with an IE augment *-u plus suffix *-ek/k. The alteration *uk>us in *bha-uk is the peculiarity of the Armenian language and is found also in the verb ռու-ուհու (from the IE. root *euk/uk). If pu means “word, conversation”, qpwu with the intensifying preposition-prefix q (z) should have meant “a lot of conversation, a lot of words”, which completely corresponds to the old interpretations of the meaning of qpwu.

In regard to the Armenian nature, the word ušmaše (-šini) “might, strength, power” is very typical. It is known that in its written period the Armenian language expressed those ideas with borrowed Iranian bases ոյժ, զաւրութիւն, հզաւրութիւն. It is natural to assume that in the Urartian period the Armenian language probably had adequate native Armenian words. One of them could be the word originating from the IE root *aug-lug- “grow, raise, cultivate” which lies at the basis of the borrowed word ոյժ and which is expressed in the Urartian inscriptions in the form of ušmaše (-šini). To IE preforms *ug-mo- or *ug-mn- the Armenian language had to have a form like *usmas/-in formed on the basis of *uc-mo-/*us-mo- or *uc-man-/*us-man-, which as we can see is rather closely expressed in Urartian inscriptions. Cf. Old Ind. ojman “strength”, Lat. augmen(tum), Lith. augumas “growth, growing”⁶.

It is absolutely possible that the word alsu(i)še (-šini) is native Armenian as well. It could have originated from the IE root *al- “grow, breed, feed” and the affix *sko-, or perhaps, from the form *altio- > Arm., alco- (with Urart. writing alsu-) that came up as a result of palatalization of that root’ augmentive -t-, cf. Lat. altus “high”. Thus it is more likely that the word alsu(i)še (-šini) had the meaning of “height” than “greatness”.

⁵Փիլոնի Եբրայեցոց, Մնացորդք ի Հայս, հ. Բ, Վենետիկ, 1826:
⁶Iran. էն>Arm. ոյժ word originates from the above-mentioned form devoid of affixes.
In the third formula the word šuri (անվու) can be found in the form šure, which Urartologists interpret as a dative case form. However, in the given text line that interpretation does not justify itself. It would be more correct to regard -e- as a similar denotation of the weakened vowel, as -i-. Uštabi - one of the words of the formula, probably denoted the initial Armenian past perfect form with աւ. In our Urartological works ušta has been compared with IE root *sta- “stand, erect, put”. But in Armenian that root was preserved only in the affixed form and with a specific semantic transition *sta-na-mi > անալունու and this form manifests itself in the past perfect only with գ-base (with the element -գ-) անացի, as all the verbs in աւ conjugation. If uštabi presents a reflection of any verb of an Armenian origin, it could be the denotation of the past perfect form (անացի) of the verb անացում, meaning “jump, jump up, jump out, leave”. In a separate context this word has particularly the following meaning: “come out, go out, quickly leave, leave” and in the New Haykazyan Dictionary it is also explained as “go far away”.

G. Melikishvili regards the third formula’s masinie as a form of the pronoun masi (“his/her, his/her own”) with ni(e) -. But other Urartologists give totally different interpretations.

J. Friedrich sees no basis to regard masini(e) as a pronoun and considers the likeness of masi and masini a coincidence. M. Tsereteli regards it as a noun and translates it as “mighty”. I. I. Meshchaninov thinks that the meaning of the word continues to remain obscure, especially because it is also found in the form masinili in an untranslatable text.

We are inclined to translate masini as “mighty” and connect it with the IE form *magh-ti- “might” (from the stem *magh- “can, be able, be capable, help”) through Armenian. For the IE *magh-ti-no->macıno- (in Urart. form masini) transition cf. *poktu-ti->hug, though a preform of the type of *magh-tio- was also possible. The Urartian form masini etymologically is totally equivalent to the Russian form мощныі. The Armenian word մարթանք (*magh-thro- + անք) - “հնարք” (“medium”) is considered to be formed of the same root with the affix *-thro-.

On the basis of the analysis of the introductory formulas of the inscriptions called Urartian, we can arrive at the following essential conclusions:

1. The Armenian nature of those formulas is rather convincingly proved: their vocabulary is mainly Armenian; the grammatical peculiarities can be explained by the grammatical characteristics of the pre-grabar period.

7 cf. «Ոստեար ի բաց ի գրկացն հայերեաց», «Ի կռոցն ի բաց ոստուցեալք` դարձան և պաշտէին զԱստուած», «Ո՞ կարէ լսել դմա... կամեցան ի բաց ոստնուլ», «Յորժամ ի տեսիլ այսց իրաց աստուածայնոց ածղ, ի բաց ոստնուս» (Նոր Բառգիրք Հայկազեան Լեզուի, հ. Բ, Վենետիկ, 1837, էջ 523):

8 Мещанинов И.И., Аннотированный словарь урартского (биайнского) языка, Ленинград, 1978, с. 204.
2. These formulas give an opportunity to make lexical reconstructions\(^9\) of the Armenian of the period preceding the grabar (Classical Armenian) in order to ascertain the proper Armenian equivalents of the future borrowings (especially of Iranian origin) on the basis of comparison of the IE preforms and forms in the inscriptions called Urartian.

3. The vulnerable point of our interpretation is that the linguistic proper relation of those formulas and the texts called “Urartian” remains open. It is known that the words in the formulas mentioned by us are found also in other inscriptions, thus the verification of relevant contexts (text lines) and comprehensive comparison of their language and the language of the analyzed word forms are strictly necessary. It is true that the meanings of some words denoted by us are in some cases better interpreted (cf. kuruni), but their further detailed study still remains an important problem for Urartologists and Armenologists.

4. With combined efforts of Urartologists a certain standard has been marked out of the versions of the cuneiform characters’ reading and it has been used for the available texts. Further examination of those versions, comparison and more precise definition of the reconstructed standard, as well as the skilled analysis of the extralinguistic trend of the cuneiform texts connected with it, along with great contribution, can actually have a revolutionary significance.

*Translated from Armenian by S.E. Chraghyan*

---

\(^9\) So far we refrain from some daring restorations and comparisons. For example, it can be assumed that the theonym Ḫaldi is a similar formation with ṅḫ- base of the word ṅḫg-, as the theonym Aršibedini (Aršibi) the further ṣmšnḫ (eagle) and di, as it is interpreted in our article «Հայկական շերտը ուրարտական դիցարանում” “The Armenian Layer of Urartu pantheon”). In this case the component Ḫḫl- could be identified with Arm. Ḫwŋ (“անգամ” “time”) which originally was a consonant base word. And it could be the native Armenian denotation of that idea [cf. Eng. time (ժամանակ) and times (անգամ)] before borrowing the Iranian word Ḫuŋwŋ (time). In other words, according to this interpretation the proper Armenian form of Ḫaldi- had to mean “the God of time”.

General Information. The first inscriptions of the Ararat (Urartu) Kingdom were written in Assyrian; later, following Išpuuine I, mostly only in Biainian (Urartian). Unfortunately, there are very few bilingual inscriptions. In fact, to date, only two of them\(^1\), which are in a damaged condition and one other, so-called quasi-bilingual inscription, partly in Assyrian and partly in Biainian, are known to us. Texts written in Biainian have reached us through the Biainian (Vannic) cuneiform inscriptions (hereafter: Biainian inscriptions)\(^2\), which date to the second half of the 9th-7th centuries BC.

There are around 800 Biainian inscriptions known to us, of which a significant part, written on various objects, are mostly recurring one line texts with few words. The repetitions are also considerable in number. For that reason the attested lexicon in the Biainian inscriptions is limited to 650 word (550 word roots). Other than words of general usage, a considerable part of the Biainian vocabulary contains chiefly military, constructional and sacral-ritual words. At present, the meanings of only 230-250 are more or less clear to us. The meanings of nearly 100 words have been determined through the bilingual inscriptions and/or logograms present in the parallel texts. The meanings of the other words are presumed from the context and are known only by their broad, general meanings.

History of Research. The Father of Armenian historiography Movses Khorenatsi (the 5th century) was the first to mention the cuneiform inscriptions of the Van Kingdom\(^3\). In 1827 F.Schulz, commissioned by the French archaeological mission to Van, made copies of almost forty inscriptions\(^4\), launching the scientific investigation of the Van inscriptions. In the early stages, the scholars expressed contradictory opinions about their language. Thus, for example, A.Mordtmann\(^5\) considered their language to be Armenian, while L. De Rober considered their language Semitic\(^6\). At the end of the 19th century the famous Assyriologists S.Guyard and A.Sayce ascertained that the Van

\(^{1}\) These are Kelishin [KUKN 30/CTU A 3-11] and Topzawa [KUKH 387/CTU A 10-5] inscriptions with parallel Assyrian and Biainan texts. Also – duplicates of the Topzawa inscription recently discovered in Movana [CTU A 10-3] and Mergeh Karvan [CTU A 10-4].

\(^{2}\) Hieroglyphs were also used in the Van kingdom (Ararat-Urartu). See Ա.Մովսիսյան, Վանի թագավորության (Բիայնիլի, Ուրարտու, Արարատ) մեհենագրությունը, Երևան, 1998.

\(^{3}\) Մովսէս Խորենացի, Պատմութիւն Հայոց, Երևան, 1991, էջ 54:


inscriptions were written using Assyrian cuneiform script. The latter by that time was sufficiently comprehensible. It became clear, that the language of a number of those inscriptions was Assyrian, and another significant portion was written in an unknown language which was subsequently called “Vannic” and later “Biainian/Urartian”. Based on the combination method of decipherment, S.Guyard set values for separate units of the unknown language and made approximate translation of some phrases. A. Sayce, continuing Guyard’s work, translated and published the Van inscriptions known at that time. The Assyrian-Biainian bilingual inscriptions discovered subsequently made the checking and modification of these translations possible. In 1900 J.Sandalgyan attempted to tackle the inscriptions utilizing the Armenian language as a base. He published the most comprehensive collection of Van inscriptions of the time - with French and Armenian translations. But A. Sayce and H. Acharyan denied his approach, and the opinion that Biainian is a separate language with no connection to Armenian became established in historiography and philology. At the same time, the opinion that Biainian is cognate to Hurrian, forming a so-called Hurrian-Urartian language family, became widely accepted.

In addition to A. Mordtmann and J. Sandalgyan, during different periods, many other scholars have studied the linguistic similarities between Armenian and Biainian. Let us just mention G. Ghapantsyan, H. Acharyan, G. Jahukyan, N. Harouthioyouny, M. Israelyan, I. Diakonoff, R. Ishkhanyan, V. Sarkisyan, H. Karagyozyan, M. Khachikyan and others who, on different occasions have returned in their works to the Armenian-Urartian (Biainian) connections. While pointing to many similarities between these two languages they basically remained within the bounds of the above mentioned conviction which regards Biainian (Urartian) as a separate language. Interpreting the existing similarities as merely loanwords, they set the emphasis on the probable impact of Biainian (Urartian) on the Armenian language. G. Ghapantsyan held a different position on this question. He argued that Armenian is a hybrid language with a Biainian (Urartian) substratum. He

7 Guyard S., Les inscriptions de Van, JA, XV, 1880, pp. 540-543, and later in 1883-1884; Guyard S., Melanges d’Assyriologie, X, 1883.
9 For more detail about this see Пиотровский Б., Ванское царство, 1959, с. 7-22 (English translation by Hogarth J., The Ancient Civilisation of Urartu, London, 1969); Շահումյան Վ., Ի Բ.Առաքելյան, Գ.Ջահուկյան. Գ.Սարգսյան, Ուրարտու-Հայաստան, 1988, էջ 127-131. About discovering and decipherment of the Van inscriptions see also, Հայկ երկրաշարժի ազգական ազգակիցներ, Երևան, 1940, էջ 5-10 and so on.
10 Sandalgian J., Les inscriptions conëiferes urartiques, Venise, 1900.
11 See Սիսիան Բ., Պատմություն Բաբիլոնին, I, Երևան, 1940, էջ 172-190.
made this argument coming from the point of view of the existence of the so-called “Asianic” language family. R.Ishkhanyan tried to separate the language spoken by the inhabitants of Van Kingdom from that of the Van inscriptions. He called the latter “Neo-Hurrian” considering it already a dead language by the time of the Van Kingdom.

V.Sarkisyan proceeds from the point of view that the ancestors of the Basques, migrating from the Armenian Highland and/or adjacent areas, took the local language material with them which, in many cases, the Basque language has preserved without distortions, especially in proper names. Pointing out that, particularly in its grammar, Armenian is a rapidly developing language, for the reconstruction of the Armenian of the pre-written period he proposes the usage of the internal reconstruction method, collated it with data of Basque and Biainian (Urartian) languages. He considers these to be cognates, making the Biainian(Urartian)-Armenian-Basque trilingual comparison. Returning to the investigation of Armenian-Urartian connections, G.Jahukyan examined the introductory formulae of the Biainian (Urartian) inscriptions and expressed an opinion about the probability that the Armenian language was the base of Biainian (Urartian) (at least in introductory formulas).

Problems of the Comparison and Possible Solutions. Four main groups of difficulties are distinctly observed in comparative studies of the language of the Van cuneiform inscriptions and Armenian:

a) The Biainian script is incomplete. It as its Assyrian prototype distinguishes only a limited number of phonemes - 24, of which 4 are vowels (a,i,e,u), 18 consonants and 2 semivowels. But for many signs, particularly in the case of consonants, the phonemic value they take is not obvious. That is why the accepted pronunciation of the Biainian words is strictly conditional. In fact, the availability of written texts is still insufficient for analysis of the phonemic systems of cuneiform languages. Therefore, parallel with the data of inscriptions, particular importance is attributed to the comparison of the given language with other cognate languages, either living, or with well known phonetic systems. The Hurrian language which, according to the accepted viewpoint is considered a Biainian (Urartian) cognate, is not useful in this case for various reasons. First, its connection to Biainian as a cognate language is not apparent, and second, the Hurrian phonemic system is equally not clearly elucidated, and besides, existing evidence shows that these two phonemic systems vary considerably. Under these circumstances the phonological comparison of Biainian and Classical Armenian - “grabar”

---

14 See Իշխանյան Ռ., Հայ ժողովրդի ծագման ու հնագույն պատմության հարցեր, Երևան, 1994:
15 Սարգսյան Վ., Ուրարտական քաղաքակրթությունը և բասկերի նախահայրենիքի հարցը, Երևան, 1988:
16 Ջահուկյան Գ., Ուրարտական արձանագրությունների ներածական բանաձևերի հնարավոր հայկական բնույթի մասին, ՊԲՀ, 2001, 1, էջ 124-129:
17 It is not clear how does Biainian distinguish the Assyrian ś voiceless fricative.
(hereafter: CArm.) parallel (common) words/roots and morphemes becomes crucial. The phonological examination of place names attested in different languages is no less important. The correspondence of the Biainian and CArm. phonemes received from the comparison of the Biainian words (common nouns, place names) and some morphemes which have the most reliable parallel forms in CArm. are represented in the Table below. As the Table demonstrates, the same Biainian signs often represent two or more CArm. phonemes. This phenomenon can be explained by the lack of specific signs in the cuneiform script for a considerable number of CArm. phonemes (36-37). Contrary to it each CArm. phoneme is rendered only by one or two (for semivowels - by three) Biainian signs. That is, reflection of the Armenian phonems by Biainian signs is regular.18

The Armenian alphabet (phonemes) in parallel with the reflecting Biainian (Urartian) signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CArm. Alphabet character</th>
<th>phonem</th>
<th>CArm. Alphabet character</th>
<th>phonem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ա-ա</td>
<td>a, e</td>
<td>U-ի</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Բ-բ</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Յ-յ</td>
<td>i/y, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Գ-գ</td>
<td>g, q</td>
<td>Մ-մ</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Դ-դ</td>
<td>d, t</td>
<td>Օ-օ</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ե-ե</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Ե-է</td>
<td>z, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Զ-զ</td>
<td>z, s</td>
<td>Ո-ո</td>
<td>p, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Չ-չ</td>
<td>č, š</td>
<td>Չ-չ</td>
<td>z, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ը-ը</td>
<td>š, g</td>
<td>Ռ-ռ</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Թ-թ</td>
<td>t, d</td>
<td>Ս-ս</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Լ-լ</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>Տ-տ</td>
<td>t/d, t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Խ-խ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ց-ց</td>
<td>z, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ծ-ծ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ՈՒ-ու</td>
<td>u/w, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Կ-կ</td>
<td>k q, k</td>
<td>Փ-փ</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Հ-հ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>Ք-ք</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ձ-ձ</td>
<td>j z, s</td>
<td>ՈՒ-ու</td>
<td>w/u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 In more detail see Ayvazyan S., Urartian-Armenian: Lexicon and Comparative-Historical Grammar (hereafter: UrAr), 2011, pp. 23-32.
a) - digraph

b) - conventionally

b) The Biainian script as its Assyrian prototype is characterized by polymorphism and polyvalence, that is to say, each cuneiform sign may correspond to several syllabic values (for example, the sign ši/e also has the values of ū/e, gu - qű, ār - ub, ku - šū, ṭuš, etc.) and vice-versa (tū/tu, ar/ār, šū/šū/šū, ṭe/ṭe, te/te9, u/ū, etc.). Most of the cuneiform signs can be read as logograms (Sumerograms, Akkadograms) and/or determinatives as well. The Biainian inscriptions also have some rare intrinsic features which do not occur in the Akkadian script. For example, the sign TUR “small” also has the phonemic value pu₄, SIG₇ “green” - q/kana₇, dIŠTAR “The Goddess Ishtar” (= Biain. “Goddess Sarde”) - sar₅ which do not occur in any of the other languages.

c) Biainian grammar is not complete because the texts of the inscriptions that have reached us are similar in style and repetitive. This is tangible, in particular, when trying to clarify the verbal morphology.

d) The restoration of many grammatical forms of the primary state of the Armenian language (referring to the probable state during the creation of the Biainian cuneiform script) is impossible and/or unreliable. This is mostly due to the immense difference in time (1000-1300 years) between Biainian and the sources written in CArm. language that have reached us, the substantial changes in Armenian during that period - particularly in grammar - and the significant number of foreign elements introduced into the language. As a result, to-date, the origin of many Armenian grammatical forms and state(s) in the pre-written period remain obscure or debatable among Armenologists.

The Results of the Comparison. a) Lexicon: the summary of the identified (semantically) Biainian (Urartian) lexicon and the corresponding Armenian and Hurrian parallel word roots (not including those preserved in proper nouns and as well as doubtful words) in which the word roots verified through bilingual texts or corresponding logograms are mentioned separately, is presented in the table below.

Altogether the list containing approximately 122 Biainian - Armenian parallel word roots, represents 60% of the Biainian identified lexicon (202 word roots). Of 96 word roots present in the Biainian lexicon and verified via bilingual texts or logograms, 59 (61%) have Armenian parallels. From the indicated 122 parallels, 86 word roots - roughly 70 percent are native; 20 of them, approximately 16 percent are borrowings and 15 of the word roots (12 percent) are of unknown origin19.

19 For the Biainian and Armenian lexicon comparison, in more detail, see Ayvazyan S., UrAr, pp. 33-104; Այվազյան Ս., Ուրարտերեն, Երևան, 2013, էջ 77-116.
b) Word Formation: 1) The nominal derivational affixes attested in the Biainian inscriptions - except for one or two - have their obvious parallels in CArm. (they often appear in their primary forms and functions in Biainian texts). As: CArm. -oyt', -i <*-eu-ti - Biain. -ibte, -ibti- /-iwt(i-)/, CArm. -k(n), -ka(n), -kow(n) <*-kō-n/ko-n - Biain. -ka(=n)/- ku=n, CArm. -(ow)ac < *ag′ - Biain. -(u)ase /-(u)ac/, CArm. -ord < *ordh - Biain. -urde l- ord/, CArm. -oc′- Biain. -use, -usi- l-oc′(i-)/, etc. They are mainly native affixes and have Indo-European origin. 2) A great number of native nominal affixes representing the ancient strata of Armenian are attested in the Biainian texts. 3) The verbal suffixes attested in Biainian also have their parallels in CArm., sometimes with distinct differences in usage from the Biainian. Here the main difference is the absence in Biainian of the CArm. c′-al (formed with c′ affricate) verbal suffixes. Instead, forms with c′ with their initial - derivational values are attested. 4) Some Biainian suffixes have their parallels in other languages as well, particularly, in Hurrian\textsuperscript{20}.

c) Nominal Morphology. As is clear from the above analysis, despite some differences which are basically conditioned by the presence in Biainian of the ergative system, the CArm. and Biainian systems of declension have considerable similarities\textsuperscript{21}.

---

\textsuperscript{20} About Biainan word formation in comparison with Armenian in more detail, see in Ayvazyan S., UrAr, pp. 105-130.

\textsuperscript{21} The most recent investigations demonstrate that, as a result of independent development, the split-ergative case is present in Hittite (A.Garrett. The origin of NP split ergativity, Language, 66, 1990, pp. 261-96; also Watkins C., 2006, pp. 560, 564, etc.) and certain other IE. languages (see Dixon R.. Ergativity, Cambridge, 1998 (first

---

### The number of identified Biainian (Urartian) word roots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Armenian parallel word roots</th>
<th>Hurian parallel word roots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Native (IE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>122 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verified via bilingual texts or logograms</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>59 (61%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This refers especially to the singular of the nominative and genitive. They practically duplicate each other. This is also partly true for the dative, but only if we agree that, prior to the genitive ending extending over it, the Armenian primary dative marker had been the genitive-dative/ablative -ǰ of several words. The other distinction in the Biainian and CArm. systems of declension is the absence of a separate instrumental case in Biainian: the ablative and instrumental have joint representation. But, in reality, it cannot be ruled out that in Biainian two distinct cases - the ablative and the instrumental (for which we have the case markers -/n/Ø/ and -/n/ respectively) exist. As regards the ablative, CArm. in general duplicates the forms of the genitive-dative, except in words of i- and ow-declension which are formed by the marker ē (< *ey). As to the Biainian ablative marker -n, it, as G.Jahukyan believes, has been preserved in a few CArm. words of n-declension. In that case, as the -/n/Ø/ alternation of the Biainian ablative marker shows, the loss of this -n must have already begun in the Van Kingdom period. The fact that in Biainian the case marker -n of the ablative alternates with -/Ø/, namely, the ablative undergoes break up, ascertains the belief that as a result of this process the ablative might finally have lost its primary form. Indeed, the CArm. linguistic material confirms that the genitive ending extended over the ablative. The nominative plural marker /-r/ (l in script) of Biainian is most probably preserved in the CArm. collective suffixes with /r/. (the nominative plural marker in modern Armenian). In contrast to CArm., the plural of oblique cases in Biainian has a standard pattern with the -(n)a- marker. Traces of this are clearly seen in CArm. where the -a-component endings of the oblique cases are obviously prevalent. Thus, if we put aside the presence of the Biainian ergative structure and the absence of the separate instrumental case, and consider the spread out of the genitive ending to the dative and ablative in CArm., then we can assert that the declension systems of CArm. and Biainian (Urartian) are for the considerable part identical.


22 Ջահուկյան Գ., Ուրարտական արձանագրությունների ներածական բանաձևերի հնարավոր հայկական բնույթի մասին, 2001, 1, էջ 124–129:

23 The Comparison of the Biainian and Armenian nominal morphologies see S. Ayvazyan, UrAr, pp. 166–172.
are divided into two parts (components) as in CArm.. In fact, for the first components [-
\i/e-, -a- and -ea- (\*ia)] of the CArm. past perfect endings in Biainian we have
respectively, -i/-, -a- and -ea- (\*ia) of the CArm. past perfect endings in Biainian we have
respectively, -i-,-a- and -ia-. And for the Biainian I-person singular -/t/, III-person singular
-\w/ and plural -/r/ (l in script) person-number markers (second components) in CArm.
we have respectively -y (<*t ? - the state before the Armenian *t>y/w/- development24),
w and n. The origin of Biainian III-person plural -/r/ (l in script) which, certainly, is reflected in the -r
element of the CArm. collective suffixes -(n)e\ar, -er, -or(e)ay. And it must be compared with the III-
person plural marker -r of several IE languages (Hittite, Latin, etc.). The Biainian past
perfect of verbs is also characterized by another - type II conjugation, by which the
transitive verbs are conjugated. All these type II verbs are conjugated in one way - by the -u(-)
marker of transitivity, which is added to the verbal stem in place of the thematic
vowel (if the stem is not monosyllabic). This Biainian marker of transitivity -u(-) is
preserved in the -ow-/\oy- component of the CArm. -ow-c-/\oy-c' suffix, which forms the
CArm. causative and active verbs. E.g. Biain. intr. aš=a- /as=a-l 'to come, to enter, to
arrive' and tr. as=a- /as=a-l 'to bring' - CArm. h-as-(an)-em (h-as-a-) 'to come, to arrive
at, to reach, etc.' and h-as-owc'-an-em /h-as-u-c'-l 'to cause to arrive, reach; to bring,
etc.', Biain. intr. ušt=a- /ost=a-l 'to go, to raid, to march' and tr. ušt=a- /ost=a-l 'to send,
to dispatch, to donate' - CArm. ost-an-im (ost-ea-) 'to burst forth, to escape from, to go
out of, to rush forward, etc.' and ost-owc'-an-im /ost-u-c'-l etc.' and so on), etc. 3) The
imperative: the CArm. aorist imperative singular -Ø ending (marker) coincides with the
Biainian marker -e of the analogous form. It should be noted, that in Biainian the word-
final -e may also be pronounced /Ø/ or /a/25). 4) Prohibitive forms of verbs: a special
form of prohibitive-imperative exists in CArm., which is formed by the addition of the
corresponding markers (sg. -r and pl. -yk') to the present verbal stem, with the
collocation of the preceding mi 'no, not' negative particle. In Biainian a prohibitive form
of verb which was formed with the ending -i=a=ne (maybe also: -(a)ure) with the
collocation of the preceding negative particle mi 'no, not' or ui 'id' exists. And in its
syntax it, of course, resembles the CArm. prohibitive-imperative26.

Conclusion

A comparison of the Biainian (Urartian) and Armenian languages shows that the
larger part of the Biainian lexicon that has reached us and is comprehensible has its

24 See also the Hurr./Biain. verb did- 'to distribute, to allot' - CArm. ti 'age; period, time' < PIE. *di-ti (expanded
form from *d̂i,*d̂ai,*də 'to distribute, to allot; to divide into pieces'), in which the aforementioned development has
not yet occurred.
25 See, for instance, Wilhelm G., The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World’s Ancient Languages, (Urartian, chapter
5), 2004, p. 131.
26 The comparison of the Biainian and Armenian verbal morphologies, in more detail, see in Ayvazyan S., UrAr, pp.
206-211.
parallel in Armenian. Moreover, the majority of those common words (roots) are native to Armenian, being of IE origin. Many of these words are presented in their older sense and/or form. What’s more, not only the roots, but also most of the derivational affixes are common with CArm. They are also, on the whole, native and of IE origin. On the other hand, the greater part of the derivational affixes forming the older layer and basis of Armenian has its parallel in Biainian. It is noteworthy, that in all the material certain phonetic differences observed are strictly regular and are, on the whole, consistent with the Pre-classical Armenian reconstructed by the comparative, or other methods. If we take into account the above mentioned normal changes in Armenian and possible dialectal differences, our calculations show that 61% of roots and 85-90% of derivational affixes of the comprehensible Biainian (Ura rtian) lexicon are common with Armenian. That is, they, of course, within the framework of the known stereotyped texts, consist of common roots and derivational affixes.

These commonalities are notable not only in the quantitative, but also in the qualitative sense, because they refer to basic and usually not-borrowed elements of every language, such as pronouns,27 main verbs, conjunctions and subsidiary words (Biainian numerals are only indicated in the form of logograms which make it impossible to compare them with Armenian). The differences are more notable in the case of the inflexional suffixes (case, verbal endings) but in these instances also, the commonalities are substantial, especially in the reliably defined grammatical forms. Moreover, this refers not only to the general typical similarities in nominal and verbal morphology, but to the actual morphemes as well, for example, nominative and genitive markers, the markers of the past perfect indicative verbs (particularly intransitive) and imperative verbs, and so on (there is no reliable evidence for Biainian present tense verb forms). More tangible differences are due to the ergative structure of Biainian, as opposed to CArm. (in this sense Biainian is similar to Hurrian)29, and consequentially, certain differences in the nominal and verbal morphology.

Despite these differences, not only particular words and phrases, but whole sentences in Biainian are read in comprehensible Armenian and understood with no difficulty and without special clarifications.

At the same time, if we speak about the divergence of the Armenian language (as a separate branch of the IE language family) from the Common Proto-Indo-European language 7-6 thousand years ago, then Armenian in the 9th -7th centuries BC should

27 See Ayvazyan S., UrAr, pp. 175-191.
28 See Ayvazyan S., UrAr, pp. 222-223, 239-237. For the comparison of the Biainian and Armenian adpositions see Ayvazyan S., UrAr, pp. 224-235.
30 It is noted that “the Hittite lineage diverging from Proto-Indo-European around 8,700 years BP... Tocharian, and the Greco-Armenian lineages – by 7,000 years BP... the early divergence of Greek and Armenian lineages, and the
be distinguished from CArm and ought to be closer to the PIE language. It is also noticeable that in the common part of Biainian and Armenian, just those IE elements are prevalent. Thus, summarizing all the above-mentioned facts, we come to the following core conclusions:

a) In its volume and linguistic value, the Armenian constituent represents the base of Biainian and it cannot be the result of borrowings and interactions.

b) At the same time, the position between Biainian and CArm. is not clear. Most likely, the differences between them are conditioned not only by the temporal factor (Biainian cuneiform texts are 1000-1300 years older than early CArm. texts), but also by the dialect factor.

c) A certain stratum of Hurrian exists both in the Biainian lexicon and some grammatical elements which, nevertheless, concedes both quantitatively and qualitatively to the Armenian language. Most of these commonalities, many of which have IE origin, are also present in Armenian. Taking all these facts into consideration, although it cannot be ruled out, it is less likely that Biainian (Urartian) and Hurrian are cognate. It is more plausible, that commonalities between Hurrian and Biainian are the result of interactions and the distant relationship of these two languages. It is also not excluded that, to some extent, they have an areal nature. A comprehensive research of Hurrian-Armenian linguistic commonalities which, as has been pointed out, are not few and not limited only to word roots, would be useful for the clarification of this issue.

German pacifist-democrat Heinrich Vierbücher was born in 1893 in a social democratic family. Being recruited to the army in August, 1914 as soon as the World War I started, Vierbücher witnessed the mass deportations and carnage of the deported Armenians in Mesopotamia and other Armenian populated places.

Vierbücher was fluent in French along with his native German language and was quick to master Turkish and Arabic as well and during 1915-1921 he became the interpreter for General Liman von Sanders. In his book “What Did The Imperial Government Hide From German Subjects: Armenia 1915: The Annihilation of the Civilized Nation by Turks”¹, published in 1922 and republished with additions in 1930 under the title “Armenia - 1915”², Vierbücher depicted in detail all the pain and wrath he felt during the mass extermination of Armenians in Constantinople, Mesopotamia, Aleppo and Damask, the heinous crimes committed by Turks and the ghastly indifference of their allies, German senior instructors cooperating with them.

In his book Vierbücher condemns the 1915 Armenian Genocide with wrath and shows the reader with vivid historical facts that the Ottoman Empire itself was based on blood and carnage from the beginning. Osman, the nomadic chieftain after whom the dynasty of sultans was called, dreamt of huge conquests. He became famous for killing his 90-year-old uncle with an arrow: the latter was an obstacle for conquering a castle.

Osman’s son Orkhan (1326-1359) created the army of janissaries which would soon violently spread dread and horror over Europe and Asia. It was re-manned with Christian boys who were brutally taken during military campaigns or kidnapped from Greek and Armenian families in Asia Minor and Western Armenia³. “With the victory gained in the battlefield called “Field of black thrush” near Kosovo, where the Serbian state power was destroyed. Murad fell from a Serb’s dagger. His son Bayazid I came to power by suffocating his brother and thus introduced a terrific tradition - nearly each enthronement was accompanied by the death of a brother and a relative. Mohammed III

² Vierbücher H., Armenien 1915. - The Armenian translation: Հայաստանը 1915-ին, Երևան, 2000:
³ Vierbücher mentioned that the sultans were in terrible fear of the janissaries they had created themselves: “Turkey would have been abolished one hundred years ago because of the janissaries’ self-will if Mahmud II with Hussein Pasha's efforts hadn’t shot 40,000 of those disobedient boys in the horse market of Constantinople in 1828” (Հայաստանը, էջ 30).
(1595-1603) had his seventeen brothers’ heads piled in a pyramid in front of a four-pillared throne. The heirs to the throne were being driven into a prince cage where they often spent half of their life dispelling their nervousness with alcohol and women, so when the “prisoners” came to power they were mostly too weak-minded to take responsibility for anything. The bloody sword that was the symbol of rule of the despotic sultans, was often directed against them: 76 of the 200 grand viziers didn’t die a natural death. One third of sultans was killed. The facts brought forward by Vierbücher are proved in one memoir by Heinrich Heine, the great German poet of the 19th century: “When I was very young I used to open the last page of the newspaper where it would always be written that such-and-such vizier was hung in Turkey and such-and-such vizier was appointed. And I always wondered how people still agreed to become a vizier”.

German military man Vierbücher presents dreadful facts about the internal life of the Ottoman Empire. A couple of years ago Turkey’s Prime Minister Receb Tayyip Erdoğan, in his falsifying style speaking in London announced that Turkey had a history bright as the sun, and the Turks radiated only light and warmth wherever they went. Erdoğan was probably unfamiliar with Vierbücher’s book.

Step by step, with calendar accuracy Vierbücher brings to the surface the monstrous violence of the Young Turks in Constantinople and other places populated by Armenians in 1915. The first news about the slaughters reached Constantinople on April 21, 1915. Then we read in his book that the Turkish government had passed a resolution on the extermination of Armenians and had secretly sent an order to the military and civilian bodies. About 590 of 600 intellectuals imprisoned and deported from Constantinople to the depths of Anatolia (Asia Minor) were killed. “Thus the Armenian people were relieved of their heads”, - Vierbücher mentions. “Kemakh (ancient Armenian Kamakh) lies between Yerznka (ancient Armenian Yeriza) and Svaz (ancient Armenian Sebastia). In June 1915”, - mentions Vierbücher, - “tens of thousands of women and children were thrown down alive from a giddy height, after being subjected to unspeakable tortures. That gorge ought to be called Dante’s Gorge. It is the abyss of a curse that has become a reality, as Dante depicted in his Hell… Humanity has reached awareness of its disgrace and recognition of its sinfulness… since here took place the most dire crime of all. The desire to clean that disgrace and the disgust of people cursing war should unite and make people go on pilgrimage to Kamakh canyon. There, over and over the pilgrims will spiritually experience what happened in 1915”.

In order to substantiate their unreasoned opinions and to make their worthless arguments convincing for the international community the Turkish denialists of the recognition of the Armenian Genocide have been repeating for decades the same false justification about the necessity to deport the Armenians under military conditions. In this regard Vierbücher noted: “Often an opinion was expressed that the slaughter of

---

4 Ֆիրբյուխեր, էջ 28:
5 Ֆիրբյուխեր, էջ 7-8:
more than one million Armenians should be less referred to as a premeditated and planned extermination, than as some hapless circumstances that could not be predicted by the government.\(^6\)

Vierbücher revealed in his book the planned nature of that genocidal massacre: “The execution of Talat’s orders doubtlessly prove that the government aims not at the transmigration of Armenians but their extermination. Those orders that were being sent to the managing organizations of Aleppo from September 1915 till March 1916 were partly presented in the original during Tehlerian’s trial”.

However, all the facts brought in Vierbücher’s book doubtless prove that the fate faced by hundreds of thousands of local or deported Armenians was not the result of unfavorable conditions but the result of the brutal mania instigated by the Young Turks’ “Sublime Porte” (read “Hell’s door”) to exterminate the Armenians in every possible way under the name of transmigration. Here are a series of various atrocities that Vierbücher describes: “In Hastevan and Salmast alone, 850 beheaded corpses were taken out of wells: why? Because the Commander in Chief of the Turkish army paid a certain sum of money for each head of a Christian. The wells were filled with the blood of Christians. From Hastevan alone 500 women and girls were sent to Şoghakn to be dishonored… Seeing the bandits raping their sisters, women threw themselves into the deep river…

One teacher from Van writes: “In mid-April our street and my house were put to fire. 250 refugee women and children had found shelter in our house from the neighboring villages and 50 people from the city. All of them were burnt alive together with the house. There was no living being in the deserted villages except for the dogs gourmandizing the corpses… The gendarmes conquering the town Mughî started to rape the wives in front of their husbands. A lot of men killed their wives and daughters not to be raped. A whole family took poison… Near Ankara 500 people were killed but before that their noses and ears were cut and their eyes were taken out”\(^7\).

“Almost none of the Armenians deported to Der el Zor oasis remained alive. Every now and then hundreds of them were taken and violently killed… In Baba, within two and a half days 1029 Armenians died of hunger”\(^8\).

How is the “committee” of historians suggested by the President of Turkey Erdoğan and Prime Minister Davutoğlu going to deny or attribute to “natural disasters” these facts established by the German officer?

In November 1916 General Liman von Sanders succeeded in stopping mass deportations of Armenians from Smyrna (they were deported and massacred in 1922). This example showed Vierbücher that within the frames of the German-Turkish alliance, the German military mission in Mesopotamia could have performed a lot of preventive actions to stop deportation, moreover the unpunished extermination of Armenians, but

---

\(^6\) Սիրենգիղեր, էջ 51:
\(^7\) Vierbücher H, Armenien 1915, S. 68-69.
\(^8\) Ibid., S. 76.
this was not done. Vierbücher in his article “The Victim of the East” expressed his whole anger towards this deliberate inaction instructed by the government. Vierbücher called Turkey ruled by Sultan Hamid and Young Turks, a monstrous executioner of the Armenian people. As the great Armenian poet Hovhannes Tumanyan diagnosed Turkey: “The epileptic of the East”. According to Vierbücher’s depiction the tributaries of the Armenians’ moans flowing from Constantinople, Trapezunt, Sebastia and Karin) “accumulated and became a tremendous-terrible symphony of unspeakable torment”.

On March 15, 1921, on Hardenberg Street, Charlottenburg, Armenian student Soghomon Tehlerian shot former grand vizier Talat pasha who secretly lived in Berlin. For this just shot Vierbücher compares the Armenian student with medieval Swedish mythical archer Wilhelm Tell with unconcealed admiration, and he sees in the surname “Tehlerian” the name of the folk hero “Tell”. The reader might remember at least from Friedrich Shiller’s drama “Wilhelm Tell” that the son of the mythical archer was condemned to death in Switzerland and according to the sadistic decision of the court he would be freed from the gallows only if his father could drop the apple on his son’s head with one shot of an arrow.

By exterminating the Armenian people, Young Turks not only did take possession of the western part of millennia-old Armenian Motherland, but also went from house to house and stole their personal property, the gold laid in Turkish banks and their cash money. “Only the property and cash money stolen from the Armenians is estimated several hundred million German golden marks”, - Vierbücher writes, - “in 1916 Turkey sent to Berlin 100 million golden marks of that stolen money to be kept in the banks as currency. After the Armistice all of that money was confiscated by the Entente Powers”.

After World War I Heinrich Vierbücher actively participated in the pacifist movement dedicating to it his indisputable rhetorical endowment and the bitter experience of a person who had witnessed war and violent massacres. In 1930 thanks to the publication of Vierbücher’s new book “Armenia 1915” condemned slaughter of Armenians the crime was voiced again, but unfortunately in 1933, after the German Nazis came to power the book was prohibited and mainly burnt. Even the libraries of private citizens were being inspected in search of that book.

For his long-lasting pacifist and anti-fascist activity and public speeches Vierbücher fell victim to the Gestapo violence. At the night of February 12, 1939 a stranger came into Vierbücher’s house and obviously acted on the orders of gestapo. Nothing is known about their conversation. Immediately after the visit Vierbücher fainted. Vierbücher who was safe and sound before that, died from a stroke right on the next day in the Berlin hospital named after Robert Koch.

Translated from Armenian by S.E. Chraghyan

10 Friedrich Shiller depicted the mythical hero in his drama “Wilhelm Tell”.
In 1917 a small book entitled *Armenia, the Lamentation of Armenia* was published at the printing house of the Mekhitarists’ Congregation of Saint-Lazarus Island of Venice. The epigraph of this book is “Armenia will revive her sweet and pacific days, under the shade of vineyards and olive woods of her martyred ancestors”. The author of the book is Jean Aicard (1848-1921), poet, member of the French Academy.

One can see in the book, as an inset, the photograph of Jean Aicard, officially dressed, with a cross shape order on the left side of his chest.

The small poem *Armenia* of Jean Aicard has a short, but eloquent preface. He writes that the cry of pain of a criminally exterminated nation attracted the attention of numerous people all over the world, including poets who wished that the whole world could hear the voice of truth muffled in the throat of tortured Armenia. No nation suffered as Armenians did. Their houses were destructed, their roofs came down and their hearths died out, but they never stopped hoping peace and freedom.

Jean Aicard believes that Armenia will revive from ashes and ruins, like the legendary Phoenix, to be more glorious and more powerful. This is our wish. «Parmi les désolations, parmi les ruines, même parmi les cendres renaîtra le phénix de l’Arménie plus glorieuse et plus puissante. Voilà ce que nous désirons»

---

1 Jean Aicard, de l’Académie Française, Arménie, la plainte arménienne, Venise, St. Lazare, 1917. (Jean Aicard, from the French Academy, Armenia, the Lamentation of Armenia, Venice, San Lazzaro, 1917).

2 Jean Aicard (1848-1921) was born in Toulon. He was poet, writer and dramaturge. In his works he used to celebrate children and Provence. He is the author of many works (see Dictionnaire encyclopédique Quillet, Paris, 1939, c. 67).

3 Jean Aicard, Arménie..., p. 5.
Jean Aicard holds up to shame the First World War begun in 1914. It focused forces of evil, which horribly and inhumanly appeared in a spot of the world. The world suddenly stood stupefied by the strength of egoism and crime. The Christian world was horrified by war and death. But the Christian world will win and Armenia will revive. The verse was written on May 6, 1917. It is full of profound meaning and written in the spirit of Christian philosophy. The author presents Armenia as a Christian martyr. Armenia is dripping with blood, but the victim is beautiful in her silk garment and the blood streaming from her heart is shining as a ruby.

Jean Aicard describes the image of crucified Armenia according to the criteria of Christian hagiography.

Some parts of the verse are like a mournful Mass, as the victim, Armenia, is dolefully parting from her beloved real life and is leaving the wax candle burning with fire of earthy life to join eternal life on the Heaven, she is going to meet the Creator, she is following behests of the Holy Gospel and she is sure that although she was constrained to leave early her earthy life, Jesus Christ is waiting for her in the Heaven. With this fate of her and reckless torment Armenia is thundering with awful remorse in the hearths of the whole human kind. The cross is everywhere, it is in the hand of Armenians and the entire world will bend down before Armenians’ cross, full of deep faith in the spiritual courage of this nation and the firmness of its faith.

The poet believes that Armenian people will live in peace and Christ will give them Resurrection as He did a miracle to resurrect Lazarus.

O dead - alive Armenia,
I believe in your eternal Glory,
Your long martyrdom will win the time,
Passing through your solitary torment,
You will revive among peoples of the world,
... Your forehead will be crowned by a sacred diadem.
By he who resurrected Lazarus from the grove.

---

4 Lazarus was the disciple and the friend of Christ, the brother of Martha and Maria. They were living in Bethany, not far from Jerusalem. Christ loved a lot this family and went often to meet them. Lazarus was sick and his sisters sent unto him saying, Lord, behold, he whom thou love is sick. Then when Jesus came, he found that he had lain in the grove four days already. Then Martha, as soon as she heard that Jesus was coming, went and met him. Martha said unto Jesus, Lord, if thou had been there, my brother had not died. But I know that even now, whatsoever thou will ask of God, God will give it thee. Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life: he that believes in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever lives and believes in me shall never die. And when he thus had spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes. Jesus said unto them, Loose him and let him go (John, 11, 1-44).
... And nations will say: “Behold how he loves her”.

Of course, in the original text by Jean Aicard this part is much more artistic and impressive:

Ô morte - vivante, Arménie,
Je crois à ta gloire infinie,
Ton martyre si long triomphera du temps.
Après avoir souffert ton tourment solitaire
Tu revivras parmi les peuples de la terre,
...Ton front sera cerclé du sacré diadème.
Par Celui qui fit sortir Lazare du tombeau.
... Et les peuples diront: « Vous voyez comme il l’aime. »

The verse of Jean Aicard is written in the spirit of hagiography and canticles praising medieval martyrs. These literary genres were proper to almost all Christian nations for whom the supreme hero was the one who was martyred for his faith. It is well known that during the Genocide of 1915 numerous Armenians were constrained to adopt Islam. Recently, in 2013, a voluminous monograph was published in the United States of America; its author is Samantha Power. The book has 620 pages and it is entitled *A Problem from Hell*.

The book tells about the age of genocides and considers the Armenian Genocide, organized by Young Turks in 1915, as the first in the world. The book contains the photograph of national avenger Soghomon Teylerian and the history of his trial. In the part of *Annotations* Samantha Power mentions the book *The First World War* by Martin Gilbert, published in 1994, in which the author gives evidence by facts that besides slaughtering more than one million Armenians, Turks forced 200,000 Armenians to convert to Islam.

These facts were evidently known to the poet who states that problems of confession are proper to the essence of genocide in general. He considers all cruelly slaughtered classes of Armenians as innocent martyrs.

Beginning with the 19th century the French intellectuals, especially those who visited Western Armenia, noticed with pain that Armenians living on their native lands had turned into slaves. In books published in Europe, mostly in France, one can read anxious descriptions of the painful situation of Armenians, bearers of ancient civilization.

---

5 Jean Aicard, Arménie..., p. 5.
6 Samantha Power, A Problem from Hell, America and the Age of Genocide, Perennial, 2003, p. 3.
Such opinions were even more frequent after massacres organized by sultan Abdul Hamid in 1895-1896.

In 1917, while Jean Aicard wrote his moving verse *Armenia*, another interesting work was published in Paris: *Essai sur les nationalités* (*Essay on Nationalities*) by J. de Morgan. In this book the author tells about his observations during his trip to Constantinople. He writes: “Beginning with the reign of the deposed sultan and at the time of Young Turks the Turkish public opinion is shamelessly against Armenians and one can hear everywhere exclamations of hate addressed to them. In fact, Turks consider among themselves that the massacres of Armenians were well done, that it was a sacred duty, something done for the glory of the Prophet, i.e. Muhammad” 8. He describes an eloquent episode to confirm what he said. “I was myself the witness of a scene of criminal cruelty in one of Istanbul streets. Two young boys were fighting. An old Turkish man having a splendid white beard was watching them, no longer paying attention to the rosary in his hand. He was encouraging one of them with voice and gestures and seeing that he was defeated, he began to shout loudly: “Vour! Vour! Erméni dir” (“Hit him! Hit him! He is Armenian”) 9. What more can we expect of such people? asks J. de Morgan.

As Jean Aicard puts it so rightly, Turks were not killing a few persons, but the entire Armenia. For the author ‘Armenia’ is a collective personage of a hero-victim whom the Christian worlds ought to know, has to be proud of him and support him.

In 1896 a little book was published under the title of *Armenia* (*Arménie*). It was a short essay about past and present events of Armenia. The author was R. Badiron. He spoke about the perseverance of the Armenia nation and about its creative capacities. The book was written on the occasion of massacres organized by Abdul Hamid in 1895-1896. According to this French writer, Armenian peasants are able to cultivate the soil with ability, while in towns, thanks to their exceptional mind, Armenians are bankers or well known oriental merchants and the sphere of their activities is extending from Eastern Africa to China 10.

The author explains why he is supporting Armenians and what his goal is. At first, he wants to inform his fellow compatriots who don’t know how Turks are slaughtering Armenians, to stir up sympathy towards their unfortunate brothers, as they could accomplish their human duty helping the innumerable orphans wandering in the deserts.

---

9 Ibidem, p. 83.
without bread, often completely naked. And when the evil will finally be eradicated, all possible means must be used to compensate the torments of numerous sufferers who are yet locked up in prisons or places of detention.  

The translation into Western Armenian of Jean Aicard's verse *Armenia* was done by Arshak Chobanian and published in the same book. The book contains another verse in French called *La plainte arménienne* (The Armenian Lamentation) which is the paraphrase of Jean Aicard's *Armenia*. Its author is Simon Yeremyan (1871-1938), a member of the Mekhitarist Congregation of Venice, who was the editor of the journal "Bazmavep" for a whole year.  

This is also a kind of funeral chant devoted to "our dead".

In this mourning lamentation S. Yeremian is speaking about the hour of revenge and the victory of justice.

Justice will come, o slaughtered nation,
We shall see the laurels flourishing,
Justice will come on the wings of years…
I am tired of dying.

O Martyrs! People will see how friends of my nation
Are sowing white lilies, full of charm, on the river banks,
And hanging, as offerings, garlands on the wall
Stained with our innocent blood.

La justice viendra, race déracinée :
Nous verrons le laurier fleurir.
La justice viendra sur l’aile des années...
Je suis fatigué de mourir.

O Martyrs! On verra les amis de ma race
Sur les rives semer le lys blanc, plein de grâce,
Et suspendre, en offrande, une guirlande au mur
Rouge encore de votre sang pur.

The verse *Armenia* of Jean Aicard is a small but eloquent episode of the general wave of indignation which is defending all over the progressive world the rights of Armenians mercilessly slaughtered by dark satanic forces.

---

11 Ibidem, p. 16.
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VORWORT

In den letzten Jahren sind die Regierungskreise sowie die offizielle und inoffizielle Historiographie und fast alle Massenmedien der Türkei darum bemüht, das Unbeweisbare zu "beweisen", nämlich dass im Osmanischen Reich kein Genozid an den Armeniern stattgefunden habe, sondern dass im Gegenteil die Armenier selbst Massenausrottungen von Türken organisiert hätten. Im Sinne dieser ungeheuerlichen Verdrehung der Tatsachen wird behauptet, dass die britischen, französischen, russischen und amerikanischen Dokumente über die totale Vernichtung der Armenier in der Türkei von Staaten stammen, die im Ersten Weltkrieg Kriegsgegner der Türkei waren, weswegen diese Dokumente als tendenziös anzusehen seien.


Es ist ebenfalls festzustellen, dass die Politik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Wiedergutmachung am jüdischen Volk für türkische Regierungskreise kein Vorbild darstellt.


Die deutschen Aktenstücke, in denen der erste große Völkermord des 20. Jahrhunderts umfassend dokumentiert ist, lassen selbstverständlich auch die
erwähnten türkischen "Vorbehalte" gegenüber den Materialien der "feindlichen Staaten" als haltlose, weil unbegründbare Ausflüchte erkennen.

In diesem Zusammenhang war natürlich die von Dr. Johannes Lepsius im Frühjahr 1919 in Potsdam unter dem Titel "Deutschland und Armenien" herausgegebene Sammlung diplomatischer Aktenstücke von wichtiger Bedeutung.

Im Vorwort der von mir zusammengestellten und im Jahre 1995 in russischer Sprache herausgegebenen Sammlung deutscher Dokumente hatte ich über die Publikation von Lepsius folgende Bemerkungen gemacht: Im Jahre 1919, als die Sammlung von Lepsius erstmals herausgegeben wurde, gab es in Deutschland noch gewisse Hindernisse und Beschränkungen für eine Veröffentlichung der diplomatischen Aktenstücke, und angesichts der Waffenbrüderschaft der Kaiserlichen und jungtürkischen Regierung sind Dr. Lepsius nicht alle Materialien zum Genozid an den Armeniern zugänglich geworden. Das betrifft besonders diejenigen Aktenstücke, aus denen die Mitverantwortung der Kaiserlichen Regierung für die Vernichtung des armenischen Volkes in der Türkei erkennbar wird.

Dr. Lepsius hat beispielsweise erst nach der Veröffentlichung seiner Sammlung feststellen können, dass ihm ein bedeutender Teil der Berichte des bekannten Diplomaten Rößler, der in den Jahren 1910-1918 deutscher Konsul in Aleppo war – in einer Stadt, durch die fast alle Konvois der deportierten Armenier kamen, soweit sie bis dahin nicht unterwegs massakriert wurden oder verhungert waren, bevor sie weiter in die mesopotamischen Wüsten vertrieben wurden - nicht zur Verfügung gestellt worden waren. Von seiner Dienststelle aus hatte Rößler im Vergleich zu anderen Diplomaten die Lage der für vogelfrei erklärten armenischen Deportierten und die Verhältnisse in der Türkei insgesamt viel besser erkennen können.


Ich würde es, nachdem in dem Buche "Deutschland und Armenien" unsere Verteidigung ohne Rücksicht auf die Türken geführt worden ist, für politisch nicht vertretbar halten, jetzt noch weiter Aktenstücke zu veröffentlichen, die ohne Nutzen für uns die Türken belasten... Ich hoffe also auf Ihr Einverständnis, wenn ich aus der Sammlung der Dokumente die Berichte der Konsuln, soweit sie in die erwähnte Kategorie fallen, entferne und die übrigen nach dem Haag schicke..."

Es unterliegt also keinem Zweifel, dass Dr. Lepsius und das Auswärtige Amt an der Herausgabe der Aktensammlung ganz unterschiedliche Interessen hatten. Wie aus dem eben erwähnten Brief Göpperts hervorgeht, war das Auswärtige Amt daran interessiert, durch die Aktenpublikation sowohl die in den Entente-Staaten und in neutralen Ländern kursierenden Vorwürfe einer deutschen Mitschuld zu demen-
tieren, als auch die Taten der türkischen Verbrecher – soweit diese dem genannten Zweck nicht dienlich waren – möglichst gut zu verbergen,** während Lepsius seine Hauptaufgabe darin sah, aufgrund der diplomatischen Berichte die entsetzlichen Vorgänge samt ihren tragischen Folgen möglichst gut zu dokumentieren und die Hauptverbrecher bloßzustellen, um dadurch einerseits zur Bestrafung der Täter und andererseits zu einer gerechten Regelung der Armenischen Frage beizutragen. Die Tatsache, dass nicht sämtliche Aktenstücke vom Auswärtigen Amt Dr. Lepsius zur Verfügung gestellt wurden, ist also durch diese Umstände zu erklären.


** Ebd., S. 607:


Die Mehrheit der in dieser Sammlung zusammengestellten Berichte erfreut sich hiermit ihrer ersten Herausgabe in der Originalsprache, wobei an ihnen keine Änderungen und Korrekturen vorgenommen wurden, auch wenn es sich um offensichtliche Schreib- und Druckfehler oder auch zur Zeit nicht mehr angewandte Rechtschreibregeln handelte.
Man kann den Inhalt der Aktenstücke dieser Sammlung, die sich größtenteils aus
den Berichten und sonstigen Mitteilungen der damals in der Türkei befindlichen
deutschen Diplomaten, Militärs und anderer Personen zusammensetzt, annähernd in
folgenden Punkten zusammenfassen:

1. Die Verhandlungen der Botschafter der sechs europäischen Großmächte – der
Entente und des Dreibunds – in Konstantinopel in den Jahren 1913-1914 zur
Armenischen Frage und der Durchführung von Reformen in Westarmenien bzw. in
den “sechs armenischen Wilajets” des Osmanischen Reiches.

2. Die totale Vernichtung der armenischen Bevölkerung in Westarmenien und in
der Türkei insgesamt.

3. Die Deportation der Armenier, ihre entsetzliche Lage auf dem
Deportationsmarsch und an den Verschickungsorten.

4. Überfälle und Ausschreitungen regulärer und irregulärer türkischer Truppen
und zahlreicher türkisch-kurdischer Banden auf die friedliche armenische
Bevölkerung und die Deportiertenkonvois.

5. Zwangsislamisierung von hunderttausenden Armeniern und anderen Christen.

6. Hunger, Kälte und Seuchen, denen hunderttausende Armenier zum Opfer
fielen.


8. Zahlreiche Berichte deutscher Diplomaten und anderer offizieller Personen,
die die Tatsache bestätigen, dass der Genozid an den Armeniern von der jungtürkischen
Regierung und dem Komitee “Einheit und Fortschritt” geplant und unter
deren Leitung systematisch durchgeführt worden ist.

9. Die Mitverantwortung der Kaiserlich Deutschen Regierung an der totalen
Ausrottung und Vernichtung des armenischen Volkes in der Türkei.

10. Die Haltung der Großmächte und der Weltöffentlichkeit zum Genozid an den
Armeniern; das Engagement verschiedener Komitees und Organisationen zugunsten
der Armenier.

11. Die Invasion der türkischen Armee in Ostarmenien und im Transkaukasus im
Jahre 1918 mit dem Ziel, das Land zu erobern und den noch am Leben gebliebenen
Rest der Armenier zu vernichten.

12. Die Aktivitäten der Delegation des armenischen Nationalrats und der
Armenischen Republik im Jahre 1918 in Berlin, um von der deutschen und
österreich-ungarischen Regierung Unterstützung gegen die türkischen Okkupanten
zu erhalten.
Selbstverständlich wurde von uns nur ein kurzes Verzeichnis der Hauptfragen aufgeführt. Eine vollkommene Vorstellung über weitere Einzelheiten des Inhalts der Sammlung wird der Leser durch die Lektüre die Aktenstücke erhalten.

Es ist noch auch hinzuzufügen, dass in einigen Dokumenten, deren Verfasser offenbar unter dem Einfluss der türkischen Propaganda standen, manche Erfindungen der letzteren über armenische "Banden und Aufstände" ohne irgendeine Faktengrundlage ungeprüft wiederholt wurden. In der Regel bestreiten aber die deutschen Diplomaten in ihren geheimen Mitteilungen derartige Behauptungen.

** * * * **


Es entstanden bei der Vorbereitung der Sammlung manche Schwierigkeiten bezüglich der Kennzeichnung der Aktenstücke. Da die Blätter der Aktenstücke des Politischen Archivs in der Regel unnummeriert sind, habe ich zusätzlich die Nummer der Abschrift (z.B. R.14055, Ab. 4553) und das Datum der Sendung angegeben. All diese Angaben geben Forschern die Möglichkeit, die Aktenstücke im Archiv leicht aufzufinden.

** * * * **

Da sich die Sammlung in der Hauptsache aus Aktenstücken des Politischen Archives zusammensetzt, habe ich darauf verzichtet, bei jedem Aktenstück den Namen dieses Archives aufzuführen, und es ist in der Regel nur auf die Nummern dieser Aktenstücke und ihrer Abschriften verwiesen worden. Die wenigen Aktenstücke aus den übrigen Archiven in Berlin, Potsdam und Dresden sind dagegen mit entspre-
chenden Anmerkungen versehen worden. Es ist zu erwähnen, dass zwölf der in meiner Edition enthaltenen Aktenstücke mit einigen Auslassungen bereits in der Sammlung von Dr. Johannes Lepsius "Deutschland und Armenien" enthalten waren. Hier werden sie aber erstmals vollständig veröffentlicht.

In seltenen Fällen sind von uns geringfügige Auslassungen vorgenommen worden, die aber an der Sache selbst nichts ändern. Diese Auslassungen wurden, wie üblich, durch Klammern (...) gekennzeichnet.

In den Aktenstücken finden sich manchmal auch einzelne Wörter und Redewendungen in französischer und englischer Sprache. Um die Bildlichkeit und die Genauigkeit der Texte aufrechterhalten, ist selbstverständlich davon abgesehen worden, diese ins Deutsche zu übersetzen.

Die Leser der vorliegenden Edition werden unschwer feststellen können, dass der Völkermord, der die gesamte armenische Bevölkerung Westarmeniens und des übrigen Osmanischen Reiches vernichtete, von der jungtürkischen Regierung geplant und ihren Anordnungen gemäß systematisch durchgeführt wurde.

WARDGES MIKAELJAN
Professor, Doktor der Geschichtswissenschaften,
Mitglied der Nationalen Akademie der Wissenschaften Armeniens
FLUCHT DER ARMENIER AUS DEM KRIEGSGEBIET NACH RUSSLAND

Kaiserlich Deutsche Botschaft
Pera, am 9. März 1915
Nr. 140
Durch k. Feldj.


Auch hier ist erzählt worden, daß armenische Soldaten wegen angeblicher Verräterei niedergemacht worden seien; eine Untersuchung dieses Falles steht aus; jedenfalls behaupten die Armenier, daß kein Verrat vorgelegen habe.

Es ist ferner - von türkischer Seite - behauptet worden, daß zahlreiche Armenier aus Bulgarien freiwillig in die russische Armee eingetreten seien. Von der Beteiligung der in anderen Ländern ansässigen Armenier türkischer Nationalität am Kriege liegen keine Nachrichten hier vor.

Der gegenwärtige armenische Patriarch ist andauernd bemüht, korrekte und gute Beziehungen zu der türkischen Regierung zu unterhalten, und in diesem Sinne auch auf die Bevölkerung einzuwirken, trotz verschiedener Gewalttaten, die in letzter Zeit vorgekommen sind, und trotz des Mißtrauens, mit dem die Türk en im allgemeinen den Armeniern begegnen. Letztthin wurde der Botschaft von Aufstandsversuchen der Armenier in der Provinz Bitlis und gelegentlichen Ausschreitungen gegen die bewaffnete Macht berichtet; vermutlich handelt es sich um vereinzelte Vorgänge und um keine organisierte Bewegung. Ebenso sollen bei einer Haussuchung in Kaisarié Bomben und Chiffrebücher gefunden worden sein. Demgegenüber versichern nüchtern denkende Armenier, daß die türkischen Armenier sich stets korrekt verhalten würden und an keinen Aufstand dachten; allerdings würden sie es auch nicht bedauern, wenn Landesteile mit armenischer Bevölkerung in russische Hände fielen.
Die türkische Presse redet seit langem nicht mehr von den armenischen Angelegenheiten, und die hiesige armenische Presse vermeidet ängstlich alles, was bei der strengen Zensur Anstöße erregen könnte, sodaß die Mißstimmung, die durch das Mißtrauen der Türken und einzelne Maßregeln, wie z.B. die Zurückstellung der Reformen in den östlichen Provinzen, hervorgerufen ist, nicht zum Ausdruck kommt.

Von einer Verwertung der eingesandten russischen Zeitungsartikel in der deutschen Presse dürfte besser abzusehen sein, schon um nicht die türkischen Kreise noch mehr gegen die Armenier zu verstimmen.

Wangenheim
Seiner Excellenz dem Reichskanzler
Herrn von Bethmann Hollweg

R 140805, A 9528.

★

VERLUSTE DER REGIERUNGSTRUPPEN UND DER VERTEIDIGER IN WAN

Telegramm
[Kaiserlich Deutsche Botschaft] Pera, den 11. Mai 1915
Nr. 1104

Entzifferung


In Erzerum selbst fanden weitere Verhaftungen von Armeniern statt.

Wangenheim
Botschafter

An das Auswärtige Amt

R 14085, Ab. 36210.
Dem Generalstab mitgeteilt.

★

129
ENVER PASCHAS MITTEILUNG ÜBER DEN BEGINN DER AUSSIEDLUNG ARMENISCHER BEVÖLKERUNG

[Kaiserlich Deutsche Botschaft] Pera, den 31. Mai 1915 Nr. 1268

Entzifferung

Enver Pascha beabsichtigt zur Eindämmung armenischer Spionage und um neuen armenischen Massenerhebungen vorzubeugen, unter Benutzung Kriegs-(Ausnahme-)Zustands eine große Anzahl armenischer Schulen zu schließen, armenische Zeitungen zu unterdrücken, armenische Postkorrespondenz zu untersagen und aus den jetzt insurgierten armenischen Zentren alle nicht ganz einwandfreien Familien in Mesopotamien anzusiedeln. Er bittet dringend, daß wir ihm hierbei nicht in den Arm fallen.

Natürlich werden die türkischen Maßnahmen in der gesamten uns feindlichen Welt wieder große Aufregung verursachen und auch gegen uns ausgeübt werden, speziell wird Amerika in seinen vielen armenischen Schulen getroffen werden. Auch bedeuten die Maßnahmen gewiß eine große Härte für die armenische Bevölkerung. Doch bin ich der Meinung, daß wir die Maßnahmen wohl in ihrer Form mildern, aber nicht grundsätzlich hindern dürfen. Die von Rußland genährte armenische Wühlarbeit hat Dimensionen angenommen, welche den Bestand der Türkei bedrohen.

Bitte Professor Lepsius und andere deutsche armenische Komitees entsprechend verständigen, daß erwähnte Maßnahmen bei der politischen und militärischen Lage der Türkei leider nicht zu vermeiden.

Habe Konsulate Erzerum, Mossul, Adana, Aleppo, Bagdad vertraulich informiert.

Wangenheim Botschafter

An das Auswärtige Amt

R 14086, Ab. 17493.
COMMUNIQUÉ DER RUSSISCHEN REGIERUNG MIT EINEM PROTEST GEGEN DIE AUSROTTUNG DER ARMENISCHEN BEVÖLKERUNG

Telegramm
Deutsche Gesandtschaft in Kopenhagen Kopenhagen, den 2. Juni 1915 Nr. 836


Gesandtschaft

An Auswärtiges Amt

R 14086, Ab. 17667.

★

DAS ZIEL DER REISE VON J. LEPSIUS IN DIE ARMENISCHEN PROVINZEN

Auswärtiges Amt Berlin, den 6. Juni 1915 Nr. 1106

Tel. i. Ziff.

Antwort auf Tel. Nr.1268
Dr. Lepsius wünscht dorthin zu reisen nicht um auf Pforte Druck auszuüben sondern um Armenier zur Vernunft zu bringen. Er ist wenn Pforte einverstanden bereit

U. St. S. [Unterstaatssekretär]

An den kaiserlichen Botschafter
in Konstantinopel

R 14086, Ab. 17943.

★

DIE INOPPORTUNITÄT DER REISE DES DR. LEPSIUS

Telegramm

Der K. Botschafter
an Auswärtiges Amt
Nr. 1338
x) A. 17493

Entzifferung

Antwort auf Telegramm Nr. 1106

Gegenüber der bereits in voller Ausführung begriffenen Maßnahme der Pforte, welche durch verschiedene einwandfrei festgestellte Tatsachen begründet erscheint, käme Dr. Lepsius zu spät und seine Bemühungen würden wirkungslos sein. Halte Reise überdies für inopportun, zumal Tätigkeit des Dr. Liparit nicht aufgeklärt ist (Bericht Nr. 329) und weil sie Empfindlichkeit der Pforte erregen könnte, welche nach vertraulicher Sondierung Reise selbst nicht wünscht.

Ich tue außerdem mein möglichstes, um zu rigorose Maßnahmen der Pforte zu mildern.

Wangenheim

R 14086, Ab. 18287.

★

135
DIE MASSENDEPORTATIONEN DER ARMENISCHEN BEVÖLKERUNG
UND IHRE FOLGEN FÜR DIE TÜRKEI

Deutsch-Armenische Gesellschaft
Potsdam, den 22. Juni 1915

Nach der Mitteilung des Ks. Botschafters laut Telegramm vom 31. Mai beabsichtigte Enver Pascha “aus den jetzt insurgierten armenischen Centren die nicht einwandfreien Familien in Mesopotamien anzusiedeln”.

Wie ich bereits in meinem Schreiben vom 18.6. mitteilte, handelt es sich indes nicht um Verschickungen einzelner Familien, sondern um Massendeportationen großer armenischer Bevölkerungssteile aus anatolischen Gebieten und aus Cilicien nach verschiedenen Distrikten besonders nach Mesopotamien.


In welcher Weise hierbei verfahren wird, davon ein Beispiel. Von den ca. 27 000 Bewohnern von Zeitun im taurischen Hochlande wurde die männliche Bevölkerung in die heissen Euphratniederungen von Deir es Zor mitten unter arabische Beduinenstämme verschickt (500 Kilometer südöstlich), die Frauen, Mädchen und Kinder dagegen in das Gebiet von Angora abtransportiert - (500 Kilometer nordöstlich) also die Männer wurden von ihren Familien durch 1000 Kilometer getrennt. Auf dem Transport wurden die jungen Mädchen in türkische Harems verschleppt, in den muhammedanischen Dörfern die Frauen der Vergewaltigung preisgegeben. Während für die Ansiedlung von muhammedanischen Bosniaken in dem evakuierten Zeitungebiet von der Regierung 20 000 Lt. angewiesen wurden, wurden die Armenier ihrer Habe beraubt und mittellos in die Fremde geschickt.

Solche Maßregel, die nur in den Deportationen der alten Assyer ihresgleichen haben, sind durch militärische Zwecke nicht zu rechtfertigen, sondern laufen auf verschleierte Christenmassacres hinaus. An Ausdehnung werden sie voraussichtlich die Massacres zur Zeit Abdul Hamids übertreffen.

Ich halte es für meine Pflicht, auf die Folgen dieser türkischen Maßnahmen aufmerksam zu machen.


2. Durch die Ausrottungspolitik der gegenwärtigen türkischen Machthaber wird in der gesamten armenischen Nation (d.h. 2 Millionen russischer und 2 Millionen türkischer Armenier) ein Hass gegen die Türkei systematisch gezüchtet, der nur den Interessen der Entente-Mächte zugute kommt und dem Einfluss Deutschlands auf die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung der Türkei, die zum grössten Teil auf den Schultern der Armenier liegt, in höchstem Maße schädlich sein muss. Durch die Evakuierung Ciliciens von Armeniern werden z. B. den dortigen deutschen Unternehmen (Baumwollgesellschaften u.s.w.) sämtliche Arbeitskräfte entzogen.

3. Es kann in einem Lande, in dem die Regierung von jeher mit terroristischen Mitteln gearbeitet hat, nicht ausbleiben, daß die Ausrottungs-
politik die Betroffenen ebenfalls in den Terrorismus hineintreibt. Man darf nicht vergessen, dass die gegenwärtige Regierung eine starke und gefährliche Oppositionspartei auch unter den türkischen und arabischen Untertanen hat, der die bisher loyalen türkischen Armenier in die Arme getrieben werden. Da die türkische Opposition (die liberale Union) mit der Entente zusammengeht, ist es unser dringendes politisches Interesse, die türkischen Armenier nicht in eine terroristische Opposition hineinzu treiben und dem deutschen Einfluss zu entziehen. Es sind etwa 120 Führer der Daschnakzagan die durchaus loyal waren, in Haft gesetzt worden und man befürchtet ihre summarische Hinrichtung. Durch die Beseitigung dieser loyalen Intellektuellen werden die terroristischen Elemente des russischen Armeniertums auch in der Türkei freie Hand bekommen.

Die loyalen armenischen Komitees haben durch die betreffenden Gesandten die amerikanische, bulgarische und griechische Regierung gebeten, ihren Einfluss zu Gunsten der Armenier geltend zu machen. Diese haben übereinstimmend geantwortet, dass nur die deutsche Regierung im Stande sei, den Übeln zu steuern, weil sie allein Einfluss auf die türkische Regierung besitze und infolgedessen auch vom Auslande für die inneren Zustände in der Türkei mitverantwortlich gemacht werde.

Dr. Johannes Lepsius

An das Auswärtige Amt
Berlin

R 14086, Ab. 19605.

★

DER BUND ZWISCHEN DEM HNTSCHAKTISCHEN FÜHRER SABAHGÜLIAN UND SCHERIF PASCHA. ZUR HINRICHTUNG VON 20 ARMENIERN

Kaiserlich Deutsche Botschaft
Pera, den 25. Juni 1915
Nr. 399
Durch Kgl. Feldjäger
am 27/6

Der Hochverratsprozess, der mit der Hinrichtung von 20 Armeniern am 15. d. Mts. seinen Abschluss gefunden hat, geht in seinem Grunde zurück auf die von dem
bekannten Scherif Pascha in Paris in Verbindung mit dem Hintschakistenführer Sabahgülian gegen die jungtürkischen Machthaber, speziell gegen Talaat bey, geplanten Anschlägen, auf die sich vor einigen Wochen in Tanin erschienenen Enthüllungen beziehen.

Über die Art, wie der Bund zwischen den Hintschakisten bezw. ihrem Führer Sabahgülian und Scherif Pascha zu stande gekommen ist, wird von gut unterrichteter armenischer Seite folgende Darstellung gegeben:

Sabahgülian, ein ebenso gewandter Redner wie Schriftsteller, leitete vor Wiederherstellung der Konstitution das in Paris erscheinende Parteiorgan der Hintschakisten und galt als der geistige Führer der Partei.

Nach der Revolution kehrte er hierher zurück, hielt sich aber zurück von den Jungtürken, während die andere grosse Partei, die Daschnakzutiun, in enge Verbindung mit dem Comité Union et Progrès trat.

Dies hatte seinen Grund darin, dass Sabahgülian von jeher die Jungtürken bekämpft hatte; namentlich hatte er – noch vor der Revolution – eine Broschüre veröffentlicht, in der er die Jungtürken heftig angriff und sie für ebenso gefährliche Feinde von Freiheit und Fortschritt hinstellte wie Abdulhamid.

Als die Oppositionspartei Itilaf (Entente libérale) sich bildete, schlossen die Hintschakisten unter Sabahgülian ein Kartell mit ihr ab, um sich eine Anzahl Sitze im Parlament zu sichern. Aber noch vor Abschluss der Wahlen verliess Sabahgülian Constantinopel und setzte in Paris, wo er wieder die Leitung des Parteiblattes übernahm, den Kampf gegen die Jungtürken fort.

Trotzdem die grosse Mehrzahl der hiesigen Hintschakisten die Haltung Sabahgülians missbilligten, vermochten sie doch nicht sich seiner zu entledigen.

Vor zwei Jahren berief er einen Parteitag nach Costantza, auf dem beschlossen wurde, den Kampf gegen die Regierung mit gewaltsamen und gesetzlich nicht erlaubten Mitteln zu führen.

An dieser Versammlung nahmen nur wenige Parteimitglieder aus der Türkei teil. Als die Beschlüsse von Costantza hier bekannt wurden, erhoben die türkischen Hintschakisten Protest gegen den Kongress und brachen alle Verbindungen mit Sabahgülian und dessen alter ego Varasdat ab.

Vor etwa einem Jahre verhaftete dann die Polizei zwei von auswärts zugereiste Armenier, die es hiess, von Scherif Pascha und Sabahgülian gedungen waren um Talaat bey zu ermorden. Gleichzeitig erhielt die Regierung durch einen Geheimagenten Kenntnis von den Beschlüssen von Costantza und verhaftete die hiesigen Hintschakistenführer, die indes entlassen wurden, da sie nachweisen konnten, dass
sie keine Gemeinschaft mit Sabahgülian und dessen Anhang hatten; auch
verpflichteten sie sich damals in dieser Sache die Regierung zu unterstützen. Ta-
tsächlich gelang es ihnen die von Sabahgülian ausgesandten Meuchelmörder zu bes-
timmen, von der Ausführung des Anschlages abzustehen; bevor diese aber abreisen
konnten, fielen sie der Polizei in die Hände. Dies erfolgte nach Ausbruch des
Krieges, und die eingeleitete Untersuchung führte dann zu weiteren Verhaftungen.

Nun klagen sich die Hintschakisten und die türkischen Behörden an, ihr Wort
nicht gehalten zu haben. Erstere machen geltend, dass sie das geplante Attentat ver­
hindert hätten; zur Denunzierung ihrer Parteigenossen seien sie nicht verpflichtet
gewesen, das sei gegen die Grundsätze jeder Partei und wäre von den anderen
Parteien (die hier in der Türkei den Charakter von Geheimbünden tragen) ebenso
gehalten. Die Behörde hingegen beschuldigt die Hintschakisten, dass sie, anstatt die
Meuchelmörder auszuliefern, versucht hätten, sie durch die Flucht der Ergreifung zu
entziehen.

Über die den zwanzig Hingerichteten zur Last gelegten Verbrechen macht das
Armenische Patriarchat folgende Angaben:

1) Paramaz, alias Matteos Sarkisian, 2) Agop Kazasian, 3) Minas Keschi-
schian, 4) Sempat Kilindjian:
Diese vier Individuen sind die von Sabahgülian ausgesandten Meuchelmörder;
sie dürfen durch ihr eigenes Geständnis und anderes Belastungsmaterial für über­
führt gelten;

5) Vahan Bojadjian und 6) Dr. Benne Torossian: waren die Korrespondenten
und Vertrauensmänner des Sabahgülian; Dr. Benne hatte auch am Kongress zu Co­
stantza teilgenommen;

7) Armenak Hampartzum und 8) Abraham Muradian: waren aus Europa
hierher gekommen, sonst hat sich ihnen nichts Bestimmtes nachweisen lassen;

9) Aram Atschikbaschian, 10) Hrant Eghavian und 11) Karekin Boghossian:
waren angeklagt, dem armenischen Geheimagenten, der den Behörden die Pläne der
Verschwörung enthüllt hatte, im Auftrage eines Vierten nach dem Leben getrachtet
zu haben; es handelte sich um eine Weiberaffäre ohne politischen Hintergrund; der
zuerst Genannte ist positiv unschuldig und die beiden Anderen sind von dem Opfer,
das sie nur verwundeten, nicht rekognosziert worden;

12) Boghos Boghossian aus Bafra (nicht Egin): hat an der Versammlung in
Constantza teilgenommen;

13) Agop Basmadjian aus Killis und 14) Tomas Tomassian haben vor zwei
Jahren an ihre Parteigenossen einen Aufruf erlassen, in dem sie zum Ankauf von
Waffen aufforderten und “zum Schutze des Vaterlandes und ihrer Ehre”;
15) **Eremia Mattossian**: hatte den unter 9-11 aufgeführten Individuen einen Revolver verkauft;

16) **Mighrditsch Abretzian** aus Harput: sein Name war in dem bei Paramaz (oben 1) gefundenen Adressenbuche als der eines zuverlässigen Mannes verzeichnet; er war wohlhabend und zahlte Beiträge an alle Vereine, u. a. auch an die Hintschakisten; der Vali von Harput hat sich vergeblich für ihn verwendet;

17) **Kegham Vanighian**: aus einem Schreiben des Paramaz (oben 1) an den Dr. Benne (oben 6) ergab sich, dass er als Leiter des Pariser Hintschakistenblattes in Aussicht genommen war;

18) **Jervant Topuzian**: ein Junger Mann von 18 Jahren; sein Verbrechen bestand darin, dass er in einem Briefe an Sabahgulian seine Zustimmung zu den in Costantza gefassten Beschlüssen ausgesprochen hatte;

19) **Ohannes Jerghazarian** aus Kaissarie: sollte, da die Untersuchung nichts Belastendes ergeben hatte, freigelassen werden, als ein Bericht des Mutessarrifs von Kaissarie einging, der ihn beschuldigte, Waffen, Bomben und aufreizende Aufrufe unter der dortigen armenischen Bevölkerung verteilt zu haben. Es lag eine Verwechslung mit einer anderen Persönlichkeit vor; aber der Angeklagte zog es vor, die Strafe für den eigentlichen Schuldigen auf sich zu nehmen;

20) **Karnik Bojadjian**: ist auf Grund eines Briefes an Jervant Topuzian (oben 18) verurteilt, in dem er die Absicht aussprach Jemand umbringen zu wollen, der ihm Unrecht zugefügt hatte; nach Ansicht des Gerichts war damit Talaat bey gemeint.

Der Patriarch ist der Überzeugung, dass nur wenige der Hingerichteten im Sinne der Anklage schuldig bzw. der ihnen zur Last gelegten Handlungen überführt waren, und dass die Todesstrafe eine viel zu harte Ahndung der vorgekommenen leichteren Verfehlungen war; das Gericht habe aber auf Weisung von oben hin auf die höchste Strafe erkannt.

Diese Überzeugung herrscht auch in der armenischen Bevölkerung, die in dieser Massenhinrichtung eine terroristische Massregel der Regierung gegen die Armenier im allgemeinen und einen Racheakt der Jungtürken gegen die ihnen feindlich gesinnten Hintschakisten erblickt.

(Wangenheim)

Seiner Excellenz dem Reichskanzler
Herrn von Bethmann Hollweg

R 14086, Ab. 20447.
DIE UNERWÜNSCHTEN POLITISCHEN FOLGEN DER REISE VON DR. LEPSIUS IN DIE TÜRKEI

Telegramm

Entzifferung


Wangenheim
Botschafter

An das Auswärtige Amt
R 14086, Ab. 20525.

★

ERFOLGLOSENER VERSUCH, DR. LEPSIUS VON SEINER TÜRKEIREISE ZURÜCKZUHALTEN

Tel. i. Ziff.
[Auswärtiges Amt] [Berlin], den 4. Juli 1915
Nr. 1276
Antwort auf Telegramm No 1523

Lepsius abreist Montag und wird in 10 bis 14 Tagen dort eintreffen. Da er alle Vorbereitungen und Verabredungen bereits getroffen hatte, war Versuch ihn
zurückzuhalten erfolglos. Er versprach jedoch sich sofort nach der Ankunft auf der Kaiserlichen Botschaft zu melden und deren Weisungen strikt zu befolgen.

[Dem Kaiserlichen Botschafter in Konstantinopel]

U. St. S.

R 14086, Ab. 20525.

DIE DEPORTATION DER ARMENIER AUS DER PROVINZ TRAPESUNT


Abschrift A 22559.
Kaiserlich Deutsches Konsulat.
Bericht Nr. 35.
J. Nr. Geh. 316.


Die Christen haben die ihnen von den Türken bewiesene vorurteilslose Behandlung schlecht gelohnt. Sie machten aus ihrer Abneigung gegen die Türkei und ihren Sympathien für den Dreierverband, in Sonderheit Russland, kein Hehl, und die hier
umgehenden Gerüchten unsinnigster Art, wie Fall der Dardanellen, Konstantinopels, Erserums, russische Landung bei Midia, oder gar Flucht des Sultans nach Brussa, sind auf sie zurückzuführen. Es kam dann die Aufdeckung der Verschwörung gegen das jungtürkische System und seine Führer, der Aufstand der Armenier in der Provinz Wan und Unruhen von ihrer Seite an anderen Orten der Türkei. Dies veranlasste wohl die Hohe Pforte gegen die Armenier Ausnahmemassregeln zu ergreifen.


Der Abtransport aus der Stadt Trapezunt und der nächsten Umgebung ist beendet. Einige Selbstmorde und eine Brandstiftung kamen vor. Sonstige Zwischenfälle sind nicht zu verzeichnen.


Zur Ehre der türkischen Bevölkerung in ihrer Gesamtheit muss gesagt werden, dass sehr viele Türken mit der Ausweisung der Frauen und Kinder nicht einverstanden sind. Andererseits muss festgestellt werden, dass die Armenier bei dieser Gelegenheit einen sehr wenig anziehenden Charakter gezeigt haben. Die ersten, welche um Intervention für ihr Verbleiben baten, waren die Geistlichen; der Gedanke, dass ihr Platz gerade in Zeiten der Not an der Seite ihrer Gemeinde sei, kam ihnen überhaupt nicht; als eine Ausnahme für die Priester nicht erzielt werden konnte, bat der Vertreter des hiesigen Bischofs, ein Diakon im weissen Bart, den Vali um die Erlaubnis zum Islam überzutreten zu dürfen, worauf ihm dieser erwiderte, dem stände nichts im Wege, er brauche nur das moslemische Glaubensbekenntnis auszusprechen und sich danach der Beschneidung zu unterwerfen, im übrigen wende sich die Ausweisung aber nicht gegen die Christen, sondern gegen die Armenier; ein zum Islam übergetretener Armenian werde dann eben als moslemischer Armenian ausgewiesen. Die männlichen Armenier verliessen nach der Bekanntgabe des Ausweisungsbefehls ihr Haus überhaupt nicht mehr, sondern sandten stets ihre
Frauen; manche Angestellte der Regierung und der Bank erwirkten für sich einen Aufschub und liessen ihre Familien allein ziehen.


In den kritischen Tagen wurde die in nächster Nähe des Kaiserlichen Konsulats gelegene Polizeiwache militärisch verstärkt und meine Privatwohnung unauffällig.

gez. Dr. Bergfeld

Seiner Excellenz dem Reichskanzler
Herrn von Bethmann Hollweg

Staatsarchiv Dresden, Akten Nr. 1952, Bl. 13-18.

★

MITTEILUNG DER HOHEN PFORTE ZUR AUSTREIBUNG DER ARMENIER AUS MUSCH

Telegramm
Der. K. Botschafter Pera, den 11. Juli 1915
an Auswärtiges Amt
Nr. 1575

Entzifferung


Bitte Hilfsbund aus diesem Anlass anheimzustellen, der Kaiserlichen Botschaft Liste seiner Anstalten in türkisch Armenien und des Personals baldmöglichst einreichen.

Wangenheim

R 14086, Ab. 1158.
Die Aussiedlung der Armenier aus Erzurum

Kaiserlich Deutsches Konsulat
J. Nr. 580
Geheim-Bericht Nr. 23

Die Aussiedlung der Armenier ist nun zu einem gewissen Abschluss gelangt, d.h. es befinden sich im Amtsbezirk des hiesigen Konsulats keine Armenier mehr. Es scheint mir daher angebracht, über die mit der Armenier-Austreibung im Zusammenhang stehenden Vorfälle der letzten Monate kurz zusammenfassend zu berichten.

Bis Anfang Mai lebten die Armenier hier frei und ungehindert und konnten ungestört ihren Geschäften nachgehen. Einzelne Vorfälle, wie die Ermordung des Bankdirektors Pastormadjan und ähnliches, übten nur vorübergehend eine beunruhigende Wirkung aus. Die Furcht vor einem Massaker durch die Türken war allerdings vorhanden und nicht unbegründet, doch dürfte die Anwesenheit und Tätigkeit General Posseldts sowie des deutschen Konsuls den Ausbruch eines solchen verhindert haben.


* Vergl. Lepsius, S. 116-121 (Dok. Nr. 129).
** Die bei diesem Bericht erwähnten Anlagen befinden sich im Archiv nicht. Einige von ihnen werden in dieser Sammlung chronologisch publiziert.
In derselben Zeit wurden die Bewohner der Ersindjaner Ebene bei ihrem Durchzug durch die Schlucht von Kemach gleichfalls bis auf wenige beraubt und getötet, die Frauen entführt. Hierbei soll, wie mir glaubwürdig mitgeteilt wurde, türkisches Militär bzw. Gendarmen beteiligt gewesen sein.


Was nun meine Haltung bei der ganzen Frage anbetrifft, so habe ich mich von folgenden Gesichtspunkten leiten lassen.

sorgane auf jeden Fall vermieden wird. Der Wali gab ohne weiteres zu, dass meine Ausführung berechtigt, wies aber seinerseits darauf hin, dass die Verantwortung nicht ihn, sondern das Armee-Oberkommando treffe, unter dessen Befehl er stehe. Dasselbe habe trotz der ihm bekannten Unsicherheit der Wege die Aussiedelung der Armenier befohlen, ohne genügenden Schutz für dieselben zu gewähren. Im übrigen versprach der Wali sein Möglichstes zu tun zur Verhinderung von Wiederholungen. Tatsächlich ist er auch bemüht gewesen, für den Schutz der Vertriebenen, soweit ihm das bei den entgegengesetzten Absichten des Komitees und anderer massgebender Persönlichkeiten möglich war, zu sorgen. Um dem Widerstand, den er bei seinen diesbezüglichen Bestrebungen beim Armee-Oberkommando sowohl wie beim Komitee fand, zu begegnen, reichten aber weder sein Einfluss noch seine Energie aus. Im allgemeinen sind die Bewohner Erserums jedoch bei ihrer Aussiedlung weit besser behandelt worden als die anderer Städte. Dem Entgegenkommen des Wali und meinen Bemühungen zufolge wurden ihnen folgende Erleichterungen gewährt:

1) Die meisten erhielten eine Frist von 14 Tagen zu Reisevorbereitungen.
2) Es wurde ihnen gestattet, ihre Sachen mitzunehmen oder zu verkaufen.
4) Die Regierung stellte vielen mittellosen Familien Ochsenkarren unentgeltlich zur Verfügung.
5) Diejenigen Männer, deren Familien ohne weiteren männlichen Schutz waren, wurden aus den Arbeiter-Bataillonen entlassen und durften ihre Familien begleiten.

Eine weitere humane Anordnung der Civil-Verwaltung, dass Kranke, alleinstehende Frauen und Kinder in Erserum bleiben sollten, wurde durch Befehl der Militärbehörde bzw. auf Betreiben des Komitees aufgehoben.

Es ist tief bedauerlich, dass infolge der von der Militärbehörde geduldeten Haltung des Komitees und seiner dunklen Hintermänner die militärisch und politisch in mancher Hinsicht vielleicht zu begründende Massnahme der Aussiedelung der Armenier aus den Grenzgebieten in einen Rache-, Vernichtungs- und Raubfeldzug gegen sie umgewandelt wurde. Von vernünftig denkenden weiten Kreisen der türkischen Bevölkerung, besonders von den Grundbesitzern, wird diese Ausrottungspolitik auch nicht gebilligt. Diese Kreise, die mit den Armeniern zusammengearbeitet haben und gut mit ihnen ausgekommen sind, erkennen die grosse

Es erscheint mir ferner nicht ausgeschlossen, dass sowohl diese Erzählung wie überhaupt die Behandlung der Armenier-Frage durch das Komitee bei den Gegnern desselben als Agitationsstoff gegen die jetzige Regierung ausgenutzt werden wird. Besonders dürfte diese Agitation dann einsetzen, wenn sich die durch das Fehlen der wertvollen armenischen Arbeitskräfte bedingten wirtschaftlichen Verluste im nächsten Jahr fühlbar machen werden.

Meine Berichte und meine Tätigkeit in der Armenier-Frage zusammenfassend bemerke ich Folgendes:

Es würde hier zu weit führen, auf die Ursachen der Armenierunruhen einzugehen und zu untersuchen, ob dieselben durch zweckmässige Massregeln und Verhandlungen der Regierung hätten vermieden werden können. Soviel mir bekannt, ist in dieser Hinsicht rechtzeitig nichts geschehen. Es ist ferner selbstverständlich, dass dort, wo auf Betreiben der armenischen Revolutionskomitees und russischer Emissäre Aufstände stattgefunden haben, mit aller Strenge gegen die Schuldigen vorgegangen wird. Ich hätte sogar viel schärfere rechtzeitige Vorbeugungsmassregeln der Regierung und der Militärbehörden an bedrohten Punkten erwartet und gewünscht, nicht aber, wie das meist geschehen, nachträgliche Vergeltungsmassregeln. Für
einen allgemein beabsichtigten und vorbereiteten Aufstand der Armenier fehlen meines Erachtens jedoch jegliche Beweise.

So sind z.B. im Vilajet Erserum weder Waffen noch kompromittierende Schriftstücke gefunden worden. Wäre hier ein Aufstand geplant gewesen, so war dafür die günstigste Gelegenheit im Januar, als die Russen 35 km vor Erserum standen und die Garnison Erserums nur aus einigen hundert Mann Gendarmerie bestand, während sich in Erserum in den Arbeiter-Bataillonen allein 3 - 4000 Armenier befanden.

Dass sich eine von ihrer eigenen Regierung unterdrückte und schlecht behandelte, folglich also unzufriedene Grenzbevölkerung anderer Nationalität und anderen Glaubens einem siegreich vordringenden Feinde desselben Glaubens, der sich zudem als Befreier ausgibt und sie mit Versprechungen lockt, anschliesst, erscheint mir, wenn auch bedauerlich, so doch natürlich und ist auch auf anderen Kriegsschauplätzen vorgekommen. Ebenso natürlich sind dagegen politische und scharfe militärische Abwehrmassnahmen. Es erscheint mir aber unnatürlich und einer auf Civilisation Anspruch erhebenden Regierung unwürdig, wenn dieselbe zuerst keinerlei Massregeln trifft, um einer vorauszusehenden Erhebung einiger Teile eines mit Recht unzufriedenen Volkes, sei es durch geeignete militärische Vorkehrungen, sei es durch politische Verhandlungen vorzubeugen, sondern eine solche durch ihre Untätigkeit und durch das provokatorische Verhalten ihrer Polizeiorgane und "Tschätäh" geradezu herausfordert.

Sie hat damit auch weite Kreise ihres eigenen Volkes der Zügellosigkeit der durch Rassenhass und "Vergeltungswahnsinn" erregten Volksmassen preisgegeben. Danach aber benutzt dieselbel Regierung die Gelegenheit, um als Folge und als Strafe der durch ihre eigene Untätigkeit absichtlich oder unabsichtlich hervorgerufenen Bewegung ein ganzes Volk kulturell und wirtschaftlich zu vernichten und auszurotten.

Dass diese Ausrottung möglich, dass sich, wie das hier geschehen, Zehntausende von Armeniern ohne Gegenwehr von einer kleinen Anzahl Kurden und Freischärln abschlachten lassen, ist wohl auch ein Beweis dafür, wie wenig kampffroh und revolutionär dieses Volk gesinnt ist. Die Armenier, besonders die Stadtbevölkerer, diese "Juden des Ostens", sind wohl gerissene Handelsleute, und kurzichtige Politiker, aber in ihrer Mehrzahl und soweit ich sie kennen gelernt, keine aktiven Revolutionäre. Wären sie es und hätten sie Waffen besessen, dann dürften sie sich auch, als in der Ueberzahl befindlich und da der Tod ihnen ja auf jeden Fall sicher, der Aussiedelung gewaltsam widersetzt haben. Dies ist aber nur an wenigen Stellen - wohl
den Sitzen der Revolutionskomitees - geschehen. Ueberall sonst verlief die Aus-
riedelung ohne jeden Zwischenfall und haben sie sich dann später mit Gottergeben-
heit abschlachten lassen. Die Furchtsamkeit der türkischen Armenier dürfte
vielleicht nur noch durch die Angst der Türken vor ihnen übertroffen werden.

Auf Grund dieser Erwägungen und in Anbetracht der ganzen Sachlage hielt ich
es als Vertreter der deutschen Regierung für meine Pflicht, dem Vorgehen der Re-
gierung gegen die Armenier und den gegen sie getroffenen Massnahmen nicht
stillschweigend zuzusehen, sondern, da wir einerseits diese Massnahmen nicht
grundsätzlich hindern können, andererseits aber nach Lage der Dinge doch eine
moralische Verantwortung dafür werden übernehmen müssen, wenigstens auf eine
möglicherweise Form der Ausführung hinzuarbeiten. Ich habe die Unbequemlich-
keiten ja Gefahren, die mit meiner Haltung bisweilen für mich verknüpft waren,
auch deshalb gern auf mich genommen, weil ich annahm, dass es meiner Regierung
späterhin nur angenehm sein dürfte, zu wissen und bekannt geben zu können, dass
ihr hiesiger Vertreter mit allen ihm zu Gebote stehenden gesetzlichen Mitteln für
eine humane und rechtmässige Behandlung unschuldiger Leidender eingetreten ist.

Bei diesen meinen Bestrebungen bin ich von vernünftig denkenden Türken aus
Regierungs- und Militärkreisen unterstützt worden, soweit dieselben davon nicht
durch die Furcht vor dem Komitee zurückgehalten wurden. In dem Ortskomitee
wiederum war es eine kleine Gruppe ziemlich minderwertiger, aber die anderen ter-
rorisierender Individuen, die, durch persönliches Interesse und Habgier veranlasst,
einen Vernichtungsfeldzug gegen die Armenier predigten. Dies waren übrigens die-
selben Leute, die durch ihr beispiellos brutales Vorgehen in den von den Türken
vorübergehend eroberten Gebieten, wie Ardanuss, Ardahan, Olti u.s.w. die türkische
Sache bei den muselmanischen Bewohnern Russlands auf lange, wenn nicht auf
immer, hinaus schädigten.

Von diesen Leuten ist der Begriff "Heiliger Krieg" zu einem Deckmantel für
Raub und Plünderung herabgewürdigt worden, und haben sie es erreicht, dass die
muselmanischen Grenzbewohner Russlands vor Nichts mehr Angst haben, als vor
ihren türkischen "Befreieren". Leider ist der Einfluss dieser dunklen Komitee-
Hintermänner, die ausserdem durchaus deutschfeindlich sind, stärker als man im
allgemeinen anzunehmen geneigt ist. Diesen Einfluss erhalten sie sich schon durch
ihrr Terrorisierungssystem und kann derselbe meines Erachtens nur durch sehr ener-
gisches Auftreten gegen sie gebrochen werden. Ein Ueberhandnehmen des Ein-
flusses und der "Regierungsmethoden" dieser Leute bedeutet eine Gefahr nicht nur
für die Türken, sondern auch für uns - ihre Bundesgenossen. Denn die Art der Behandlung der Armenier-Frage hat deutlich gezeigt, welches gefährliches Instrument die Regierungsgewalt in der Hand keine Verantwortung tragender und nur persönliches Interesse kennender Leute ist.

Ich erlaube mir diesem Bericht ergebends folgende Anlagen beizufügen:

1) einen Bericht über die Erlebnisse eines dem Massaker bei Terdschan entronnenen Bauern. Diesen Mann habe ich am selben Tage dem Wali vorgeführt, der durch ihn zuerst nähere Mitteilungen über die Vorgänge bei Terdschan erhielt. Der betreffende Kaimakan ist vom Wali daraufhin abgesetzt worden.
2) Bericht über das vom Kriegsfreiwilligen Karl Schlimme auf seinem Ritt nach Trapezunt Gesehene.
3) Schreiben des armenischen Bischofs von Erserum an das Konsulat.
4) u. 5) Schreiben des armenischen katholischen Bischofs an das Konsulat.


Scheubner-Richter

An seine Durchlaucht Kaiserlichen Botschafter
Herrn Hohenlohe-Langenberg, Konstantinopel

R. 14088, zu Ab. 28584.
DIE VERTREIBUNG DER ARMENIER NIMMT DEN CHARAKTER VON
MASSAKERN AN

Telegramm

[Adana, den 6. September 1915]
No. 22


Büge

[An den deutschen Botschafter in Konstantinopel]

Konst./Ankara 170, Ab. 53ª.

★

ANWEISUNGEN FÜR KAISERLICHE KONSULATE BETREFFEND DIE
ARMENIERFRAGE

[Konstantinopel, September 1915]

I. Instruktionen der Kaiserlichen Botschaft an die Kaiserlichen Konsulate betreffend Behandlung der Armenierfrage:

Unter dem 31. Mai wurden die Konsulate Erzerum, Mossul, Adana, Aleppo und Bagdad davon verständigt, dass das Kriegsministerium zur Eindämmung armenischer Spionage und um Massenerhebungen der Armenier vorzubeugen neben andern Massnahmen (wie Schliessung der Armenischen Schulen, Unterdrückung der Armenischen Zeitungen u. s. w.) beschlossen habe, alle nicht ganz einwandfreien Familien aus den damals insurgierten Zentren nach Mesopotamien zu überführen,
sowie dass Enver Pascha uns dringend ersucht hatte, ihm hierbei nicht in die Arme zu fallen. An diese Mitteilung war die Bemerkung geknüpft, dass wir mit Rücksicht auf die politische und militärische Lage der Türkei die Massnahmen der Regierung nicht grundsätzlich hinderten, sondern nur in der Ausführung zu mildern suchten.


Er sowohl wie die Konsuln zu Aleppo, Erzerum, Mossul, Samsun haben sich wiederholt im Sinne des Vorstehenden bei den Provinzialbehörden verwendet.

Nachdem hier durch Berichte aus den verschiedensten Quellen bekannt worden war, dass man vielfach die deutsche Regierung und ihre Vertreter in der Türkei als die Urheber der Armenierverfolgungen bezeichnete, erging unter dem 11. August folgende Weisung an die in Betracht kommenden Konsulate:

"Die Armeniergreuel haben in den letzten Wochen trotz unserer wiederholten Vorstellungen einen Umfang angenommen, der es uns zur Pflicht macht, unsere entschiedene Missbilligung dieser Vorgänge so erforderlich zum Ausdruck zu bringen. Verschiedentlich ist von Türkischen Offizieren, Beamten, Geistlichen und anderen Personen im Innern offen ausgesprochen worden, dass wir die Urheber dieser
Greuel seien: einer solchen uns kompromittierenden Auffassung ist gegebenenfalls energisch entgegenzutreten”.

II. Unser Standpunkt in der Armenischen Frage war der, dass die Türkische Regierung im militärischen Interesse und im Interesse der inneren Sicherheit des Landes berechtigt war zu außerordentlichen Mitteln zu greifen, die als Akte der Notwehr bezeichnet werden können, wie z. B. die zwangsweise Verschickung der Armenischen Bevölkerung aus den durch die Russische Invasion und durch die Aktion der Französischen und Englischen Flotten bedrohten Gebieten.

Dahingegen haben das Auswärtige Amt und die Kaiserliche Botschaft die Ausschreitungen aller Art gemissbilligt, die sich in Gefolge dieser Zwangsmassregeln einstellten: die Erwartungen einzelner Persönlichkeiten, die Massenhinrichtungen, wie sie namentlich in Diarbekir und Kaissarie stattgefunden haben, die Überfälle auf die Verbanntentransporte, die an einzelnen Orten (in Musch, Erzerum, Ersindschan, Trapezunt, Diarbekir, Angora, Malatia) systematisch organisierten Niedermetzeln von Tausenden wehrloser Männer und Frauen, die Ausdehnung der Metzeleien auf die Christen anderer Konfessionen, die keine politische Interessengemeinschaft mit den eigentlichen (s. g. Gregorianischen) Armeniern haben und ihnen zum Teil feindlich gegenüberstehen, auch die schonungslose Behandlung der Ausgesiedelten, die aller Subsistanzmittel beraubt, dem Hunger und Elend preisgegeben wurden, erschien nicht zu rechtfertigen.

Ebensowenig ist vom militärischen Standpunkte aus die Aussiedlung der armenischen Bevölkerung aus den von Kriegsschauplatz entfernten Landesteilen zu begründen.

Der wirtschaftliche Schaden, den diese Massregel angerichtet hat, berührt in gleichem Masse Handel, Ackerbau und Industrie des Landes; die deutschen Interessen sind schon jetzt empfindlich in Mitleidenschaft gezogen.

Die Kaiserliche Botschaft hat die Pforte im gemeinschaftlichen Interesse der Verbündeten wiederholt auf die politischen und handelswirtschaftlichen Folgen der Armenierverfolgungen aufmerksam gemacht und auf Abstellung der schlimmsten Missbräuche gedrungen; sie hat hierbei absichtlich den humanitären Standpunkt nicht betont und auch den Anschein gemieden, als ob sie sich in eine innerpolitische Angelegenheit mischen wollte.

In zahlreichen Fällen, in denen deutsche Interessen berührt waren, hat die Botschaft in offizieller und offiziöser Form sich für einzelne Armenier verwendet.

An die Kaiserlichen Deutschen
Konsulate in der Türkei

Konst./ Ankara, 171, zu Ab. 6381.

★

BERICHT ÜBER DIE ANKUNFT DER VERSCHICKTEN ARMENIER IN ALEPPO, ÜBER DIE ZAHL DER TODESFÄLLE UND DIE MASSREGELN GEGEN DIE ANDEREN CHRISTEN IN DEN ÖSTLICHEN WILAJETS

Kaiserlich Deutsches Konsulat Aleppo, den 27. September 1915
K. No. 95
No. 2130

Über die Verschickung der Armenier beehre ich mich weiter das folgende zu berichten:
1) Einzelne Scenen, wie sie sich sonst wohl nur unbeobachtet abgespielt haben, etc., rollten sich kürzlich vor den Augen der Bevölkerung in Aleppo selbst ab. Die Regierung hat seitdem ihre Massnahmen so getroffen, dass die Scharen der Verschickten Aleppo grösstenteils nicht mehr berühren sollen.

Auf der Bahn sind auch Sterbende noch mit verladen worden. Am nächsten Morgen lagen zwei Tote an der Verladestelle. Die Zahl der Todesfälle unter den Verschickten ist seit Anfang September, wo sie im täglichen Durchschnitt 25 betrug, bis Mitte September rasch auf 40, 60 und mehr gestiegen. Da nicht für alle Verbannten Unterkunft hat beschafft werden können, kommt es vor, dass Sterbende auf der Strasse liegen. Der Beerdigungsdienst ist wie alles andere schlecht organisiert. Es war mir erzählt worden, es sei einige mal vorgekommen, dass zur Beerdigung bestimmte Körper im Augenblick, wo man sie in das Grab legen wollte, - sie werden ohne Sarg beerdigt, - noch Lebenszeichen von
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Gedankenlosigkeit, mangelnde Voraussicht und Härte der oberen Behörden und die Rücksicht der unteren Organe wirken zusammen, dass die verbannten Armenier teilweise nicht wie Menschen behandelt werden. Wenn die geschilderten Dinge in Aleppo vorkommen, unter den Augen der Behörden und der Bevölkerung, welche Behandlung muss man da in der Einsamkeit des Marsches voraussetzen?


Es ist nicht nur die Härte dieses Geschickes, welche mich veranlasst hat, Vorstellungen dagegen bei Euer Durchlaucht zu erheben. Die türkische Regierung schadet sich selbst und uns als Verbündeten. Sie bedroht nicht nur ihre einzige, für einen Feldzug gegen Aegypten vorhandene Etappenstrasse mit der Gefahr der Verschlechtung, sondern sie stopft sie auch mit zehntausenden von Menschen voll, während sie jeden Augenblick für grössere Truppenbewegungen gebraucht werden kann.

kann erst die Zukunft lehren. Jedenfalls besteht kein Zweifel, dass auch andere Christen als Armenier Gegenstand der Verfolgung geworden sind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mardin</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>27000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goliye</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Armen</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalat Mara</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansuriye</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benabil</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Die roten Zahlen bezeichnen die ermordeten und verschleppten Menschen. Entfernungen in Stunden von Mardin: Goliye 1 1/2, Tell Armen 4, Kalat Mara 1/2, Mansuriye 1/4, Benabil 3/4.

Der in Spalte 3 genannte Bevölkerungsteil gehört zwar religiös der armenisch-katholischen Kirche an, spricht aber arabisch und gilt im Bewusstsein des Volkes nicht als armenisch. Wahrscheinlich ist er auch der Rasse nach nicht armenisch. Handelte es sich um Armenier, die allmählig die arabische Sprache angenommen hätten, so würden doch die Familiennamen armenisch geblieben sein. Auch diese aber sind durchgehend arabisch.

In Söird, (Wilajet Bitlis) und Djeziret ibn Omar (Wilajet Diarbekir) sind die Chaldäer, im Djebel et Tor nördlich Mardin sind sämtliche Christen ausgerottet.

Wie erst verspätet hier bekannt geworden ist, sind zwei Mutesarrifs von Mardin abgesetzt worden, weil sie sich weigerten, die Befehle der Regierung gegen die Armenier auszuführen.


Trotz der Zusicherung der Regierung, dass die noch nicht Verbannten an ihren Wohnsitzen bleiben dürften, sind ausserdem wieder 40 Häuser in Marasch geräumt worden und zwar überwiegend solche besserer Familien, darunter des weltlichen Vertreters der katholischen Gemeinde. Das Bestreben der Regierung geht darauf hinaus, alles was Bildung, Besitz und Einfluss hat, zu beseitigen und nichts übrig zu
lassen, als die niedrigste fühlerlose Volksschicht. In Marasch und Aintab ist wie an vielen anderen Stellen dieses Ziel bereits erreicht.


5) Die Armenier Aleppos haben ausser anderen Zufluchtsstätten für hier durchgekommene Verbannte auch ein Haus zur Aufnahme von Neuverwaisten bestimmt. In diesem befanden sich am 23. September

43 Witwen
48 Waisenknaben, deren Mutter noch lebt
132 Knaben, die Vollwaisen sind
46 Waisenmädchen, deren Mutter noch lebt
100 Mädchen, die Vollwaisen sind


Gleichen Bericht lasse ich dem Herrn Reichskanzler zugehen.

Rößler

Seiner Exzellenz dem Reichskanzler
Herrn Dr. von Bethmann Holliweg

R 14088, Ab. 30049.

★

* Bei diesem Aktenstück im Archiv gibt es keine Anlage 209
Euerer Exzellenz beehre ich mich, in den Anlagen eine Anzahl hier gemachter Aufzeichnungen über das gewaltsame Vorgehen der jungtürkischen Regierung gegen die armenische Nation abschriftlich zu überreichen.

Die teils von mir teils auf meine Veranlassung von den Beamten des Konsulats gefertigten Notizen beziehen sich ausschliesslich auf solche Fälle, welche entweder innerhalb des Amtsbezirks sich ereigneten oder hier durch durchreisende Armenier zur Kenntnis des Konsulats gebracht wurden.

Wie hier erzählt wird, sollen an den verschiedensten Orten im Innern des Landes, besonders in den Gebieten der türkisch-arabischen Sprachgrenze, die Armenier in grausamster Weise niedergemetzelt worden sein.

Ueberall und in jedem Falle fällt die Verantwortung auf die türkischen Behörden. Da die türkische Regierung offiziell die Erklärung veröffentlicht, dass die gesamte armenische Bevölkerung sich vollkommenster Sicherheit des Lebens und des Eigentums erfreut, glaube ich, der Kenntnisnahme Euerer Exzellenz diejenigen Vorkommnisse nicht fernhalten zu dürfen, aus welchen die Art und Weise des Vorgehens der Regierung gegen die Armenier festgestellt werden kann.

Seiner Exzellenz dem Reichskanzler
Herrn Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg

R 14088, Ab. 30012.

ANLAGE I

Ingenieur Paul Kern von Eregli, z.Zt. hier, teilte mir gestern, Montag 12. September, mit, dass nach seinen Wahrnehmungen die türkischen Behörden die vertrie-
benen Armenier in jeder Weise brandschatzen. Z.B. wird für das Betreten der Stadt Eregli eine Taxe von 5 Piastern (1/4 Medschid), für das Passieren einer kleinen Verbindungsbrücke zwischen zwei Lagern von Deportierten eine solche von 2 Piastern erhoben.

Brot wird nur gegen Bezahlung geliefert, Wasser zuweilen gänzlich verweigert.

Das gleiche gilt für alle solche Ansammlungen. Nirgends erhalten die Leute Nahrung umsonst, bisweilen müssen sie, wie in Osmanié, für ein Brot 5 - 8 Piaster zahlen. In Osmanié liegen viele Tausende (bis 20000 Personen), die in der Nacht von den Dorfbewohnern bestohlen werden.

Adana, 13. September 1915

ANLAGE 2

Ein türkischer Offizier Namens Assim Bey, der seinen Dienst in Mamuré bei den Genietruppen verrichtet, hat anfangs September d.Js. einen Armenier Namens Mis-sak Simikian gesagt, dass von 60000 verbannten Armeniern aus Kharput kaum 15000 in Mossul angekommen seien. Die übrigen seien unterwegs vernichtet worden.

Zwei Kurden aus Mardin, die den Provianttransport nach Konstantinopel besorgen, haben einem kurdisch sprechenden Armenier, Markos Gasarian, auf seine Anfrage, wie es in den Ostprovinzen Kleinasiens zugeht, geantwortet, dass alle Armenier in Kharput, Diarbekir, Mardin und Werenschehir niedergemetzelt worden seien.

Missak Simikian und Markos Gasarian haben Vorstehendes in Adana mir persönlich erklärt.

ANLAGE 3

Der frühere zweite Direktor des türkischen Seminars (Dar el muallemin) und jetzige Direktor des türkischen Waisenhauses Osman Bey hat den christlichen Zöglingen erklärt, dass sie entweder zum Islam übertreten oder das Waisenhaus verlassen müssten.

Nach Mitteilung der Lehrerin am Waisenhaus, Fräulein Sirpuhi, welche mich aufsuchte, haben in Folge der an sie gestellten Zumutung sämtliche Mädchen, etwa 35, das Haus verlassen und Aufnahme in verschiedenen Familien gesucht. Ihr Schicksal ist mir nicht bekannt geworden; ich hatte sie an die amerikanische Mission verwiesen.
Von den etwa 60 christlichen Knaben des Waisenhauses sind 14 dort verblieben, da sie nicht wussten, was sie anfangen sollten. Die Mohammedanisierung dieser Zurückgebliebenen hat bereits begonnen.

Osman Bey hatte den Kindern erklärt, dass die christliche Religion in dem Osmanischen Waisenhaus nicht geduldet werden könne. Die Zöglinge hätten sich jeder Religionsbetätigung, besonders des Betens, unbedingt zu enthalten. (Sirpuhi).

Adana, den 30. September 1915.

ANLAGE 4


Ein Räuberüberfall grösseren Stils auf fortziehende Armenier fand kürzlich, 18. September, bei der Station Veissié (zwischen Dschihan und Toprakkale der Bagdadbahn im Wilajet Adana) statt.

Ein gewisser Manuk Schahbasian, Grosskaufmann in Adana, dessen Familie sich andere befreundete Armenier angeschlossen hatten, sodass ein Wagenzug von 33 Wagen entstand, wurde Abends von türkischen Räubern überfallen.

Da die per Wagen abziehenden Armenier ohne Weiteres als wohlhabend gelten, haben es diese – mohammedanischen – Räuber vor Allem auf solche Karawanen abgesehen. Nach ihrer Auffassung tun sie eigentlich kaum etwas Unrechtes, wenn sie die Armenier überfallen und unter Umständen todschlagen, da ihnen von den Behörden ziemlich unverblümmt der Auftrag zur Niedermetzelung der Armenier gegeben ist.

(In dieser Hinsicht beweisend ist u.a. das Verhalten der Eisenbahnstreckenarbeiter bei Ulu Kischla, die sich für die Ermordung der Armenier direkt auf den Kaimakam von Ulu Kischla beziehen: Mitteilung des Eisenbah.chefs Meier in Mersina).

Die überfallenen Armenier zahlten zusammen 1200Ltq. an die Räuber und durften dann ihre Reise fortfahren. Die Zahl dieser Gelegenheitsräuber steht nicht fest; es dürften jedenfalls kaum mehr als einige wenige gewesen sein, schon aus Rücksicht auf den Beuteanteil eines jeden.

In einiger Entfernung hinter dem langgestreckten Wagenzuge des Schahbasian fuhren die Wagen des Orman Katibi Lewon Effendi. In Folge des schlechten Weges kamen diese Wagen nur mühsam vorwärts. Auch hier erschienen die Räuber, wahrscheinlich dieselben, welche Schahbasians Zug gebrandschattet. Für diesen Überfall
steht die Anzahl der Räuber fest, es waren nur zwei Personen. Nachdem die Mohammedaner ihr Bedürfnis nach dem Blut der Armenier durch Stechen und Schlagen wenigstens teilweise befriedigt hatten, erpressten sie 35 Ltq. von Lewon Effendi. Die Verletzungen desselben waren ziemlich bedeutend, sodass er ausser Stande war, die Reise fortzusetzen, und nach Adana zurückkehrte, wo er augenblicklich sich noch befindet.


ANLAGE 5

Am 10. September 1915 habe ich die beiden Armenier

Stepan Garabekjian 38 J. alt aus Talas
Hakop Papasian 43 J. alt aus Talas

vernommen und Folgendes festgestellt:

Am 28. August d.J. haben die armenischen Bewohner von Talas (Kaisarije) ihr Hab und Gut verlassend, den dortigen Behörden überlassend, die Verbannungsreise nach Mesopotamien antreten müssen:

Am 29. August haben die vier Gendarmen und zwei Polizisten, die die Karawane der Verbannten von Talas an begleiteten, unterwegs an einem unbewohnten Orte und in der Abenddunkelheit ihr Raubwerk begonnen. Mit geladenen Gewehren, mit Gewehrkolbenschlägen, und mit Knutenhieben haben sie die verbannten Armenier eingeschüchtert und von ihnen Geld herausgepresst. Der eine der Misshandelten, Arabadschi Alexan hat infolge Verblutungen unterwegs, nicht weit von Nigde (Konia) den Tod gefunden:

Z. B. haben die Nachstehenden folgende Beträge den Gendarmen bezahlt

Garabed Sajabalian: 10 Ltq.
Artin Garamanian 18 Ltq.
Stepan Garabekjian 5 Ltq.
Hakop Papasian 5 Ltq.

Die gesamte den Gendarmen und Polizisten bezahlte Summe beträgt etwa 450 Ltq.
Diesen Gendarmen haben den sechsjährigen Sohn des Stepan Garabejekian auf den Boden geworfen und den Tod desselben herbeigeführt.

Es sind wieder dieselben Gendarmen gewesen die mit Knutenhieben das Kind Pehliwanians getötet haben.

ANLAGE 6

Am 8. September 1915 haben die nachstehenden 3 Armenierinnen
Antaram Tersian
Mariam Erserumzian
Agawni Kasandschian
aus Orta Köj (Bezirk Amassia Wilajet Sivas) mir Folgendes mitgeteilt:


Vier Personen aus Haddi Köy sind von den Gendarmen vor den Augen der Frauen erschossen worden.

Die Namen einiger Opfer, die die oben erwähnten Frauen angeben konnten sind folgende:

Avedis Terzian, 48 Jahre alt
Nigogos Erserumzian, 40 J. alt
Kirkor Palandjian, 45 J. alt
Mikirditsch, 25 J. alt,
Assadur 23 J. alt
Garabet Gasli, aus der Ortschaft Orta-Köy und
Avedis
Serkis
beide aus der Ortschaft Hadschi Köy.
Nach dem Verlust ihrer Männer sind die verwitweten Frauen und verwaisten Kinder in Erkelet nördlich Kaisarije angekommen, wo die türkische Bevölkerung alle jungen Frauen, Mädchen und Knaben entführte. Mariam Erzerumzian gab mir an, dass Bakal Mustafa Agha ihren 14jährigen Sohn, Nischan, weggenommen und bei sich behalten habe.

ANLAGE 7

Aussagende Personen:
Mariam, Frau des Ohannes aus Aladscha (Angora) 38 J. alt.
Sultane, Frau d. Harutiun aus Aladscha (Angora) 28 J. alt
Güstüma, Frau d. Meliko aus Josgad (Angora) 30 J. alt
haben mir am 11. September 1915 folgende Aussage gemacht:
Am 22. August abends kam unsere Karawane, bestehend aus 700 Personen, alles Verbannte aus Orta-Köj, Hadschi-Köj und Aladscha, in Tepé Han (Wilajet Angora) an, wo die Männer zuerst in ein Han interniert wurden. Dann haben die Gendarmen alle gruppenweise geplündert, ihnen hauptsächlich das bare Geld weggenommen und sie den Mörderbanden ausgeliefert. An der Mordtat haben sich auch die Gendarmen beteiligt indem sie vier Personen aus Hadschi-Köj vor den Frauen erschossen."
Die Namen der von den aussagenden Frauen bekannten Opfer sind:

- Meliko 35 J. alt
- Harutiun 30 J. alt
- Doni 60 J. alt
- Nischan 50 J. alt
- Garabed 25 J. alt
- Kevork 20 J. alt
- Krikor 20 J. alt
- Garabed 23 J. alt
- Sarkis 30 J. alt
- Sarkis 28 J. alt
- Nasar 14 J. alt
- Ufan 30 J. alt
- Iskender 13 J. alt

Die Gendarmen haben die letztgenannten zwei Personen zu ihrer Mutter gebracht und ihr versprochen, sie gegen Lösegeld freizugeben. Trotzdem sie fünfzehn Ltq. bekommen hatten, haben sie dieselben vor den Augen ihrer Mutter erschossen.


Eine der Frauen aus Aladscha hat am 10. September d.J. auf der Strecke Tarsus-Adana entbunden. Die Gendarmen haben die zur Hilfe eilenden Frauen namentlich die schon erwähnte Frau Sultané mit Peitschenhieben und Rutenschlägen weiter getrieben und die Wöchnerin auf der offenen Strasse im Freien liegen lassen wollen. Mit grösster Mühe haben die Frauen ihre Reisegefährtin nach Adana bringen können.

ANLAGE 8

Aussagende Personen:
Sefere Göschbekian aus Aladscha (Angora)
Mardiros Bogossian aus Aladscha (Angora)
machten mir am 11. September d.J. fast dieselbe Aussage wie die Frauen
Mariam, Sultané und Güstüma und fügten noch hinzu, dass sie unterwegs Augen­
zeuge gewesen sind, wie die Gendarmen und Soldaten aus Tersili mehrere hundert Personen aus Josgad und seiner Umgebung alle männlichen Geschlechts in einem
Tal einige Stunden südlich von Josgad niedergemetzelt und umgebracht haben.

Diese aussagenden Personen haben mir auch mitgeteilt, dass sie unterwegs in
den Ortschaften Tschat, Burun-Kischla, Tschachmachsadé und Keller keine Ar­
menier männlichen Geschlechts gesehen haben und überall unterwegs haben sie
erfahren, dass alle umgebracht worden seien.

Der Kaimakam von Bogaslajan soll die Metzelei in allen diesen Ortschaften
angeordnet haben.

ANLAGE 9

Am 6. September 1915 vormittags gaben die verbannten Armenierinnen aus der
Ortschaft Hadschi-Köj im Sandjak Tschorum des Wilajets Angora
Hinasant Tinkojan
Nojemik Awedian
Mariam Jachnian
Saruhi Ekmekschian
Nuritza Schischmanian
Arakini Sogalian
folgende Aussage:
Die türkische Behörde hat die armenische Bevölkerung in Hadschi-Köj aufge­
fordert am 8. August d.J. ihre Wohnstätten binnen 3 Tagen zu verlassen, um die
Verbannungsreise nach Mesopotamien anzutreten. Man hat den Frauen erlaubt ihre
Männer zu begleiten und ihnen zu verstehen gegeben, dass sie der Regierung wegen
dieser Gnade dankbar sein sollen.

Am 14. August hat die Regierung 120 Familien 174 Wagen zur Verfügung
gestellt, um die allernotwendigsten Gegenstände und Nahrungsmittel mitzunehmen.
Unter der Führung von 12 Gendarmen sind die Verbannten ohne Gefahr über Josgad in Bogaslian eingetroffen.


Die übrigen Frauen haben ihre Reise weitergeführt und sind in Akserai angekommen, wo die Türken mit der Zustimmung der Gendarmen ihnen den letzten Rest des baren Geldes weggenommen und zu dem Zweck sogar die Unterwäsche der Frauen untersucht haben.

Von Akserai an haben die Frauen bettelnd über Bosanti-Tarsus die Stadt Adana erreicht, von wo aus sie die Weiterreise antraten.

Unter den getöteten befinden sich folgende Personen:

Tateos Sogalian, Vater
Ohannes Sogalian, Sohn
Jegia Tenkoian

Unter den getöteten befinden sich folgende Personen:

Tateos Sogalian, Vater
Ohannes Sogalian, Sohn
Jegia Tenkoian
Abraham Göwertschinian
Kework Göwertschinian
Wahan Göwertschinian
Hakob Awedian Vater
Awedis Awedian Sohn
Stepan Awedian Sohn
Garabed Tersian
Mowses Hamalian
Setrak Hamalian
Benjamin Ekmekdschian
Mateos Schischmanian
Mihran Schischmanian

Die obige Aussage der oben erwähnten Frauen habe ich auf Weisung des Kaiserlichen Konsuls veranlasst.

ANLAGE 10

Das eklatanteste Beispiel der Bestechung und Bereicherungshandlung ist der Fall des Abgeordneten Mateos Nalbandian aus Kosan.

Dieser, eingeschüchtert durch das abschreckende Beispiel der beiden verbannten und ermorderten Abgeordneten Sohrab und Wardges, sah sich genötigt, alles aufzubieten, um sich auf irgend eine Weise von den Qualen und Gefahren der Verbannung zu befreien, und rettete auf folgende Weise sein Leben:


Auch andere Fälle der Bestechung liegen vor:

Alle bekannten armenischen Handelsfirmen, die wohlhabenden Handwerker und Gewerbetreibende der Stadt Adana werden seitens des Polizeichefs Dschemal Bej


Ein Beweis dafür ist das neue System der Versteigerung der städtischen Steuern. Gemäss der letzten Bestimmung des Stadtrats, dessen Vorsitzender der Polizeichef Dschemal Bej ist, sollen diejenigen Armenier, welche die städtischen Steuern kaufen und die Steuererhebung übernehmen, von den Verbannungsmassregeln nicht getroffen werden. In der Hoffnung, sich auf diese Weise befreien zu können, haben die reichen und bemittelten Armenier kollektiv für die städtischen Steuern etwa 7000 L.q. einlegen müssen. Im verflossenen Jahre brachten diese Steuern der Stadtverwaltung kaum ein Viertel von der oben erwähnten Summe ein.

ANLAGE 11

Infolge der letzten Verordnungen haben die meisten Armenier die Stadt Adana verlassen müssen, sodass die als Anzahlung bezahlte Summe 1800 L. q., welche die letzten Ersparnisse und das Reisegeld der zur Verbannung Verurteilten bildete, grösstenteils verloren ging, da sie seitens der Stadtverwaltung nicht zurückerstattet wurde.
Da die höheren Beamten sich auf diese Weise zu bereichern suchen, die Bestechung und Erpressung als harmlose und erlaubte Handlung ansehen, das Gesetz und die Würde des Staates desavouieren, besitzen sie natürlich keine moralische Kraft und Autorität, die subordinierten Beamten, Richter, Aerzte, Offiziere, ja selbst die Gendarmen und gewöhnlichen Soldaten im Zaume zu halten. Jeder Beamte sucht Mittel, nach seinem Ermessen zu Geld zu kommen.


Beispiele anderer Fälle der Bestechung und Gelderpressung sind nicht selten.


Wahan Wartabedian und Bogdschalian, beide Kaufleute in Adana, haben mir mitgeteilt, dass sie je 20 Ltg. durch die Vermittlung Ohanians dem Polizeichef Dschemal Bej als Bestechung gegeben haben, um vorübergehende Begünstigung von einigen Wochen zu geniessen.

ANLAGE 12

Khadschadur Krussian
Agop Hadjikian
beide wohnhaft in Adana, haben mir Folgendes mitgeteilt, welches sie von den aus Ismid verbannten Armenierinnen, deren Männer unterwegs von Soldaten erschossen wurden, erfahren haben:

Die Armenier aus Ismid haben sich auf der Strecke Ulu-Kischla-Pozanti geweigert, mehr als das vereinbarte Fahrgeld zu zahlen. Die Kutscher, alle Türken, haben die Armenier überfallen und misshandelt. Zwei Armenier haben, um die Gegner abzuschrecken, zu ihren Waffen gegriffen, ohne sie allerdings zu gebrauchen.

Garabed Michalian
Melkon Moskefian
Vikar Nerses, alle aus Ismid.

Einen schwer verwundeten Armenier hat man nach Tarsus geschafft, wo er gepflegt wurde u. am Leben blieb. Den nächsten Tag haben die verbannten Armenier aus Akserai:

Mihran Mutafian
Missak Casandjian
Edward Abadjian

die sechs Leichen dort liegen gesehen. Sie haben dieselben zudecken wollen, um sie den Vorbeifahrenden zu verhüllen, aber die Gendarmen haben die Decke wieder weggeworfen, um die nackt Leichen den Passanten zur Schau zu stellen.

★

ZU DEN ÄRGSTEN VERLEUMDUNGEN UND GEHÄSSIGSTEN LÜGEN BETREFFEND DIE VOGELFREIEN ARMENIER

[Dr. Jos. Marquart Wilmersdorf, den 8. Oktober 1915 Wilmersdorf]
R. J. M. No. 2240

Sehr geehrter Herr Konsul!

Bei meiner Rückkehr von der Ferientour finde ich Ihren und Herrn Professor Mittwochs Brief vor. Was Ihren Wunsch bezüglich der Übersetzung armenischer Briefe betrifft, so würde ich Ihnen persönlich sehr gerne gefällig sein. Nachdem man den Türken unseresseits gestattet, die schauerlichen Metzeleien der letzten Zeit unter den Armeniern in einer völlig entstellten und erlogenen Weise darzustellen und die...
ärgsten Verleumdungen und gehässigsten Lügen über die vogelfreien Armenier in unserer Presse zu veröffentlichen und unsere Zeitungen sich nicht schämen, diesem allzu durchsichtigen Verleumdungsfeldzug, welcher der vor 2 Jahren in derselben Presse gegen die angeblichen bulgarischen Greuel geförderten Hetze, auf ein Haar ähnelt, andauernd ihre Spalten zu öffnen, dagegen den Armeniern und ihren Freunden der Maulkork vorgebunden wird, so würde die Übersetzung erwähnter Privatbriefe in meinen Augen als einseitige Spionage in türkischen Diensten erscheinen. Ich habe meinen diesbezüglichen Standpunkt schon vor mehreren Wochen Herrn Professor C.F. Lehmann-Haupt gegenüber, der damals in Zossen mit der Aufsicht der ausländischen Korrespondenz betraut war, auseinandergesetzt und muß daher zu meinem Bedauern unter den obwaltenden traurigen Umständen Ihr Ersuchen ablehnen.

Mit dem Ausdruck ausgezeichneter Hochachtung bin ich
Ihr sehr ergebener gez. Dr. Jos. Marquart
Universitätsprofessor

Herrn Max Freiherrn von Oppenheim,
Kaiserlicher Konsul Berlin
W. 50, Tauentzienstraße 19 a

R 14088, Ab. 29589.

★

BRIEFLICHER BERICHT SALICH BEY GOURDJES AN TALAAT BEY ÜBER
die Frage der Armenierverfolgungen

Auswärtiges Amt
Wilmersdorf, den 8. Oktober 1915

Abschrift
A 30454
Nr. 906
1. Anl.

Vertraulich!
Euerer Excellenz beehre ich mich beifolgend Abschrift einer Aufzeichnung eines Vertrauensmannes über eine Unterredung mit Salich Bey Gourdji vorzulegen. Es
handelt sich dabei um einen Bericht über die Frage der Armenierverfolgungen, den Salich Bey Gourdji an Talaat Bey gesandt hat.  

In Vertretung:

Seiner Exzellenz dem Reichskanzler
Herrn von Bethmann Hollweg

Konst./Ankara 171, zu Ab. 3045415.

ANLAGE


Gourdji teilte mir aus dem Inhalt des Berichts folgendes mit: Die Verfolgung der Armenier in der Türkei, die eine Ausrottung offenbar beabsichtige, sei, wie jeder Kenner der Verhältnisse leider zugeben müsse, aus einer Zwangslage der Türkei zu erklären. Wenn die Türkei sich je wieder in den Fragen der inneren Politik erholen wolle, wenn sie überhaupt lebenskräftig bleiben wolle, so müsse sie die Armenier in irgendeiner Weise ausschalten. Die sogenannte Armenierfrage müsse eben gelöst werden, eher könne die Türkei nicht an innere wirkliche Reorganisation denken. Der Weg, den die Regierung aber jetzt einzuschlagen scheine, dieser Weg, der durch Metzeleien und Gewalttaten gekennzeichnet zu sein scheine, sei gänzlich falsch. Selbst wenn in der Art und Weise des Vorgehens gegen die Armenier keine anderen Wege zu finden seien, müssten unbedingt die Formen gegenüber dem Ausland andere sein. Man dürfe nicht einfach alles, was Armenien angehe, mit Stillschweigen gegenüber dem Ausland übergehen, sondern müsse durch geeignete Mitteilungen das Ausland so unterrichten, dass das Vorgehen gegen die Armenier in humaner Weise erscheine. Im Grenzschutz gegen Russland gebe es genügend Gründe, um eine Verschickung der Armenier aus Hocharmenien in der üblichen und völkerrechtlich plausiblen Weise zu erklären.

Vor allem aber müsse man sich in Konstantinopel sehr reiflich das Vorgehen gegen die Armenier überlegen unter dem Gesichtspunkt, dass die Beziehungen Deutschlands zum Vatikan von ganz besonderer Natur seien, und Deutschland of-

Auf jeden Fall müsse man alles vermeiden, was die Lage Deutschlands gegenüber dem Papste in der Armenierfrage erschweren könne. Man müsse sich auch bemühen, rechtzeitig im Auslande gegen eine weitere Verhetzung betreffs Armeniernmassakern vorzubeugen, da auch in einer derartigen "Greuelfrage" Deutschland in besonders schwieriger Lage sein würde, weil es nicht ohne weiteres die "christlichen" Armenier unberücksichtigt lassen kann, und ausserdem so wie so schon bei Greuelsachen vorsichtig sein müsse.

THE DECISION OF THE OTTOMAN GOVERNMENT ON THE DEPORTATION OF ARMENIANS
(May 30, 1915)

Safrastyan R. A.
Academician of NAS RA

The secret report of Interior Minister and the leader of the Central Committee of the Young Turks party, Mehmet Talât to Sadrazam Said Halim Pasha, was discussed in the Ministerial council meeting of May 30, 1915. The deportation of Armenians was approved, which had been already taking place, and a relevant resolution was passed. It was signed by seven members of the government: sadrazam Said Halim Pasha, Minister of Internal Affairs, Talât, Minister of War Enver Pasha, Minister of Social Affairs, Abbas Halim Pasha¹, Minister of Education Ahmed Şükrü², Minister of Commerce Ahmed Nesimi³ and Minister of Justice, Pirizade Ibrahim Hayrullah⁴.

The next day the original text of the “Resolution” without the “Brief description” section was officially copied for the purpose of sending to respective ministries. One of those copies which is kept in the Archive of the General Headquarters of the Department of Military history and strategic research and General inspectorate, was included in the collection of documents published by General Headquarters of the Turkish armed forces⁵.

The original document being published by Turkish historians, has been widely used as a proof of a hypothesis of the Turkish official historiography as if the purpose of the deportation was only the deportation of the Western Armenians and not their massacre. It mentions all the “dangers” as if coming from Armenians, a number of resettlement problems connected with the deportees. At the same time, special attention was paid to their life’s organization in the new places of their settlement, as well as questions of abandoned property in their native places of habitation, etc. A lot of provisions of the Resolution obviously did not pursue the goal of having a real influence

¹ Said Halim Pasha’s brother.
² Later he took the surname Bayındır.
³ Later he took the surname Sayman.
⁴ See the original text of the resolution Meclis-i Vükelâ Müzâkerâtına Mahsûs Zabıtnâme: Hülasâ-i me’âli, 17 Mayıs 1331. - BOA. Meclis-i Vükelâ Mazbatası, 198/163. -
http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/assets/file/1915_Olaylari/resim/2600belge/1198.PDF
on the deportation process by imparting to it a seemingly “organized” character outwardly or just formally. According to Talât and his accomplices, it had to create a “legal” ground that would give them an opportunity to elude the responsibility of committing the extermination of the Armenian nation under the deportation cover.

But the expression, “to fully exterminate and liquidate” (imhâ ve izâlesi kat’iyyen muktezi) reveals not only the real purposes of the highest authorities of the Ottoman empire and the Young Turks leaders, but also, in the framework of modern conceptual approaches of Genocide studies, gives an opportunity to reveal its intent\(^6\) to commit genocide under the deportation cover.

Realizing that danger the Turkish authors resort to a number of tricks the purpose of which is to conceal the meaning of the above-mentioned expression and to delude the reader by distorting it. Thus, for example, the “classics” of official Turkish historiography, Bayur and Gürün, and the representatives of the new generation unanimously avoid translating the expression “imhâ ve izâlesi kat’iyyen muktezi” into modern Turkish accurately and do not hesitate sometimes to use translations of the Ottoman words incomprehensible for those who know modern Turkish\(^7\).

Such a trick can certainly be described as rather “delicate”. But the Turkish authors that carry out an official order are not limited to it. The authors\(^8\) of the collection of documents published by the General Headquarters of the armed forces go even further and turn to evident falsification. This collection includes modern Turkish and English translations of the copy of the “Resolution”. Its translators have tried to “mitigate” the meaning of the expression. In the modern Turkish translation the expression, “etkili bir şekilde bertaraf edilmesi mutlak surette gerekli olup” is used, which may be translated as “it is a total necessity to neutralize effectively”. It is evident that the authors\(^9\) of this translation have avoided reproducing exactly the meaning of the expression of the original text, “imhâ ve izâlesi”- “exterminate and liquidate”.

\(^6\) See Սաֆրաստյան Ռ., Օսմանյան կայսրություն. ցեղասպանության ծրագրի ծագումնաբանություն (1876-1920 թթ.), Երևան, 2009, էջ 20-43:


\(^8\) Among them is, e.g. Yusuf Halaçoğlu, the notorious falsifier of the history of the Armenian Genocide, former president of Turkish Historical Society (Türk Tarih Kurumu).

\(^9\) The names of the translators are mentioned in the collection, but it isn’t specified who exactly is the translator of the Turkish translation of the original.
The English translators who obviously made use not of the Ottoman original text, but the modern Turkish translation, unhesitatingly shortened the above-mentioned expression and presented it as: “ought to be eliminated effectively”. Thus they went further from the original.

Let us compare the Ottoman original of the “Resolution” passed by the Ministerial council with the English translation. It is mentioned in the original: “to fully exterminate and liquidate” and in the English translation we read: “ought to be eliminated effectively”. The change of meaning is obvious; it was falsified.

Thus, it is clear that by publishing the original text of the “Resolution” of the Ministerial council, the Turkish historians try to make its real meaning difficult to understand for the non-specialists in every possible way. By publishing that document they try not to throw light on the poorly studied pages of the history of the Armenian Genocide, but to use it as an additional “argument” for substantiating the false hypothesis that the Ottoman authorities “showed concern” towards the Armenian people during the deportation.

Summing up, it should be mentioned that the atmosphere of uncertainty and fraud created around just one archival document by the representatives of official Turkish historiography arouse doubts and urges one to think that the practice of such methods can be applied in many other cases of official publications of the Ottoman archival documents in Turkey.
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VERJINÉ SVAZLIAN

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

TESTIMONIES OF THE EYEWITNESS SURVIVORS
From 1955, during about 60 years, in the beginning on my own initiative, and, subsequently, under the auspices of the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, and later of the Museum-Institute of the Armenian Genocide of the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia, I have written down, and later, audio- and video-recorded the memoir-testimonies [700 units], as well as popular Armenian song-testimonies of historical character (in Armenian and Turkish-language) of the eyewitness survivors of the Armenian Genocide. This research has been carried out by me not only in the various regions of Armenia, but also in the Armenian Diaspora during my short-term personal or scientific trips in Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Greece, France, Canada, the USA and Turkey. These memoir-testimonies have been published in various languages in my 16 volumes.

Verjiné Svazlian writing down the tragic memoirs and songs narrated by the Genocide survivor, Mariam Baghdishian (b. 1909, Moussa Ler).

Following the overthrow of Sultan Abdul Hamid’s regime the party of the Young Turks, "Ittihat ve Terakki" (Unity and Progress), which formed the government, adopted Sultan Hamid’s massacre (1894-1896) policy and, professing the Pan-Turkish and Pan-Islamic ideologies, endeavored not only to preserve the Ottoman Empire, but also to brutally annihilate or to amalgamate and forcefully Turkify the Armenians and the other subject Christian peoples and to create a universal Pan-Turanic, Pan-Islamic state extending from the Mediterranean Sea to the Altai territory.

The eyewitness survivors of the Armenian Genocide (1915-1923), who, for the most part are no longer alive presently, remembered in every detail, during my recordings, the historico-political circumstances of the first genocide perpetrated in the 20th century. The representatives of the senior generation even remembered adoption (in the atmosphere of false freethinking of the Young Turks party) of the Turkish Constitution in 1908, accompanied by motto: “Freedom, justice, equity, irrespective of nationality and religion”. A nationwide exultation prevailed in the country, since “equal rights” were to be secured by law to all the nations living in Turkey. While a survivor from Bitlis, Hmrayak Boyadjian (born in 1902), has testified in his memoir: “...When Hurriyet was declared in 1908, everybody, in the beginning, was of the opinion that Armenians and Turks would live like brothers. There were even festivities in our village and fusillades were performed”. [Sv. 2011: Testimony2 19, p. 114] Nevertheless, a year had not elapsed since the declaration of the Turkish Constitution, when the town of Adana and the neighbouring Armenian-inhabited villages [which had been saved from Abdul Hamid's massacres] became the target of the hatred and genocidal actions of the Ittihat officials and brutalized Turkish mobs. During the Holy Week of 1909, from the 1st to the 3rd of April, Adana and its environs were on fire. The blood-thirsty Turkish crowd attacked the Armenian-inhabited quarters of Adana and the neighboring villages, plundered all the shops, slaughtered the unarmed and unprotected Armenians, not sparing even the women and the children.

The eyewitness of that turmoil historian-novelist, Smbat Byurat, has, under the immediate impressions of those sad events, created the following poem of great popularity as a truthful reproduction of the event, which has been communicated to me by the eyewitness survivor from Zeytoun, Karapet Tozlian (b. 1903):

---

2 Testimony – henceforth: T.
"Let the Armenians cry, the cruel massacre
Turned magnificent Adana into a desert,
The fire and the sword and the merciless plunder
Ruined, alas, the House of Roubiniants!

Unarmed Armenians, in a moment
Fell before the mob under the swords,
Churches and schools were lost in flames,
Thousands of Armenians ruthlessly died.

The merciless Turks deprived
The child of his mother, the bride of her groom,
Smashed everything on their way,
Swallowed and got repleted with Armenian blood.

Three days and nights the fire from inside,
The enemy’s sword and bullet from outside,
Wiped out the Armenians from the face of the earth
Blood ran down the Armenian streets…” [Sv. 2011: T. 436, p. 563]

The massacre of Adana was premeditated. This fact is testified by the telegram from Constantinople sent by the permanent under-secretary of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Adil bey to all Turkish authorities in Cilicia, where it was written: “Utmost care should be taken that no harm is inflicted on foreign religious institutions or consulates”3. As noted H. Simonyan, “This was, in essence, an order to massacre Armenians”4.

During the massacres of Adana, dozens of Armenian towns and villages were ravaged and burnt down, while Moussa Ler (Dagh), Deurtyol, Hadjin, Sis, Zeytoun, Sheikh Mourad, Fendedjak and a number of other localities were saved from the slaughter due to the organized heroic self-defense against the attacks of tens of thousands of Turks.

In actual fact, that was the beginning (when the Young Turks had been feverishly preparing the total extermination of the Armenian nation) of the Great Genocide. When the First World War broke out Turkey entered into the war, having expansionistic objectives and a monstrous scheme of realizing the annihilation of the Armenians - the Armenian Genocide.

In February 1914 the party of "the Unity and Progress" formed a committee (Behaeddin Shakir, Doctor Nazim, Midhat Shukri). The so-called “Young Turk

---

3 Թերզեան Հ., Կիլիկիոյ աղետը, Կոստանդնուպոլիս, 19 12, էջ 38-39: The author of the memoirs “The Calamity of Cilicia”, a pharmacist from Hadjin, Hakob Terzian, was one of the leaders of Armenian resistance. He was a martyr of 1915 Armenian Genocide (Simonyan H., The destruction of Armenians in Cilicia, April, 1909, London, 2012, p. 7).

4 Simonyan H., op. cit., p. 46.
triumvirate” (Talaat - Minister of the Interior, Enver - Minister of War, and Jemal - Minister of the Marine) operated the genocide against Armenians together with this committee. They were responsible for the organized implementation of the deportation and massacre of all Armenians in Western Armenia, Cilicia and the Armenian populated areas of Asia Minor. It was committed by a secret order signed by Talaat pasha, Enver pasha and Doctor Nazim and sent to the authorities concerning the deportation and the extermination of the Armenians. Talaat pasha warned with violent hatred: “We have to square accounts with the Armenians”, and-promised to spare nothing for that purpose. Talaat pasha had issued a special order (9 September, 1915): "The right of living and working of the Armenians on Turkish soil is completely removed. In accordance with this, the government orders not to spare even the infants in the cradle...".

On the 2nd of August 1914 the Secret Treaty of Alliance was signed between Germany and Turkey in Constantinople. On the 6th of August 1914 a supplementary agreement was signed, the fifth clause of which stipulated: "Germany will use pressure to adjust the eastern frontiers of the Ottoman Empire so as to secure the immediate contact of Turkey with the Mohammedan population living in Russia".

During one of the sessions of the executive committee of Ittihat, Behaeddin Shakir had declared that it was necessary to immediately begin and finish the deportation of the Armenians and, in the meantime, massacre the people. “We are at war”, he had cinically added, “there is no fear of interference from Europe and the Great States, the world press also cannot raise any protest and, even if it does, it will be without much result and, in the future, it will be considered as a fait accompli".

The general mobilization (Seferberlik - Turk.) had become the greatest evil for the Christian nations living in the Ottoman Empire, including the Armenians. Under the pretense of recruitment to military service, Armenian males aged 18-45 were drafted to serve in labor battalions (Amelé tabour - Turk.) and according to the special order of the war minister, Enver pasha, were taken to secluded places and were killed out of sight of viewers.

---

7 Կիրակոսյան Ջ., op. cit., 1965, p. 245.
10 Մեսրոպ Լեւոն, Տէր Զոր, հ. Բ, Բարիզ, 1955, էջ 258.
“...In 1914 Turkey declared a general mobilization”, - a survivor from Harpoot, Sargs Khachatrian (born in 1903), has narrated, - “and drafted the Armenian young men into the Turkish army. They took them and made them work in the 'Amelé tabour' and then they killed them all”. [Sv. 2011: T. 116, p. 264]

The mobilization in Turkey was followed by the arms collection. That was accompanied by ubiquitous round-ups, during which, on the pretext of collecting “arms”, the Turkish policemen ravaged the houses of the Armenians, plundered their properties, arrested and killed many of them.

The arrest of the Armenian intellectuals followed the mobilization and the arms collection; it pursued the purpose of depriving the Armenian nation not only of its fighting force, but also of its leading minds. On Saturday, April 24, at midnight, 600 Armenian notables (political leaders, educators, writers, clergy and dignitaries) were forcibly taken to police quarters in Constantinople and subsequently were sent to the deserts of Mesopotamia and exterminated. Among those who were deported to the deserts of Changhere and Ayash and exterminated were the well-known lawyer, member of the Ottoman Parliament and writer, Grigor Zohrap, the poets, writers and physicians Daniel Varouzhan, Siamanto, Ruben Zartarian, Ruben Sevak, Hovhannes Telkatints, Melkon Kyurdjian, Yeroukhan, Smbat Byurat, Tigran Chyokurian, Nazaret Taghavarian and numerous celebrated people from Istanbul, Sva, Diarbekir, Marzvan, Erzroum, Kayseri, Izmir and other Armenian-inhabited localities. During the following days, weeks and months their number tragically increased.

Everywhere the Armenian schools and colleges were being closed and demolished.

Besides the Armenian educational institutions, the Armenian churches were also ravaged. The Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople was incorporated into the Catholicosate of Sis, and Catholicos Sahak II Khabayan was recognized as the spiritual leader of Western Armenians.

On March 15 and April 3, 1915, the Russian Intelligence informed about the Ottoman empire that Armenians were arrested throughout the country, systematic massacres were committed in Karin (Erzroum), Deurtyol and Zeytoun; bloody clashes took place in Bitlis, Van and Moush; atrocities, plunder and murders occurred in Akn; economic collapse and a general massacre of the population were noted all over Asia Minor.

http://www.tagesspiegel.de/downloads/4430082/4/manifest
A survivor born in 1905 at the village of Kem of the Hayots Dzor (Armenian Valley - Arm.) of Van, Sirak Manassian, has testified about the horrible state of the Western Armenians: "On the 4th of March 1915, we heard that they had killed the public servant-educator, Mr. Ishkhan\textsuperscript{12} in the neighboring village of Hirj. That was at the time when the Turks were summoning, through Djevdet pasha, all our eminent leaders and were slaughtering them. In those dreadful days they unexpectedly killed Mr. Iskhan and threw him in the well. Not satisfied with this crime, they also threw his two children alive into the well. When we heard that, we and all our compatriots got much alarmed and started to get ready for the attack of the Turks.

On March 5, 1915, a strong artillery bang was heard. The people assembled in the square and then crowded in the church. The Turks had already mobilized and taken away the young men.

...After staying there for a month or two, we fled and approached Van. We were always moving at night, since we were pursued in the day-time. When we approached Van and were about to enter the town, the Turks stopped us and started to look for males. The heroes of Van, who were probably watching with field glasses, began to fire. Some of the Turks fell, others fled and we were saved and entered Van. We were lodged in Van in the school building. Every morning the brass band marched, playing, in the streets of Van, followed by the children. The self-defense of Van had already begun. An Armenian told us: 'Children, go and collect the used bullets so that they can prepare new ones.' We went and collected the bullets and handed them to the workshop. The day came when the battle became more intense in Van and Aygestan. The Vaspourakanis, who had gathered there, defended with unyielding will and determination Aygestan and the center of Van, Kaghakamedj, where violent combats took place. Hearing that the Russian army was advancing from Salmast to Van, the Turks departed panic-stricken. Our heroes attacked and not only did they liquidated the Turks, but also acquired a considerable amount of artillery units, bullets, etc.

On the 6th of May the Armenian flag waved over the citadel of Van. The Vaspourakanis welcomed with great love the Russian soldiers and the Armenian volunteers under the leadership of General Andranik Ozanian". [Sv. 2011: T. 35, pp. 142-143]

\textsuperscript{12} Ishkhan – Nikoghayos Poghos Mikayelian (1881-1915), an active leader of the Armenian self-defensive movement. Opposing the Turkish rulers, he has defended the interests of the Armenians of Van, has given an impetus to education. He was killed on the eve of the self-defensive battles of Van in April by order of the vice-regent Djevdet pasha.
In the villages surrounding Van, the Turks had time to exterminate on the spot thousands of Armenians and, when the Russian army entered Van, accompanied by the Armenian writers Hovhannes Toumanian and Alexander Shirvanzadé, they became witnesses of bewildering scenes. "...Wherever Turks had the opportunity, they had massacred the Armenians," wrote H. Toumanian in his memoirs, "and mainly the males, and had taken away the beautiful women. And when if they had had sufficient time and when the terror of the Russian army and the Armenian volunteers had not been close, they had invented barbaric amusements: they had crucified people, various body parts of live people had been cut and arranged in different patterns; games had been invented: people had been put below the waist in cauldrons and boiled so that the live half could see and feel...; they had cut with red-hot iron bars the various parts of the body and roasted them on fire; they had roasted live people; they had massacred children before the eyes of parents and parents before the eyes of their children"13.

Naturally, if the Armenians had not had recourse to self-defense in Van, they would have been martyred in the same manner. It is appropriate to mention here the following words of a survivor from Van, Ardsroun Harutyunian (born in 1907): "Self-defense is born when there is violence against the people..." [Sv. 2011: T. 40, p. 150]

And therefore, the heroic self-defensive battles fought in Van, Shatakh and other localities constituted the noble outbreak of the Western Armenians revolting against the acts of violence committed by the Ittihat government, their voice of protest addressed to the Great States of the world. This is also attested to by the following fragment of a popular song:

"Van, a little town with its districts,
Full of corpses in hundreds and thousands,
The field was colored red with blood,
The clouds, the sky and the stars raised their voice
And roared and ordered loud enough
To be heard in Europe and America." [Sv. 2011: T. 628, p. 599]

However, neither Europe nor America interfered and only the national heroes succored the helpless people.

From the beginning of the First World War all the Western Armenians, including also the Sassounis, were subjected to new and brutal pursuits, plunders and murders.

In March 1915, the Turkish hordes also invaded Sassoun. In April-May, the first combats of the Sassounis took place. Exhibiting a heroic resistance to the Turkish army,
but suffering great losses, the Armenian fighters retreated to the slopes of the Andok Mountain and continued the self-defense. In June, unyielding fights took place in the region of Assank. The combatants of the Monastery of Gomuts and of Talvorik provoked confusion among the Kurdish hordes and seized the Satan bridge; the inhabitants of Ksak came to their rescue. On the 30th of July, the Sassounis liberated Shenik, but the enemy occupied the stables situated on the slopes of Andok with a new assault. The Sassounis heroically defended themselves from the attacking Turks and Kurds in the mountains of Andok, Tsovassar and Gerin. The survivors rescued from the massacres of Moush and its environs, about thirty thousand in number, who had taken refuge in the mountains of Kana and Havatorik, displayed a heroic resistance. However, that heroic self-resistance was cruelly suppressed.

“The Turks attacked and began to massacre”, a survivor from Sassoun, Arakel Davtian (born in 1904), related. “They took away the beautiful girls and women. There was a freedom-fighter in our village, named Missak, who had a gun. He went into the monastery and started to fight. We had no arms. Sassoun resisted for two months. The Turkish soldiers came and besieged us. We had no help whatsoever and they slaughtered many of us”. [Sv. 2011: T. 4, p. 91]

Another eyewitness survivor from Sassoun, Yeghiazar Karapetian (born in 1886), has related these historic events in more detail: “The attacks of the Kurds on the Armenians were, seemingly, of an unofficial character, but there was a general belief that they were all performed according to the instructions of the government, something which was proved by the fact that the Armenians' protests were not heard and their appeals remained unanswered…

On the 22nd of June, one hundred Kurdish horsemen from Bakran settled on the slopes of the Krenkan Mountain. On the following day, ten horsemen came to our village and claimed from the village notables ten sheep, ten measures of flour and ten felt-gowns. They received all this free of charge and without any objection and, being well-acquainted for a long time with the denizens of Havatorik or being conscience-stricken, Ali of Tamo said: ‘Armenians, I have often eaten your bread and salt, now I have to tell you a truth. An order has come from the Sultan that we have to mercilessly massacre all the Armenians living on the Ottoman soil. Now if you stand up and have a look at the Slivan field, you will see that the wheat fields have ripened and the spikes have fallen one upon the other, but there is not a single sparrow there. It is deserted. We have completely exterminated the Armenians of that locality and the government has called us here with the purpose of slaughtering the Armenians of the Moush plain and of Sassoun. In a few days, massacres will begin here also and it should be so that men giving the name of Jesus Christ will not remain alive on this land.”
The Kurds took away what they demanded, while we remained pensive. ...Thus, this Armenian-populated province, which was bound to the land and the plough for centuries, became, in the course of one day and one night, deserted and uninhabited, while its real owners were slaughtered with swords, burned in fire, drowned in water by the hands of the ruthless Turks and Kurds in a monstrous operation; its victims were the Armenian dwellers, of both sexes, of one hundred and five villages, totaling seventy to eighty thousand souls in number. Their wealth, worth millions, was pillaged. ...The 28th of June was the Sunday of Vardavar (the Transfiguration of Christ - Arm.), the merry holiday of the Armenian nation, which, alas, was converted into the Sunday of Mardavar (burning of people - Arm.) for the Armenians of the Taron plain". [Sv. 2011: T. 1, pp. 81-82]

Shogher Tonoyan (born in 1901), from Moush, has also given an account about the above-cited Vardavar holiday: "...On the day of Vardavar, 1915, the Turkish askyars (policemen - Turk.) brought Chechen brigands from Dagestan to massacre us. They came to our village and robbed everything. They took away our sheep, oxen and properties. Those who were good-looking were taken away. My aunt's young son, who was staying with me, was also taken away, together with all the males in the town. They gathered the young and the elderly in the stables of the Avzut Village, set fire and burned them alive. They shut people in the stables of Malkhas Mardo, they piled up stacks of hay round them, poured kerosene and set on fire. Sixty members of our great family were burned in those stables. I do not wish my enemy to see the days I have seen, loa!14 Only my brother and I were saved. From the beginning, they took away the young pretty brides and girls to Turkify them and also they pulled away the male infants from their mothers' arms to make them policemen in the future. The stable was filled with smoke and fire, people started to cough and to choke. Mothers forgot about their children, loa! It was a real Sodom and Gomorrah. People ran, on fire, to and fro, struck against the walls, trod upon the infants and children who had fallen on the ground. ...What I have seen with my eyes, loa, I don't wish the wolves of the mountain to see! They say that the Turkish mullah hung himself at the sight of these distressing scenes. During that turmoil, the majority of the people choked and perished. The roof of the stable collapsed and fell upon the dead. I wish my little brother and I had been burned in that stable and had not seen how sixty souls were burned alive. I wish I had not seen the cruel and ungodly acts of those irreligious people. The Armenians of the neighboring villages of Vardenis, Meshakhshen, Aghbenis, Avzut, Khevner and others were burned.

14 "Lao" (my child) – an affectionate expression in the Sassoun dialect of the Armenian language used when speaking to a daughter or son.
in the same manner in their stables. I do not wish my enemy to see what I have seen. When the roof of the stable collapsed, the flames and the smoke escaped from the opening and air penetrated in the stable. My uncle's daughter, Areg, and I took my unconscious brother by the arms and legs and, treading on burnt logs and corpses, we came out through the breach. There we saw the Turkish soldiers dancing in a circle, swinging and striking their sabres and singing merrily "Yürü, yavrum, yürü!" (Walk, my child, walk! - Turk.). Up to this day that song resounds in my ears..." [Sv. 2011: T. 9, p. 98]

Hrant Gasparian (born in 1908), from Khnous, has testified: "I told you what I have seen. What I have seen is in front of my eyes. We have not brought anything from Khnous. We have only saved our souls. Our large family, as a whole, was composed of one hundred and forty-three souls. Only one sister, one brother, my mother and I were saved...". [Sv. 2011: T. 13, p. 108]

If only four people were saved out of a large patriarchal family of 143 souls, then it is possible to imagine how many thousands of Armenians were sacrificed in the prototypes of Nazi gas-chambers, the stables and barns set on fire, long before the Jewish Holocaust. The following popular song has been woven with reference to these historic events:

"…The province of Sassoun with its forests,
With its high mountains as ramparts
Always withstood the Turkish army,
Sassoun smells now of hot blood". [Sv. 2011: T. 627, p. 599]

The smell of “hot blood” was spread also in the heroic Western Armenia’s towns of Shapin-Garahissar, Shatakh, Karin, Pontos, Moush, Svaż, Harpoot, Diarbekir (Amid), Malatia, and in the Armenian-inhabited localities of Western and Central Anatolia (Asia Minor), İzmit, Bursa, Ankara, Konia and elsewhere. They exterminated, with unspeakable cruelty, all the Armenians, not sparing even the infants.

And when the Russian troops retreated, a great number of Armenians, who had heroically fought in the self-defensive battles of Van, Sassoun, Shatakh, Shapin-Garahissar, Moush, Bitlis, Alashkert, Bayazet, Babert, Erzroum and other localities, were obliged to migrate after them to Eastern Armenia. They left, in despair and in tears, their Homeland, their native millennia-old historical cradle and started, whimpering, on their exile journey. That indescribable, great national grief has been expressed, in a condensed form, in the following dirge composed by the talented survivor from Moush, Shogher Tonoyan (born in 1901):

"We abandoned the sweet plains and meadows of Moush,
Our sacred lodges, houses, roofs and Homeland,  
Chapels and monasteries, books and canons, Bibles  
Were abandoned and remained in the hound’s muzzle.” [Sv. 2011: T. 653, p. 609]  

The road of exile was a real tragedy.  

Vardouhi Potikian (born in 1912), from Van, has painfully recalled that horrible turmoil. “…May my enemy not see that day. Woe! Let it be a black day! We had come and reached the bridge over the Berkri River. Suddenly the people began to yell: ‘Flee.’ We saw in the dark: the Berkri Valley was narrow and the Armenians hadn’t reached the river yet, when the Turks and the Kurds attacked. As the Armenians tried to escape, their feet slipped and they fell into the river and got drowned. Some tried to cross the river on animals, some entered the water all by themselves and the current carried them down the river. They were yelling, screaming and crying. The Kurds were firing on us. Mothers forgot about their children”. [Sv. 2011: T. 54, p. 168]  

The following popular vivid song has been created under the immediate effect of those distressing scenes of exile:

“The Turks came down the black Berkri Mountain,  
Corpses were scattered in thousands and thousands,  
May you be ravaged, you, ruthless Berkri River,  
You drank the blood of thousands and thousands!” [Sv. 2011: T. 438, p. 564]  

Suffering countless victims, the exhausted and agonizing human flood moved forward, sad and wistful, through clouds of dust.  

When I asked an eyewitness-survivor from Van, Aghassi Kankanian (born in 1904), who had become a well-known chemist, to tell me about his deportation, he said, reliving with great emotion and tearful eyes, his sorrowful past: “...Till we got to Igdir we marched under the rain and the sun, in the mud, half-starving and thirsty, for ten days. On the roads, the Kurds often attacked us, killed people and plundered. The most terrible attack took place near the Bandimahu bridge over the Berkri River, where there was an accumulation of deportees. Numerous mothers, clasping their infants in their arms, threw themselves into the river, so as not to fall into the hands of
the Turks. Those who were killed or died during our march were left on the roadside, mostly unburied. Seeing so many unburied corpses, I was so much affected that I became melancholic and that state continues up to the present day. I cannot feel completely glad”. [Sv. 2011: T. 33, p. 139]

Destitute, exhausted and leaving their dead kinsfolk unburied on the roadside, the remaining Western Armenians arrived, after great difficulties, in Igdir (Surmalou), which would suffer the same fate. The words of the following popular song about Surmalou have been communicated to me by the well-known and beloved singer, Hayrik Mouradian, a survivor from Shatakh (born in 1905):

“Eh, Surmalou, dear Surmalou! 
There’s no sound of bells and no Armenian speech, 
You’ve become a forest of nest-destroying wolves, 
You, that were rich in schools, you, populous province.”[Sv. 2011: T. 655, p. 609]

The life of the Armenians in Cilicia had also become a nightmare. The Berlin-Baghdad railway, which had a particular economic importance, passed through Armenian-populated Cilicia. This circumstance troubled the Turkish government, since the laborious and active Armenians living in Cilicia could, by their prosperous state, become predominant in Turkey's economy. The Armenian villages and settlements were scattered in mountainous Cilicia from Hadjin, Zeytoun to Deurtyol; and their populations, although engaged in silk-production, carpet-making and other national handicrafts, had a sufficiently enlightened new generation, owing to the presence of Armenian and foreign schools and colleges, which had played an important role in the formation of their mental-conscious outlook. Besides, the outrages and the massacres, which had started in many provinces of Turkey, coupled with the promised, but not realized, "Reforms" following the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-1878, had not completely exterminated the naturally freedom-loving Cilicians. Zeytoun, the eagle-nest of Cilicia, had, for a long time, become the flash point of Turkish tyranny and it was high time to square accounts with the bold inhabitants of Zeytoun as well.
The details of these events were divulged in the narratives of the eyewitness survivors from Zeytoun, Gyurdji Keshishian (born in 1900), Hovsep Bshtikian (born in 1903), Karapet Tozlian (born in 1903), Eva Chulian (born in 1903), Sedrak Gaybakian (born in 1903), Samvel Ardjikian (born in 1907) and Gayané Adourian (born in 1909). [Sv. 2011: TT. 252-258, pp. 432-446]

The Cilicians, who were the worthy inheritors of the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia (1198-1375) and had glorious traditions of the national-liberation struggle, could once again fight in self-sacrifice, but this plan was hindered by the Catholicos of Cilicia, Sahak Khabayan, and some Armenian notables, who, deceived by the false promises of the Turkish government, called the Armenians to obedience, arguing that “a little movement could endanger all the Armenian population of the provinces of Turkey”.

The Turkish government had already, as in the other localities, collected the Armenians' weapons and drafted the young men into the Turkish army, although many of them had been able to escape from the army and hide themselves in Zeytoun. Khurshid pasha came with an army of three thousand soldiers to claim the deserters who had taken refuge in the ancient St. Astvadsadsin (Աստվածածին - Holy Virgin) Monastery, built on the top of the Berzenka Mountain. On the 25th of March, the enemy started to shell the monastery. The self-defensive fighters of Zeytoun, under the leadership of Panos Chakerian, responded to the enemy’s attack, sparing their scanty bullets.
Karapet Tozlian (born in 1903), from Zeytoun, has told me: "...The monastery was just opposite the town of Zeytoun and we, the Zeytounis, were standing and watching. Suddenly we saw a few [Turkish] policemen who were carrying gazyagh (kerosene - Turk.) in tin containers to burn the monastery, but the [Armenian] eskhies (gunmen - Turk.) fired at them from inside the monastery and killed them". [Sv. 2011: T. 254, p. 439].

On the 9th of April, 300 notables of Zeytoun were taken to the military barracks, followed also by their families, who were all deported to unknown places. These were the first exiles. The forcible deportation from Zeytoun started. First, the district of the monastery was deprived of its inhabitants and subsequently all the villages surrounding Zeytoun were deserted. Then the eagle-nest Zeytoun was ravaged.

The deportation and massacre of the Armenian population of Cilicia started in the spring of 1915. One after the other, Marash, Aynatap, Hadjn, Antioch, Iskenderun, Kessab and other Armenian-inhabited localities were deserted.

"The forcible deportation of the Armenians was only a fraudulently veiled death sentence", the French publicist René Pinon has written in his published work entitled "La suppression des Arméniens. Méthode allemande - travail turc" ("The Extermination of the Armenians: German Method - Turkish Work")15.

On the roads of exile, the ruthless policemen and the criminals and murderers, set free from the prisons and wearing military uniforms, plundered and robbed everybody, ravished and dishonored the women and the girls. The disarmed, leaderless and helpless Armenian people were driven, with tearful eyes, from their native homes under the strokes of whips and bayonets. The genocidal policy initiated by the Turkish government had embraced almost all the Armenian-inhabited localities.

A survivor from Bassen (Erzroum), Ishkhan Haykazian (born in 1909), shared his meditations with me: "...Sometimes I think of my past life: how could the Turks massacre the unarmed Armenian people so brutally... While, at that time, the Armenian people were completely defenseless and had no weapons...". [Sv. 2011: T. 93, p. 226]

The extermination of the Armenians was realized both on the spot and in the places of exile, in the vast deserts of Mesopotamia, especially in Rakka, Havran, Ras-ul-Ayn, Meskené, Suruj, Deir-el-Zor and elsewhere.

"...Only I remained alive in our village," informed the 80-year-old Eva Choulian (born in 1903), a survivor from the region of Zeytoun: "The Turks came and drove us all out of the village. They were forcing us to march with whip strokes. They tied our hands behind and gathered us in a high place resembling

military barracks. They disrobed us totally and we stood completely naked as the day we were born. Then they broke one’s hand, another’s arm, still another’s leg with axes and daggers. Behind us a little boy, whose arm was broken, was crying and calling for his mother, but the mother had already died by an axe. That place was Der-Zor. It was very cold; we lay on each other to get warm. ...They came in the morning, assembled us and started once more to kill and drop the bodies in water. Below the cave, the River Khabur was flowing. They cut someone’s head, another’s leg, still another’s hand and all these human parts were piled one upon another on the ground. Some were not yet dead, but had their bones shattered or their hand severed. Some were crying, others squeaking. There was the odor of blood on the one hand and hunger on the other. People who were alive started to eat the flesh of the dead...”[Sv. 2011: T. 255, pp. 443-444]

Aram Kyosseyan (born in 1908), from Harpoot, has also testified: “I was seven years old in 1915 when the order of deportation from Harpoot came. We set out duly dressed as if we were going to a wedding ceremony. The plunder started on the road, not once, but repeatedly; they robbed us in every possible manner. At the end, we were left with our underclothes, which were torn to pieces. I was in the cart. My mother used to close my eyes so that I would not see the dead people lying on the ground. Eventually, my mother and my brother were unable to walk and remained on the road. I do not know whether they died or not... The Turks were coming behind us and were collecting the children. We did not know if they would kill us or take us as their children. ...We had walked so much that we were exhausted. At last they ordered us to come to a halt. We stopped in a valley. They began to ask the adults: 'Are you Turkish or Armenian?' Those who replied, 'I am an Armenian,' were set apart and those who said, 'I am a Turk,' were put on another side. The ones that did not deny their Armenian origin were taken to a remote place and slaughtered. The others who agreed to become Turks were saved. At night, they gathered us, the children, on top of a small hill. We were so tired, that we lie down and fell asleep. At daybreak, we found out with horror that we ignorantly slept all night on that hill of cut heads...”. [Sv. 2011: T. 123, p. 273]

The below-cited heart-rending dirge of the afflicted people has been woven under these ghastly impressions:

“The nightingale sings, it’s spring,
Don’t uncover our wound; it’s deep, deep,
Oh! Merciful Lord, what is this Der-Zor?
Weeping and weeping our eyes got blind!” [Sv. 2011: T. 458, p. 567]

And since it was violently prohibited to speak Armenian, they had to express their sorrow and affliction mostly in the Turkish language.
I have written down these popular songs, which have a great historico-factual value, in different periods, from survivors of different localities and in different variants, a fact which testifies that the said songs, being the immediate reflection of those tragic events, were of a nationwide character. Meanwhile, those quatrains of epic character entitled “In the Desert of Der-Zor” (more than 90 in number) are linked to each other by their thematic similarity and their refrains, objectively depicting the inexpressible sufferings endured by the Armenians.

The Genocide survivor, Yeghissabet Kalashian (born in 1888), from Moussa Ler, who is my first Turkish-language song performer, has narrated her mournful past: “At the time we were in the Arabian desert; we were living like animals - no clothes, no manner of life, no washing, no drinking. Even during the fulfillment of our natural needs the gendarmes stood by, showing an indecent behavior to women and girls. Food? What food? We gathered grass, we grazed on grass like animals. If we found salt, we ate grass with salt. Sometimes Arabs were seen in the distance. The Arab Bedouins had a lot of sheep, but they had no houses and lived in tents... My three little children died on the roads of exile. That is why I am all alone at this age...”.

This woman, aged seventy in 1956, who lived in the district of Vardashen, in Yerevan, was the first to communicate us quatrains of the Turkish-language Derzorian series of songs created by the Western Armenians. She sang these, recalling her miserable past, the children she had lost, while the tears ran down incessantly from her eyes, her voice coarsened and she could not sing; she took a breath, started to sing anew and cry again.

According to the information provided by my narrators, the massacre began in April, on Easter Sunday, so that the Armenians, too, would be worthy of the Passion of Christ. “The Armenians will dye their Easter eggs with their own blood”, said the Turks, while the affliction of the Armenians, turned into a song, resounded in a heart-breaking manner:

“They dismantled the tents on Zatik-Kiraki,”
They drove all the Armenians into the desert,
They slaughtered the Armenians like goats,
Armenians dying for the sake of faith!” [Sv. 2011: T. 480, p. 571]

And the indescribable tortures of the Armenians began:

Since the desert of Deir-el-Zor had become the living cemetery of the Armenian Genocide, where there was no hope of salvation:

---

16 The English translation of those Turkish-language songs are presented here.
17 The Armenian words “Zatik-Kiraki” (Easter Sunday) have been used in the Turkish-language song.
The countless corpses of the “Armenians dying for the sake of faith” were scattered everywhere, since the Ottoman soldiers had become “butchers”:

“The place called Der-Zor was a large locality, 
With innumerable slaughtered Armenians, 
The Ottoman chiefs have become butchers, 
Armenians dying for the sake of faith!” [Sv. 2011: T. 467, p. 569]

It is sufficient to cite here a quotation from the narrative of the well-known specialist in literature, Garnik Stepanian (born in 1909), a native of Yerznka: “...We came out of Yerznka. There was a bitter frost. My grandmother Vardanush was walking on the road of exile with great difficulty. Suddenly she stopped and said: 'Shoot me! Kill me! I can walk no longer.' She sat on the ground. The gendarmes tried to drag her and finally left her on the road. They drove us forward.... We were marching and looking behind every now and then. It was snowing heavily and the snow was covering her entire body. Soon my grandmother became a statue of snow. ...We reached Malatia. It was already spring. They had massacred all the Armenians. There were mounds everywhere, under which fifty to a hundred people were buried. Some of them were still alive, since the earth over them was moving...”. [Sv. 2011: T. 95, pp. 226-227]

A 96-year-old survivor from Nicomedia, Geghetsik Yessayan (born in 1901), also recollected the inconceivable sufferings of the roads of deportation and exile: “At the time of the Armenian Genocide, in 1915, I was fourteen years old. The exile started. Our family was composed of twelve people when we set out. Only two survived. They beat us on the roads with whips, they tormented us, they did not give us water. We traversed, on foot, through the towns of Devlet, Eskishehir, Konia, Ereyli, Bozanti, Kanli Gechit (Bloody Pass - Turk.), Aleppo, Bab, Meskenë, Dipsi, Abou-Harar, Der-Zor”. [Sv. 2011: T. 231, p. 414]

An 80-year-old eyewitness survivor from Sebastia, Souren Sargsian (born in 1902), recalled, in detail, his past days: “…After two days we arrived at the village of Ferendjelar, which was a small negligible village, but which became notable in the history of the Armenian nation. According to the governmental plan, the people had to
climb, on foot, up the Tauros Mountains and surmount a height of 3900 meters on their road of exile. Hundreds and thousands of caravans came here to their crucifixion, whence they went to their death. Women, children, newly born babies were being abandoned, forsaken and helpless. My sister Knarik remained there with her newborn infant. She was ill and was unable to walk. Ferendjelar (name of a locality - place of concentration of deportees)! Ferendjelar! Abandoned children, old, lonely women, diseased people lying here and there in agony, putrefied corpses under rags or in the streams". [Sv. 2011: T. 155, pp. 319-322]

Mkrtich Karapetian, from Tigranakert (born in 1910), narrated: 

"...Finally we came and reached the northern part of the desert of Der-Zor, the town of Merdin, where the train passed on its way to Aleppo. They made us stop there in a green field. There was a valley below. They separated us, the children, and took the adults towards the valley and made them stand in a line. There were about three to four hundred adults and we, the children, were nearly as many. They made us sit on the green grass, and we didn't know what was going to happen. Breaking from the line, my mother came several times to us, she kissed and kissed us and went back. We, my elder brother, I and my one-year-old brother, saw from afar a line of women moving forward; our mother was among them. On coming out of our house, mother was dressed in her national costume - a velvet dress, embroidered in gold thread; her head was adorned with gold coins; on her neck was a gold chain; twenty-five gold coins were secretly sewn inside her dress on both sides. When our mother came for the last time and kissed us madly, I remember she was clad only in her white underwear; there were no ornaments, no gold and no velvet clothes. We, the children, were unaware of the events happening there. In reality, they had taken off their clothes, one after the other, had arranged the garments on one side, had stripped the women completely, had cut their heads with axes and had thrown them into the valley...". [Sv. 2011: T. 139, p. 289]

Although the Armenian orphans, deprived of their fathers and/or mothers, who had taken refuge with foreign families, had forgotten their mother tongue, they had not, however, forgotten to cross themselves as Christians.

A 90-year-old survivor, an inhabitant of the Armenian national St. Prkich (Savior - Arm.) hospital-old-age home in Istanbul, Sirena Alajajian (born in 1910), from Adabazar, whose beautiful face had been tattooed with blue ink by the
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Rober Galenian (born in 1912), from Harpoot, also alluded to the policy of Turkification and forcible apostasy conducted by the Young Turks: “...The Turks apostatized the small children. They made them say: 'Mohamed Rassul Allah (Mohammad is God's Apostle - Turk.),' they circumcised them, they changed their names and forced them to speak Turkish...” [Sv. 2011: T. 127, p. 276]

An 81-year-old survivor, Harutyun Alboyadjian (born in 1904), from Fendedjak, also recalled with bitterness his sorrowful childhood: “...When they killed my parents they took me and other under-age children to the Djemal pasha18 Turkish orphanage and Turkified us. My surname was '535' and my name was Shukri. My Armenian friend was renamed Enver. They circumcised us. There were many others who did not know Turkish, they did not speak for weeks, with a view to hiding their Armenian origin. If the gendarmes knew about it, they would beat them with 'falakhas' (heavy club used as an implement of torture - Turk.); the punishment consisted of twenty, thirty or fifty strokes on the soles or looking directly at the sun for hours. They made us pray according to the Islamic custom, after which we were compelled to say three times 'Padişahım çok yaşa!' (Long live my King! - Turk.). We were clothed in the Turkish manner, a white robe and a long black, buttonless coat. We had a müdür (head-master - Turk.) and several khojakhanums (women-teachers - Turk.). Djemal pasha had ordered that we should be given proper care and attention, since he appreciated the Armenians' brains and graces and hoped that, in case of victory, thousands of Turkified Armenian children would, in the coming years, ennoble his nation and we would become his future support...” [Sv. 2011: T. 247, p. 426]

18 Djemal pasha (1872-1922) - Turkish statesman, one of the leaders of the party "Unity and Progress", a member of the “Triple leading committee” (Talaat, Enver, Djemal) of the Young Turks, one of the principal criminals of the Armenian Genocide.
Meanwhile, Soghomon Yetenekian (born in 1900), from Mersin, has recalled with the same deep emotion what he had seen: "...I do not wish my enemy to see what we have seen on our way to Der-Zor. My heart stops beating when I remember all that... Girls and women, three to four hundred in number, united their belts, fastened themselves together and, one after the other, jumped into the Euphrates River, in order not to fall in the Turks' hand. The current of the river could not be seen then, the corpses had risen to the surface and were piled up one upon the other like a fortress; the dogs got enraged by eating human flesh..." [Sv. 2011: T. 237, p. 420]

Aharon Mankrian (born in 1903), from Hadjn, also, confirmed the same fact, remembering the scenes he had witnessed: "...The water of the Euphrates was bloody, it was impossible to drink it; the corpses floated down the current..." [Sv. 2011: T. 248, p. 428]

The Armenian people were martyred in the cruelest manner; few people miraculously returned from the roads of forcible deportation and exile.

The deportation and massacre initiated by the tyranny of the Young Turks had, within a few months, attained enormous proportions, involving the regions of Western Armenia, Cilicia and Anatolia (Asia Minor). The towns of Svaz (Sebastia), Shapin-Garahissar, Harpoot, Malatia, Diarbekir (Amid), Izmit, Bursa, Ankara, Konia and the other Armenian-inhabited localities of Central and Western Anatolia (Asia Minor) were being deserted one after the other.

During these tragic days, however, the bold spirit of heroism, coming from the depth of centuries and inherited with the blood, reawoke in the soul of the Armenian people, who preferred "cognizant death" to slavery and decided to withstand violence with joint forces.

Under the circumstances of the extensive slaughter organized by the Young Turks, the Armenians were able to organize, in a number of regions, an uneven combat against the superior forces of the Turkish army, but these self-defensive battles were fought without a definite plan, in a spontaneous manner and isolated from one another. Nevertheless, as a result of those heroic battles, tens of thousands lives were saved from the Young Turks' atrocities in Van, Shatakh, Moush, Sassoun, Shapin-Garahissar and elsewhere.
On the 18th of July, an order for the deportation of the Armenians of Kessab arrived. During these very days, the Very Reverend Tigran Andreassian, a preacher, escaping from the group of people deported from Zeytoun, had returned to his native Moussa Ler (Dagh) and had told about the inexpressible sufferings of the poor exiles. Seeing that their turn would come soon, nearly all the inhabitants of the seven villages of Moussa Ler united together, on the 19th of July, and decided to disregard the disastrous order of deportation.

Movses Panossian (born in 1885), a 106-year-old participant of the heroic battle of Moussa Ler, narrated those events to me with a juvenile ardor peculiar to him, recalling the oath of the inhabitants of Moussa Ler: “I was born here, I will die here. I will not go as a slave to die with tortures under the enemy’s order; I will die here, with a gun in my hand, but I will not become an emigrant”. [Sv. 2011: T. 281, p. 463]

The details of that historical event have been related to me by the participants of the heroic self-defensive battles of Moussa Ler, Movses Balabanian (born in 1891), Hovhannes Ipredjian (born in 1896), Tonik Tonikian (born in 1898) and many other natives of Moussa Dagh. [Sv. 2011: TT. 281-297, pp. 463-471]

Everybody was filled with the feeling of protest and vengeance. Men and women, children and old people left their homes and orchards and ascended the inaccessible summit of Moussa Ler to defend their honor and dignity, to withstand the attack and to fight against the innumerable soldiers of the enemy. All, without exception and without delay, started, in an orderly manner, to set up tents, to dig trenches, to build ramparts with solid walls, leaving small embrasures from inside. In some places, they cut down the thick forest to enable them to see the enemy. Even the little boys, the so-called “telephone boys”, worked as signal men. The women organized the food, the girls and the young brides carried water for the fighters from afar. Step by step, the enemy approached the positions of the Moussa Ler fighters, but gunfire opened from different spots created the impression of a complete encirclement and the Turks fled, terror-stricken, leaving hundreds of dead soldiers.
During fifty-three days, violent battles were fought under the command of Yessayi Yaghoubian, Petros Demlakian and the Very Reverend Tigran Andreassian. During this period, four serious battles took place on the heights of Kezeldja, Kuzdjeghaz, Damladjik and Kaplan-Duzagh. On this occasion, the following imposing popular historical-epic song has been woven:

“We are courageous Moussadagh braves,
We are all well-trained gun-carriers,
The Turks want to deport us
And exterminate us in the deserts.

We do not wish to die like dogs,
We wish to leave a good memory,
To die with glory is an honor for us,
To be martyred is our nation’s praise…” [Sv. 2011: T. 635, p. 601]

The enemy concentrated new forces to chastise the rebellious Armenians. The provisions and armaments of the Moussa Ler people were exhausted. The heavy rain had rendered the three hundred shot-guns they had, all in all, unfit for use. Being in despair and hoping to receive aid from the sea, they tied white bedsheets together, they wrote on one of them “The Christians are in danger, save us!” and on the other they drew the sign of the Red Cross and displayed them on the mountain slope overlooking the sea.

On the 5th of September, the French battleship “Guichen” passing off-shore in the Mediterranean Sea noticed them and slowed down its course. With a metallic box, containing a petition written in foreign language and hung from his neck, Movses Gereguian jumped into the sea. He reached the ship swimming and, crossing himself, presented the letter to the captain. On the 14th of September, the French steamship “Jeanne d’Arc”, escorted by British battleships, approached Moussa Ler and, taking on 4200 inhabitants of Moussa Ler, transported them to Port-Saïd, where they were sheltered under tarpaulin tents.

The Moussa Ler people lived in Port-Saïd for four years, during which they earned their living by comb-making, spoon-making, rug-making, embroidery and other national handicrafts.

When relating their childhood memoirs, the survivors still remembered the way they had learned the Armenian alphabet by writing the letters on the hot sands of the desert with their fingers, up to the time when the Siswan School, established by the Armenian General Benevolent Union, began to operate in some tents, in addition to the hospital and the orphanage.
The heroic battle of Moussa Ler shook the world; it demonstrated to the world the immense capabilities of a handful of people who have heroic traditions and unanimous will power.

In his book “The Forty Days of Moussa Dagh”, the notable Austrian writer Franz Werfel has artistically depicted in vivid colors the exploit of the Moussa Ler people. However, the world did not pay attention in due time to the alarm raised by the great Austrian writer and a greater evil, Fascism, was born, as a consequence of which 6 million innocent Jews and millions of people of other nationalities were martyred.

In May 1915, the new mutasarrif (governor - Turk.) of Yedessia (Urfa), an Ittihat member, Ali Haydar organized the arrest of forty local Armenian notables and demanded from all the Armenians to hand over their arms in forty-eight hours. At the end of July, the enlightened primate of the Armenian Diocese of Yedessia, the Very Reverend Artavazd Galenterian, was put under arrest. In August, one thousand five hundred young Armenian recruits from Yedessia were slain in the localities of Gutemé and Karaköprü. Subsequently, they apprehended one hundred Armenian tradesmen and collected bribes from their kinsfolks saying that they would let them free, but they killed them all. They captured also one hundred others, who were destined to the same lot. In those days, the caravans of the exiled Zeytounis and of the poor Armenians deported from the other provinces of Turkey, all, dispossessed of their valiant youths, arrived in Yedessia, together with the sobs and laments of the child-deprived mothers, the horrifying stories about the young girls and innocent infants. The thirty-five thousand denizens of Yedessia
decided, after a special deliberation, to have recourse to arms similar to the inhabitants of Moussa Ler.

In October 1915, the heroic self-defense of Yedessia was organized, under the command of Mkrtitch Yotneghbayrian and Harutyun Rastkelenian. The whole Armenian population of Yedessia rose up. Children and old people, boys and girls fought like one man, in self-oblivion, during twenty-five days and nights uninterruptedly. The Armenian quarters were divided into six fighting regions, where eight hundred fighters were positioned. The Yedessians (Urfans) took an oath: “We are ready to die the arm in our hands.”

However the Turkish policemen and the rabble made a new attack and occupied the Armenian Catholic Church. The Yedessians (Urfans) let the enemy soldiers invade the Armenian quarter and, lying in ambush, annihilated them. Their intrepidity had become proverbial.

“Urfa is large; it cannot be separated,  
Its ground is firm; it cannot be dispersed,  
The braves of Urfa  
Are alone of their kind.” [Sv. 2011 T. 638, p. 602]

Meeting an obstinate resistance, a regular army composed of six thousand soldiers under the command of Fakhry pasha was sent to Yedessia (Edessa-Urha), to which were joined twelve thousand brigands. The defenders of Yedessia opposed a heroic resistance and inflicted heavy losses on the Turkish murderers. Fakhry pasha, enraged, declared in a worried tone: "What will our situation be if, in these critical days, several Urfas stood against us?"  

Seriously wounded in the knee and lying on a stretcher, Mkrtich Yotneghbayrian passed from one position to another and encouraged the fighters. Fakhry pasha sent a mediator, the German factory-owner M. Eckart, to M. Yotneghbayrian, exhorting him to stop the battle and to surrender. But the heroic son of Yedessia answered him: "If you have the feelings of a civilized and Christian man, save the innocent Armenian nation, which is being massacred in the deserts!"

The next day, the enemy tightened the siege and destroyed the Armenian quarter with a heavy cannonade. The condition of the Armenians became more critical day after day. On the 23rd of October, the Turks invaded the Armenian quarter and cruelly slaughtered the devoted heroes of Yedessia and deported the surviving eight hundred families of the neighboring Armenian-inhabited village of Kamurdj to Deir-el-Zor and ruthlessly massacred the majority of them on the road.

---

19 Սահակեան Ա., Դիւցազնական Ուրֆան եւ իր հայորդիները, Պէյրութ, 1955, էջ 818:  
20 Արզումանյան Մ., Հայաստան. 1914-1917, Երևան, 1969, էջ 453:  
21 Յուշամատեան Մեծ եղեռնի, խմբ. Գերսամ Ահարոնեան, Պէյրութ, 1965, էջ 804:
These historical events were narrated to me by three of the survivors of Yedessia, Khoren (born in 1893), Khacher (born in 1893) and Nvard (born in 1903) Ablaputians. [Sv. 2011: TT. 143-145, pp. 294-302]

Thus, the deportation and the massacre had already embraced the entire Ottoman Turkey. As a consequence of the inhuman and Armenian-annihilating policy conducted by the government of Young Turks, more than one and a half million Armenians became the victims of the Armenian Genocide.

The Armenian exiles, dispossessed of their dwellings and properties, of their beloved kinsfolk, who had experienced all the afflictions of the deportation and the genocide, have, on their road to death, expressed their indignation with curses:

“...May the person who planned this exile
Be sacrificed on the road to hell!” [Sv. 2011: T. 528, p. 577]

The eyewitness survivors have referred in their memoirs to the leaders of the Ittihat government, who organized that massive carnage. According to Yervand Karamian (born in 1903), from Hadjn: “In 1915, Talaat, Djemal and Enver pashas had come to an agreement and had schemed their plans together. Hence, when they deported us, they plundered us from all sides and took away all our properties. They attacked us with daggers and brutally slaughtered everybody...”[Sv. 2011: T. 249, p. 428]

During the years of his office as the Ambassador of the United States of America in Turkey (1913-1916), Henry Morgenthau condemned the Minister of Internal Affairs of the Ittihat government, Talaat pasha, exhorting him to discontinue the violence with regard to Armenians and declared: “...The Americans are outraged by your persecutions against the Armenians. You must base your principles on humanitarianism, not on racial discrimination, otherwise the United States will not regard you as a friend and an equal... You will find the public opinion against you everywhere and particularly in the United States. Our people will never forget these
massacres. The Americans will always bear the Turks a grudge for the massive extermination of Christians in Turkey. They will look upon it as nothing but willful murder and will seriously condemn all the men who are responsible for it. You will not be able to protect yourself relying on your political regulations and say that you acted as Minister of Interior and not as Talaat. You are defying all ideas of justice as we understand the term in our country...”22.

While Talaat pasha had declared boastfully: “In solving the Armenian problem, I did more work in three months than Abdul Hamid had done during thirty years”23.

An eyewitness-survivor from Malatia, Verginé Nadjian (born in 1910), also testified to that fact: “...The Turks took into consideration neither children, nor adults. The Turks said: 'We will exterminate the Armenian nation, so as to leave one Armenian in the museum...’” [Sv. 2011: T. 134, p. 285]

Referring to the historical events, it should be pointed out that in the days of the First World War, in 1916, two of the Allied countries, England and France, had signed a secret agreement (Sikes-Picaud) that, in case of the defeat of Turkey, Cilicia, having two million six hundred thousand hectares of arable and fertile lands, would pass under the supervision of France. The English and French authorities had agreed with the Armenian National Delegation that, if the Armenian volunteers fought against Turkey, the Armenians would enjoy ample political rights after the victory and the Armenian volunteers would constitute the garrison of the towns of the newly formed Autonomous Armenian Cilicia.

Consequently, Armenian young men from the Turkish army, from the roads of exile, from various places and even from America (natives of Moussa Ler, Aynap, Marash, Kessab, Hadjn, Hoosenik, Chengoosh, Sebastia, Harpoot, Arabkir and other localities) were enlisted in the French Army, creating the Oriental (Armenian) Legion.

The Armenian volunteers, filled with a feeling of vengeance for their numerous innocent martyred kinsfolk and defying death, defeated the Germano-Turkish armies and won the magnificent victory of Arara, near Nablous - Palestine. These historical events, too, have found their artistic reflection in popular Turkish-language songs:

“One by one I counted four years,
The Armenian soldiers occupied Nablous,
They were one thousand five hundred in number,
The English and the French were amazed”. [Sv. 2011: T. 545, p. 579]
And indeed, the French and the British commanders-in-chief praised the brave Armenian legionaries. On the 12th of October, 1918, General Allenby sent a telegram to the President of the Armenian National Delegation, Poghos Noubar, saying: “I am proud to have the Armenian regiment under my command. They fought courageously and had a great share in the victory”24.

When the government of the Young Turks was overthrown, their activities, in general, and their anti-Armenian crimes, in particular, were condemned both in Turkey and in the whole world. The new rulers, who were subject to the Entente States, adopted the position of condemning the leaders of the Young Turks’ regime. The eminent Armenian historian, the political figure and former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Armenia, John Kirakossian, in his book "The Young Turks Before the Judgement of History" has cited the testimonies of newspapers and political men, as well as documents of the Turkish archives, which also confirm the absolute truthfulness of the testimonies communicated by the eyewitness survivors. Here are a few quotations:

“...Thus, by November-December 1918 the Constantinople periodicals were full of testimony that helped to lay bare the truth. The newspapers published copies of the anti-Armenian documents and circulars by Talaat, Behaeddin Shakir, and Nazim Bey25. One of them contained the following citation: “Carry out exactly the orders given to you concerning the murder of the Armenians” (“Zhamanak”, newspaper, Constantinople, 11.12.1918) In the same issue of that newspaper there was also published Behaeddin Shakir's ciphered circular written in verse and addressed to the provincial governors as a signal:

No gun should be fired!
No soldier should be involved!
No Armenian should remain!
Slaughter the adults!
Choose the pretty ones!
And exile the rest!”26

“In its turn newspaper “Alemdar” wrote about Talaat and his adherents: “[They] hanged, murdered, deported, massacred and made others massacre, deport, and slaughter the Armenians. They are twice assassins, because they gave orders to murder and themselves murdered” (see: “La Renaissance” No. 127, 4.30.1919). Istiklal admitted that: “World War I awakened in us bestiality and immorality. To renounce the bitter truth is to renounce the sunlight” (see: “La Renaissance”, newspaper, Constantinople, No. 173, 22.06.1919)27.

24 Քէլէշեան Մ., Սիս-Մատեան, Պէյրութ, 1949, էջ 592:
26 Կիրակոսյան Ջ., Երիտթուրքերը պատմության դատաստանի առաջ, Երևան, գիրք 2-րդ, 1983, էջ 163:
Ahmed Riza, Chairman of the Parliament (a former political figure of the Young Turks) made a declaration on December 2, 1918, at the opening of the trial of the Young Turk criminals. It read: "For all the crimes and misdeeds committed by the government, for the outrages, public crimes..., confiscation of estates and buildings... oppression perpetrated from the day we entered the war (October 30, 1914) and until the fall of Talaat Pasha’s government (October 7, 1918)... I demanded the criminals be revealed as quickly as possible and brought to justice". Ali Bey, Minister of Justice, replied to this that: “those who organized massacres during the deportation or took part in it, whether they are governors or soldiers, must be tried as ordinary citizens and by an ordinary court” (“Zhamanak”, newspaper, Constantinople, 7. 25. 1918)28. When they started to arrest the governors and other officials, the Turkish newspaper “Tasfiri Evkyar” published the following article entitled “From the palace to the prison dungeon”, where the following lines were printed: “It is really sad that many of these personalities were enjoying, two months ago, glory and honor in our provinces and today they are taken to prison as ordinary criminals. It is difficult to comprehend why these people did not think that one day they would also be called to account for all the crimes perpetrated by the government of Talaat pasha, even if we were triumphant in the war” (No. 7, 15.12.1918)29. “We have no doubt, that, if requested, the libraries of Istanbul or Ankara can immediately put at the disposal of the Turkish State officials the collections of “La Renaissance”, “Tasfiri Evkyar” and other newspapers. Let them read and study their own country's history ... and stop lying”30, concluded John Kirakossian and continued, "at the end of 1918, the “Ittihat Party” [and] the Young Turks were outlawed in Turkey. The European public opinion was strictly anti-Young Turk. The eminent orientalists, the German Josef Markwart and the French Jacques de Morgan demanded publicly to take into the International Tribunal for trial the principal criminals who committed the policy of massacres against the Armenians. In his speech delivered in January 1919, the German scientist Josef Markwart demanded from his government to make every effort to find Enver, Talaat and the other criminals, to hand them over to the Entente, to bring them to trial in the International Tribunal31.

...The international public opinion was following and was commenting, on a large scale, the different aspects of Turkish life after the end of the war. The newspapers published testimonies of eyewitnesses relating about the anti-Armenian policy of the Turkish criminals32.

...Numerous books were published after the end of the war; not only were the Young Turks condemned as criminals, but there were also demands that action be taken against them with the participation of the representatives from the Entente and

28 Ibid.
29 Կիրակոսյան Ջ., Երիտթուրքերը պատմության դատաստանի առաջ, էջ 171:
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid., p. 172.
32 Ibid.
the United States\textsuperscript{33}. ...On July 13, 1919, the “New York Times” informed that “Turkey had condemned its military leaders of the period”, that the military tribunal had sentenced to death Enver pasha, Talaat pasha and Djemal pasha and that “the three of them had taken to flight”. The paper informed also that Djavid bey and several others (including the Sheikh-ul-Islam) had been condemned to fifteen years of penal servitude\textsuperscript{34}.

...The court sessions continued for months. ...Two charges were imputed to the Young Turk leaders: the involvement of Turkey in the war and the extermination of the Armenian nation. \textit{This was already the official recognition} of the monstrous crime perpetrated by the government officials of the Young Turks", concluded J. Kirakossian\textsuperscript{35}.

The Treaty of Sèvres, signed after the war, provided that the Entente countries should establish a supervision over Cilicia and that the Turkish troops should have already been evacuated from Cilicia. Numerous Armenian deportees, miraculously rescued from Deir-el-Zor, Ras-ul-Ayn and other living cemeteries, exhausted, emaciated and destitute, gradually returned and resettled in Cilicia. With hope and faith with regard to the future, they began to restore the ravage and to cultivate the abandoned orchards. The Turks, however, succeeded in coming to an agreement with the Allied States and urged the French to evacuate their peace-maintaining forces from Cilicia.

Not only did the French military administration not undertake serious measures to ensure the security of the Armenians, but they left the local authority in the hands of the Turkish military officials, who, furthermore, were not disarmed.

Ignoring the Treaty of Sèvres and taking advantage of the indecision and weakness of the French military administration, the Turkish forces and the local bandits directed their arms towards the Armenian population of Cilicia.

Starting from January 1920, the Turkish forces launched an attack on the Armenian localities of Cilicia. During the violent battle, which lasted for twenty-two days, the Armenians of the town of Marash were slaughtered and burned to ashes.

A miraculously saved eyewitness from Marash, \textbf{Vergine Mayikian} (born in 1898) narrated us in detail the horrifying events she had seen, bitterly reliving her grievous past: “...Karapet agha was very rich, he was a very skilled shoemaker. \textit{He made the shoes of the Turk leader of Marash, Jutki efendi (sir - Turk.) and felt very safe, but as he had no weapon, he

\textsuperscript{33} Kirakosyan J., The Armenian Genocide, pp. 163-164.

\textsuperscript{34} Կիրակոսյան Ջ., Երիտթուրքերը պատմության դատաստանի առաջ, էջ 208.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., p. 176.
couldn't defend himself. One night, breaking the gate of the garden, the Turk rabble rushed in, entered his house, killed every member of his family, from old to infant, threw them into the well of the garden; they plundered his property and shared it among themselves. After this event the Armenians began to think about self-defense. They transferred, for safety, the women and the children to the church of Karassoun Mankants (Forty Holy Martyrs' - Arm.). The Karassoun Mankants Church was the largest and safest church, since it was surrounded by ramparts. They transferred there all the women, the young brides and the children of our region, on the whole, more than two thousand people. It was simply crammed. The altar, the vestibule and the upper hall were full of people. Our freedom-fighters guarded the church on all sides. But the Turkish rabble was enraged and was thirsty for Armenian blood. From every side the voices of the Turks were heard: ‘In the name of Muhammad's sacred vow, we'll slaughter all the Armenians.’ The Turkish armed mob surrounded the Karassoun Mankants Church and encircled it like a chain. They didn't even let the doors be opened, saying that they would open it at night. That was the order. The Karassoun Mankants Church was built on a hilltop. The road leading to it was a few hundred meters in length and its width was almost four meters, and there were trees on both sides. The Armenians inside the church waited for the doors to be opened at night. Ten o'clock in the evening came, then eleven o'clock, then midnight, but nobody opened the door. People were overcrowded inside. There was no water and no light inside the church, there was ordure everywhere, one was crying, another lamenting, still another praying. In one word: a complete commotion. We heard their voices from the cellar of our house where we were hidden. At half past one after midnight, we noticed from our narrow casement that a few Turks were climbing over the arched roof of the church and were throwing kerosene-soaked burning rags through the church cupola. The smell of burning spread all over. The voices reaching from the church were heart-breaking. People were crying, shouting, screaming and entreating to open the door. Their voices seemed to come from under the earth. They were sighing and moaning so loud that their echoes reached us; these echoes diminished with every passing hour. But the smell of burning flesh and bones remained. The monsters had realized their plan. Nobody was alive any more in the church and in the neighborhood. The space of several hundred meters around the church, which was paved with large stones, was apparently covered with a thick layer of soap: it was, in reality, the grease of the burned Armenians, two inches in thickness, which had flowed down the threshold of the church and had hardened. The footsteps of the first passersby were printed on that layer of grease, like on the snow. Suddenly we saw Turkish women, everyone with a sieve in her hand, running toward the church. We were watching from afar, but I couldn't hold myself back; I wanted to go and see what had happened there. I put on something like a
robe, wrapped my head with a bed sheet and covered my nose and mouth. I already spoke Turkish very well and was sure that I would not betray myself. I set out to go to the Karassoun Mankants Church, the sooty walls of which were in a dilapidated state, while the molten grease of the burned people had flown from under the door down the hill. I trod on it and my feet clung to the ground. At last I saw a Turkish woman passing by, with a sieve in her hand, who asked me: 'Badji (sister - Turk.), why didn't you take a sieve with you?' Without getting confused, I said: 'I'll come back and fetch one.' She smiled and replied: 'Do you think anything will remain when you come back?' It was already the third day, the walls of the church were still hot and reddened like a potter's oven. I went into the church and what did I see? Every one of the Turkish women had appropriated a section of the church and did not allow the others to trespass on her property; they shouted at each other: 'I'll kill the one who crosses my borderline...' It was worth seeing how those monstrous-looking women rejoiced when they found a molten piece of gold in the sifted ashes...". [Sv. 2011: T. 259, pp. 446-447]

The following concise, though figurative, popular song has been composed under the direct impressions of those bewildering historical events:

"Marash is called Marash, alas!
Marash, how do they call you Marash?
When they burn a church in Marash,
And they burn Armenians in the church!" [Sv. 2011: T. 550, p. 580]

Thirteen thousand Armenians perished during the massacres of Marash. Subsequently, the surviving eight thousand residents of Marash, together with six thousand Armenians from Yedessia, were forcibly deported to Aleppo, Damascus, Beirut, Jerusalem, Baghdad and to the regions of Anatolia (Asia Minor) found under Greek domination.

On the 1st of April, 1920, the Turks besieged Ayntap. The life of about ten thousand Armenian refugees from Ayntap and eight thousand from Sebastia, who had just re-established and found peace there after the end of the war and the Armistice, became once more turbulent. The Armenians of Ayntap took up a self-defensive position. A central military committee adjoining the National Union was created on the spot under the leadership of Adour Levonian. The latter took stock of the arms and the ammunition of the 750 fighters and organized the manufacture of shells.

These historic events have been recounted to us with inspiration by Gevorg Hekimian (born in 1937) who had heard the narrative from his mother: "In 1920, Ali
Kelendj attacked Ayntap with a tremendous army. The leader of the self-defensive committee of Ayntap was Adour Levonian. Adour pasha collected the copper cauldrons from the inhabitants of Ayntap and had them melted to make shells. He and his volunteers attacked the enemy and broke through the siege, forcing the twenty-four thousand soldiers commanded by Ali Kelendj to flee in dismay in one night shouting: The Armenians are filled with vengeance. ‘They had composed this song about Adour Levonian in our Ayntap,’ said my mother and sang: [Sv. 2011: T. 269, p. 454]

“Adour pasha, get up! Light your kindlings! The Turks are attacking: Charge with your volunteers!” [Sv. 2011: T. 641, p. 604]

In the meantime, the commander-in-chief of the occupation of Cilicia, Gozan oghlu Doghan bey, with his innumerable soldiers laid siege to the town of Hadjn; the town initially had an Armenian population of 35,000, of which only 6,000 had been rescued from the Genocide.

“Doghan bey came and entered Hadjn… How regrettable for you, immense Hadjn!… Our possessions were pillaged there… The Armenians were trampled down there!” [Sv. 2011: T. 551, p. 581]

In the enemy's opinion, “the complete destruction and extermination of the Armenian citadel of Cilicia, Hadjn, was an hour's job and that they would be capable of burying the six thousand Armenians with a slight attack.”36 The inhabitants of Hadjn, however, were resolute. They formed the superior council of the self-defense of Hadjn under the leadership of their governor, advocate Karapet Chalian, and elected as the defense commandant officer Sargis Jebejian, General Andranik's comrade-in-arms. Four military companies and a squadron composed of sixty cavalrymen were organized. Hadjn and its environs were divided into four defense regions. Trenches were dug. Everybody was in fighting trim. The available 132 rifles were distributed to the 1200 males aged 16-50, who were capable of taking up arms.

That is why the Hadjn people, who were in great need of arms, waited impatiently for the help expected from abroad through the National Union of Adana; the help included not only arms and ammunition, but also new fighting forces. Nevertheless, no help was received and the condition of the population of Hadjn became desperate, since the French high-ranking military representatives conducted an equivocal policy and, though they had promised to provide provisions and ammunition for the self-defense of Hadjn, they not only broke their word, but informed also the Turks about the

36 Թերզեան Ս. Յ., Հաճընի ութամսեայ դիւցազնամարտը, Պուենո-Այրես, 1956, էջ 241.
organization of the self-defensive plan of the Armenians. The freedom-fighters of Hadjn seized the enemy’s enormous cannon with great difficulty, but they could not use it to defend themselves for the lack of shells. Starvation caused a great distress to the inhabitants of Hadjn. “People were obliged to eat cats, mice, dogs, leather, the bark of trees, moccasins.”37 These facts were confirmed also by Aharon Mankrian (born in 1903), a survivor from Hadjn, in the memoir he related to me. [Sv. 2011: T. 248, p. 428]

The enemy reinforced the army with new cannons and innumerable regular armed forces. After prolonged and obstinate battles and a heroic resistance, which lasted for eight months, the Turkish forces were able to destroy and to burn down all the stone houses of Hadjn by cross-point heavy cannonade. Hundreds of valorous combatants fell on the fortifications; thousands of Hadjn denizens were cruelly massacred. Only 380 people succeeded in accomplishing a breakthrough by fighting and came out of the terrible encirclement of fire.

This heroic self-defensive battle has also been praised in various songs, which are sung by the people:

“...Three hundred Armenian braves,  
All armed with rifles,  
Gave a blow to Doghan bey’s army,  

With yells of “Vengeance” the town of Ayntap also fell; it heroically resisted, fighting intermittently for 314 days, as well as the ancient capital of Cilicia, Sis, the valiant eagle-nest, Zeytoun, the town with a historic past, Tarson, the commercial center Adana and various other Armenian-inhabited localities of Cilicia.

Verginé Mayikian (born in 1898), from Marash, also referred in her memoir to the political events of that period, which had disappointed the Armenians: “...We led our comparatively peaceful life until 1918-1920, when the French authorities were still in Cilicia. The French and Armenian newspapers always wrote that the French forces would eternally remain in Cilicia, because the prestige of France had grown after the First World War, while that of Turkey had, on the contrary, decreased. But that peace, alas, did not last long. We felt gradually that the Turks began to hate us. And one day, we woke up and knew that the French had covered the hoofs of their horses and had left Marash silently. We got up in the morning and were astonished, since nobody knew

37 Արամ Ասպետ, Դրուագներ Հաճընոյ հերոսամարտէն, Պէյրութ, 1961, էջ 242:
anything about it. Even the famous Hakob agha Khrlakian, who supplied the French army with rations free of charge, had heard nothing from General Dumont concerning their departure. Thus, the French army was no longer in Marash in September 1920. It seemed that the Turks knew about it beforehand; at night there were some gun-shots here and there to frighten us...” [Sv. 2011: T. 259, p. 446]

The French government, breaking its obligations as an ally, handed Cilicia over to Turkey by an agreement signed on the 20th of October, 1921, in Ankara, condemning the Armenian population of Cilicia to the danger of massacre.

Although the Turkish government cruelly suppressed the heroic resistance and the self-defensive battles started in various localities, nevertheless, the devoted Armenian heroes, who struggled for their elementary human rights and for the physical survival of their nation, recorded brilliant pages in the history of the national-liberation struggle of the Armenian people.

It was at that time that the national hero Soghomon Tehlerian took revenge for the millions of victims of the Armenian Genocide by killing Talaat pasha in Berlin.

On June 2-3, 1921, the regional law court of Berlin heard the case of Talaat's murderer, Soghomon Tehlerian, and acquitted the Armenian avenger, since he had carried into effect the death sentence passed by the Turkish tribunal.

The Armenian nation has also imparted a poetic tinge to that startling event:

“Talaat pasha fled to Berlin,
Tehlerian caught him up,
He shot him in the forehead, knocked him down,
Fill your cup with wine, brother!
Fill your wine and drink to our health!...” [Sv. 2011: T. 650, p. 607]

Although the German judges acquitted the Armenian avenger showing an understanding attitude, nevertheless, the condition of the Western Armenians did not improve therewith...

In 1921, after the forcible deportation of the Armenian population of Cilicia, it was the turn of the Armenians of Anatolia (Asia Minor), whose majority had been ruthlessly massacred during the Genocide and those who were miraculously rescued continued their existence in the Armenian-inhabited localities under Greek domination and especially in the port of Izmir.

In 1922, the Turks also burned down the Armenian and Greek quarters of Smyrna (Izmir), driving the Christians to the seashore. That horrible event has been recorded in the memory of the Western Armenians as "the calamity of Izmir".

According to the statement of a survivor from Yerznka, Garnik Stepanian (born in 1909): “...In 1922, Mustafa Kemal's soldiers burned Izmir, they poured petrol and kerosene and burned the Armenians and the Greeks gathered in the churches...” [Sv. 2011: T. 95, p. 228]
A survivor from Afion-Garahissar, **Arpiné Bartikian** (born in 1903), remembered with emotion the ghastly scenes she had witnessed and told me: “...And then the Milli (Nationalistic - Turk.) movement started, Izmir was committed to the flames. They burned the Armenian quarter, Haynots, in the first place and set fire to the St. Stepanos Church, since all the Armenians had taken shelter in it; we fled and ran to the seashore. There were numerous boats in the sea, but the Turks had drilled holes in all the boats in order to prevent the Armenians from escaping. The poor Armenians sat in the boats and sailed to the open sea, but, after some time, the boats were filled with water and sank. The swollen bodies of the drowned people floated on the surface of the sea. They took us with the rest to Baldjova and lodged us in wooden huts near the shore. They started to inspect us. They dragged and forcibly took away the pretty girls. I was a puny, undersized girl and hid myself under the skirts. Our Mary had her face blackened with soot and her hair was shorn and she had an ugly appearance. They looked at her and left her saying: 'she is useless'. A little farther we heard the voices of the Turks who were sharpening their knives to slaughter us. An Armenian girl saw that her turn was approaching, she threw herself down from the window, but she did not die. Other gendarmes had been standing under the window... they brought her after a few days in an unrecognizable state...” [Sv. 2011: T. 195, p. 382]

An eyewitness survivor, familiar to us from the deportation episodes of Deir-el-Zor, **Smbyul Berberian** (born in 1909), from the town of Afion-Garahissar, also remembered with equal emotion and tearful eyes what she had seen during the calamity of Izmir: “...Somewhere, the Turks had made a bonfire, and they were throwing the Armenians into the flames. They caught my mother and cast her into the fire. I and my sister began to shout and cry, but we could not rescue our mother from the fire... Then other Turkish soldiers came and found us. They made us stand in line, selected two men among us; they made them lie down on the ground and began to flay them, laughing and saying: 'We are slaughtering cows.' They skinned the men with difficulty. Those two poor men were being tortured alive; they were shouting and screaming painfully. In the end, they skinned them completely... The Turkish gendarmes pierced everyone, the Armenians and the Greeks, with bayonets and threw them into the sea without distinction of age: infants, children, old people and mothers. You could not see the water because of the human corpses...”. [Sv. 2011: T. 198, pp. 384-385]

Then the survivor sobbed and, with tears running down her eyes, sang with deep emotion the long dirge she had composed herself, of which two verses are given below:
“We came out of Afion\(^{38}\)
And came to the town of Izmir,
I didn’t find my dear mother
And sobbed my heart out.

Ah, dear mother, they deceived us,
They separated me from you,
They threw you in the fire,
They burnt you and charred you…” [Sv. 2011: T. 563, p. 586]

The situation was fatal and inextricable. There was fire behind and water in front. Only those who gave their last gold coins and ornaments to the Turks to save their lives were rescued from the hell-like turmoil, while those who had no means, threw themselves into the violent sea-waves and, defying death, tried to swim to the ships anchored at a distance and bearing European flags, which would carry the homeless Armenians to unknown destinations:

“...We fled from there to Greece,
Many others – to France,
Still others – to Egypt,
Thus, we’re dispersed in all directions”. [Sv. 2011: T. 564, p. 586]

Thus, the Armenian Diaspora was created as a historical reality.

Uprooted from their paternal land, the Armenian exiles were in foreign lands, unaware of foreign languages and laws, only fit to work as cheap labor, despite the fact that the talented skill of the Armenian artisans and the elegant handiwork and carpets of the diligent Armenian women had won the admiration of foreigners. Moreover, the dread of assimilation, degeneration and, particularly, unemployment gave the wandering Armenians no rest.

“...We found ourselves in foreign lands,
I yearn and long and cry,
May the Armenian Problem be solved soon,
Have patience, my soul, have patience!

Rejoice and do not cry in grief,
Stand firm on your feet,
You will soon hear about Repatriation,
Have patience, my soul, have patience!” [Sv. 2011: T. 663, p. 612]

---

\(^{38}\) The town of Afion-Garahissar.
The caravans of the Western Armenian repatriates deprived of their homes and native cradle, followed each other to Eastern Armenia, first, in the 1920-1930s from Constantinople, France and Greece and, subsequently, in 1946-1948, a mass Repatriation was organized from Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Iraq, France, Greece, the Balkan states and from distant America...

The Western Armenians resettling in a territory 10 times smaller than that of historic Armenia they had lost, created new boroughs and districts with the names symbolizing the memory of their historical native cradle. Nevertheless, the anguish of the former ruined house and of the extinguished native hearth continued to fume in their memory and the vision of the lost homeland, transformed into a call of the soul, was transmitted from generation to generation:

“When the doors of hope will be opened,  
And we shall return to our country again,  
Our Homeland, our magnificent country,  
Which was taken from us with violence.

I wish to see my Cilicia,  
Its air is pure, its water - clear,  
I wish to see my Cilicia,  
Monasteries and fortresses are plenty there.

When the Armenian Problem will be solved,  
And our ancestors' land will be given to us,  
We will cultivate our fields  
And will populate our villages.

I wish to see Sassoun and Van;  
Zeytoun, Hadjn and Moussa Dagh,  
Tarsun, Marash, Sis and Aytap,  
We, certainly, will embellish”. [Sv. 2011: T. 658, p. 611]

The repatriates came to Soviet Armenia full of hope and faith. They came in dense caravans encouraged by the victory of the Soviet Union in the Second World War and, particularly, by its official claim for the Armenian lands presented to Turkey on the 1st of November, 1945.... And together with the great expectations, the popular song was woven from mouth to mouth:

“I want to go to Armenia,  
I want to see Yerevan,  
I want to hoist the flag  
On the top of Mount Ararat!” [Sv. 2011: T. 666, p. 613]
And the song of the people resounds as a claim:

“...We want them, we want them,
Kars and Ardahan are ours...

Kars and Ardahan will
Soon be returned to us,
So that we transform
These waste lands into a paradise”. [Sv. 2011: T. 672, pp. 614-615]

The Turkish diplomats, however, burying in culpable oblivion all those historical events that happened not long ago, and denying the Armenian Genocide, have declared: "We have no debts to anyone in terms of Turkish lands and rights. We shall live as honorable people, we shall die as honorable people”39.

On the other hand, according to the authentic historical facts of the Armenian Genocide and the testimonies we have recorded from the eyewitness survivors and thousands and thousands other evidences, the past of Ottoman Turkey and Young Turks regime has never been “honorable”.

As Hakob Holobikian (born in 1902), from Harpoot, has concluded, after describing in detail the afflictions he and his compatriots had suffered: “…This crime committed by the Turkish Ittihat members will never be forgotten and should never be forgiven...”. [Sv. 2011: T. 115, p. 264]

The painter Elena Abrahamian (born in 1912), from Kars, has, after narrating her sorrowful memoir with tearful eyes, come to the conclusion: “…The Turks don't admit that they have massacred the Armenians. …The Turk is a Turk. Whatever shirt he puts on himself, he will remain the same Turk. Granting that they do not admit the Armenian Genocide, then what was it that we saw with our own eyes and heard with our own ears? And what I have seen in only a drop of what the Turks have done. If the Turks do not admit what they have done, there can be no reconciliation with them”. [Sv. 2011: T. 77, p. 193]

---

39 Լազեան Գ., Հայաստան եւ Հայ դատը (Վավերագրեր), Գահիրէ, 1946, էջ 372-373.
At the end of her narrative, Evelina Kanayan (born in 1909), from Igdir, has declared with deep emotion, but self-confidently: "...Even if the representatives of the United Nations come, I'll tell them all I have seen..." [Sv. 2011: T. 59, p. 176]

Ghoukas Karapetian (born in 1901), from Moks (Mokk), has summed up his memoir as follows: "...What happened in 1915 will never be forgotten. The Turks want all that to be forgotten and they don't admit it, but may God help us and be a righteous judge for us, the Armenians". [Sv. 2011: T. 57, p. 170]

Meanwhile, Dsirani Matevossian (born in 1900), from Harpoot, has proposed in a simple popular language: “May the Turks die, they brought all this disaster upon us; we got deprived of our country, of our riches, of our kin. And now, they declare impudently that the Armenians have slaughtered the Turks. Our gold, our houses and lands were left to the Turks. I am surprised how the Armenians can't make short work of the Turks. Let all what we have told be written in a book and let all the peoples of the world read it and know who is guilty, who is righteous and who is the aggrieved party...”. [Sv. 2011: T. 113, p. 259]

The Turkish propaganda and official historiography of today are not sparing any efforts to distort the historical evidences with a view to carefully concealing from the coming generations the Armenian Genocide perpetrated by the Turkish state. They are trying to sidestep the truth that the Turkish authorities themselves undertook, from the beginning of 1919, the organization of the trial of the Young Turk criminals.

So, the deplorable historical reality is an irrefutable fact and is not subject to any doubt.

Having this circumstance in view, Hakob Papazian (born in 1891), from Sivrihissar, a graduate from the
Istanbul Medical University, who had served in the Turkish army as a medical officer and had seen all these inhuman cruelties with his own eyes and thoroughly analyzed them, has concluded: "...When I recall all that I think to myself: none of the civilized countries took any step towards humanism. Therefore, willy-nilly they encouraged the Turks to annihilate millions of unarmed and defenseless, innocent Armenians of Western Armenia, a whole nation, from the old to the young with such cruelty that hadn't been heard or written in the history of mankind: people were tortured and tormented to death, held captive, kidnapped, raped, forcibly turned into Turks, slaughtered, sent to the gallows, some were hanged head-down and left to die in torments. They imprisoned hundreds of people in churches and barns, hungry and thirsty, for several days and then they poured kerosene on them and burned them to ashes. Countless, innumerable people were drowned in the Euphrates River. On both sides of the road of exile they buried small children alive up to their neck and left them to die, and the deported people were led by the same road to see these atrocities and to feel violent grief. The Turks cut open the bellies of pregnant women with swords, they violated the young virgin girls, kidnapped young women to make them concubines in their harems, they forced aged and young people to become Turks and speak only Turkish... The Armenian nation was isolated and was in a tragic situation. The Armenians lost their historical native land, millions of Armenians were martyred ruthlessly. And all that took place before the eyes of civilized humanity, by their knowledge and permission. The Great States acted as Pilates for their future material interests and willy-nilly allowed the Grey Wolf - the Turks - to torture and devour an unarmed and defenseless nation. They encouraged the Turks, thus becoming accomplices in the Armenian Genocide...". [Sv. 2011: T. 200, p. 387]

And Pargev Makarian (born in 1915), from Ayntap, has added: "...The Great Powers deceived the Armenians; they gave Cilicia to the Turks. The Armenians of Zeytoun, Adana, Sis, Marash, Kilis, Ayntap, Yedessia, Kamourdj and other towns left their native lands. We were forced to leave Cilicia. We were obliged to abandon our country. And in 1922 they incited the disaster of Izmir; the Armenians and the Greeks escaped through the flames, threw themselves into the sea; all those, who were saved, went to other countries. Thus, the Turks "cleaned" Turkey of the Christians. Turkey, along with Western Armenia and Cilicia, remained to the Turks...". [Sv. 2011: T. 272, p. 456]

In actual fact, the international community, too, did not warn in time and did not condemn at its true worth the first genocide, The Armenian Genocide, perpetrated in the 20th century, and that fact gave birth, as a logical sequel, to Fascism and, most recently, to international terrorism, with its unpredictable manifestations and universally disastrous consequences, since unpunished crimes repeat themselves in prejudice of mankind.
Thus, the memoirs and songs of historical character communicated by the eyewitness survivors, saved, in this manner, from a total loss and entrusted to the coming generations, become, owing to their historico-cognitive value, testimonies elucidating, in a simple popular language, the Armenian Genocide and the historical events following it; they are authentic, objective and documental evidences, which are not only attestations of the past, but are also a warning for the future...

That is why it is particularly important to expose and to put, by means of the present study, into scientific circulation the popular factual-documentary testimonies of the eyewitness survivors concerning the whole course of the Armenian Genocide, the innocent martyrs and the lost Homeland, since GENOCIDE is a CRIME, which should be brought to light also with the help of the eyewitnesses. And the greatest witness is the People, who, painfully reliving, have narrated and continue to narrate and testify their tragic past. That past, which is the past of the Armenian people, their history, their collective historical memory, which should be presented to the world and to the righteous judgement of mankind.
During their millennia-old history the Armenian nation has created rich culture, built a wide variety of architectural monuments in its cradle - the territory of the Armenian Highland.

As a continuation of the Armenian Genocide, Turkey perpetrates the genocide of culture in the largest, western part of historical Armenia. In the course of World War I and during the following decades a policy of destroying or appropriating many thousands of historical Armenian monuments was realized in Western Armenia through the Turkish state program. As a result, thousands of centuries-old and diverse monuments having universal value were destroyed forever.

In 1912 the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Turkish government assigned the Armenian patriarchate of Constantinople to make a list of operating Armenian monasteries and churches in the territory of the Ottoman Empire. Archbishop Maghakia Ormanyan, who was assigned to this task, submitted a list of almost 2200 units of Armenian monasteries and churches operating in Western Armenia.

After the whole of Western Armenia was bereft of its native people by committing the Armenian Genocide the Turkish authorities realized the policy of annihilating the monuments of material culture of the Armenian people in a planned and purposeful manner: they were led by the naive viewpoint that in this way Turkey could continue the occupation of Western Armenia.

Thus, thousands of monuments that had been created during millennia and were in fact the universal civilization’s integral value were wiped off the face of the earth by the fanaticism of the Turkish authorities. A phenomenon, the intentional manner and actions of which confirmed the planned genocide committed by the Turkish government towards Armenian culture as well.

It is apparent that the primary target of the destruction was chosen, especially those monuments that exposed the historical reality more vividly and testified to the existence of the native Armenian people in their historical Motherland before the genocide. This is the reason why the Armenian cemeteries and lapidary inscriptions, monasteries, churches and chapels rich in thousands of tombstones and khachkars (Խաչքար, stone cross) that represented the Christian layer of the Armenian culture were destroyed first and foremost, whereas, for example, from Armenian bridges and

---

1 The Condition of Armenian Monuments in Western Armenia since 1915, ՎԱՐՁՔ (DUTY OF SOUL), Research on Armenian architecture, 2, 2010, pp. 2-65.
founts and residential or public buildings only the Armenian construction inscriptions (that told the truthful history of their construction) disappeared, and they were appropriated by nomadic Turks in that savage way.

If the Christian cult structures were privatized and their fate totally depended on the owner’s will (they were used as a cattle shed, a barn, a straw yard, sometimes as a dwelling or they were very often just destroyed to use the construction material), the territories occupied by cemeteries mainly remained under the state jurisdiction. That is why in many villages the public buildings such as schools, village municipalities, hospitals, etc., were built in the territory of Armenian cemeteries as a result of which all the cemetery monuments vanished.

Based on the formula that genocide is not only the physical, but also the cultural extermination of an ethnic or religious group, it can be inferred that the Turkish authorities committed the genocide of Armenians in 1915 and in fact, continue that crime till now. A posture, which is completely inappropriate and reprehensible for a country that is a member of international organizations such as UNESCO and ICOMOS, and has pretentions to become a member of the European family. Moreover, Armenian culture is a part of world civilization so preserving Armenian Christian architecture is an important task of the international community.

Republican Turkey still continues denying the planned and executed state level genocide of 1894-1896 and 1915-1923 and moreover, spares no effort to get rid of the monuments that testify to the Armenian origin of Western Armenia.

Furthermore, in modern Turkey the denial of the Genocide has become a state policy. Special organizations established and supported by the government are publishing, spreading and propagandizing various books in different languages distorting and falsifying the Armenian history. The genocide which was and is still being committed against Armenian culture has two main goals: to prove that Western Armenia has never been the cradle of the Armenians and that no genocide was committed against the Armenians in Western Armenia by Turkey.

According to the UNESCO data of 1974, 464 of the 913 survived buildings were completely demolished, 252 were turned into ruins and 197 need extreme reconstruction. In spite of the existence of the law in Turkey about the preservation and reconstruction of historical monuments, no monument had been reconstructed in Turkey until 1999-2000. During recent years, implementing an even more distorting plan, they started the works of “reconstructing” the city walls, residential blocks and trade rows of Ani, etc.

Armenian architectural monuments have consistently been exploded and used as targets during military exercises; their ashlars were used as construction material and the ones that were still erect served as a barn, storehouse, even a prison and in some cases they were turned into a mosque or were falsely announced samples of “Seljuk architecture”.

533
The Turkish authorities explained the destruction of Armenian churches by earthquakes in the region. But how is it that those earthquakes selectively do not destroy, for example, any Seljuk monument?

For years the Turkish media proclaimed that before “leaving” the country, the rich Armenians had hidden their gold under stones on which there were inscriptions of “the faithless” or a cross engraving. Obsessed with the idea of finding gold Turks and Kurds who had occupied the Western Armenian settlements bereft of Armenians constantly destroyed and are still destroying everything that reminds them of Armenianness.

Today Turkey is a member of UNESCO but numerous facts prove that after the Armenian Genocide modern Turkey continues to commit the genocide against Armenian culture.
Tekor. St. Yerrordutyun (Holy Trinity) Church (5th century)
(photo of the beginning of XX century).

In 1956 the church of Tekor became the target of the Turkish army during artillery exercises.
The church of St. Hovhannes of Bagavan (in ancient Bagrevand district, Ayrarat province) (631/639), on the left bank of the river Aratsani

The church of Bagavan was completely destroyed at the end of the 1940s and some of its stones were sold and others were used to build a mosque in a nearby town.
The Horomos monastery (the X-XIII centuries) to the north of the city Ani on the right bank of the Akhuryan river.

The Horomos monastery was destroyed in the 20th century.
Argina. The church named Katoghike (the 10th century), where the Armenian Catholicos resided (photo of the beginning of XX century).

The church of Argina, was totally destroyed by explosion between the 1940s and 1950s.
Five churches of Khtskonk monastery built in the X-XIII centuries were exploded in 1964; only St. Sargis church remained erect “by a miracle”.
Taron. All the monastic buildings in St. Arakelots monastery of Mush were destroyed; the pantheon-cemetery of the renowned Armenians of V-XV centuries vanished. There were the cemeteries of Movses Khorenatsi, Ghazar Parpetsi, Anania Shirakatsi, Stepanos Taronatsi (Asoghik) and others and khachkars and tombstones to honor their memory.
St. Karapet monastery of Mush was robbed and partly destroyed in 1915. In 1960s as a result of artillery exercises it was turned into a pile of stones which was later used as construction material while founding a village in the same place.
Vaspurakan. To the south of Van, near the village Tsvstan the monastery Krmku built in X-XII centuries. It was totally destroyed in XX century.
Vaspurakan. To the east of Van, near the village Koghbants (present Sarmach) the churches St. Astvatsatsin and St. Karapet and all the other auxiliary buildings of the St. Grigor monastery of Salnapat (X-XIII centuries) were exploded in the 1960s.

Rshtunik. In the village Narek (present Yemishlek) the memorial monastery Narekavank consisting of several churches and numerous auxiliary buildings was completely
destroyed. In the 1970s at the site of the monastery, using its stones, a mosque and residential buildings were built.
Vaspurakan. The Varagavank monastery was subjected to great destruction in 1915 and part of the complex was used as a storehouse and barn. During 1998-2000 a mosque was built with the stones of the monastery right next to it.
Vaspurakan. In the village Artamet near Van hundreds of medieval *khachkars* of a large cemetery were destroyed and vanished.

Touruberan. The medieval cemetery of Khlat containing hundreds of *khachkars* were destroyed and vanished.
Vaspurakan. The monastery of the island Lim (Van Lake) was exploded as a result of which the church and belfry built in X-XI centuries were totally ruined.
In 2000 the trench that had been dug along the whole length of the foundations of the southern wall of the church Mren (639-640) preordained an imminent collapse. In 2007 the facade of the church was completely destroyed.
A number of Armenian churches (in Khlat, Khasgegh, Baghesh, Khultik, Parkhand, Mazra, Tspni, Khakhu and many others) were turned into mosques
The church Arakelots in the city of Kars (in 1998 it was turned into a mosque. Some years before, the adjacent construction (duplicating the belfry of Haghpat) to the Arakelots church had been destroyed.
In the 1960s the St. Gr. Lusavorich church of Kars was destroyed.
General view of the castle of Tignis from the south-east (photo by architect Toros Toramanian, the 1900s)
The remains of the Tignis castle (photo by S. Karapetian, 2005).

The church with a round layout built in the X-XII centuries that was in the Chldr district was ruined in the XX century.
To the south of the city of Ani the monastery of Bagnayr was built in the VII-XIII centuries.
Several churches and other monastic buildings of Bagnayr were destroyed in the XX century.
REPORT TURKS SHOT
WOMEN AND CHILDREN

Nine Thousand Armenians Massacred and Thrown into Tigris, Socialist Committee Hears.

PARIS, Aug. 3. — B. Varazdate, a member of the Executive Committee of the Armenian Social Democratic Party, writing to L’Humanite, the Socialist daily, says that the committee has received word to the effect that Turks, after massacring all the males of the population in the region of Bitlis, Turkish Armenia, assembled 9,000 women and children and drove them to the banks of the Tigris, where they shot them and threw the bodies into the river.

These advices have not been substantiated from any other source.

The Armenian population of Cilicia, in the Turkish Vilayet of Adana, also has been subjected to persecutions, according to the reports of the committee. More than 40,000 persons already are dead and it is feared that the Armenians at Moucks and Diarbekr, in Kurdistan, also have been massacred.

Twenty members of the Armenian Social Democratic Party, M. Varzadate says, have been publicly hanged in Constantinople after being charged with wishing to found an independent Armenia.
BURN 1,000 ARMENIANS.

Turks Lock Them in a Wooden Building and Then Apply the Torch.

LONDON, Friday, Aug. 20.—A Reuter dispatch from Petrograd says:

“Almost unbelievable details of Turkish massacres of Armenians in Bitlis have reached Petrograd.

“In one village, 1,000 men, women and children are reported to have been locked in a wooden building and burned to death.

“In another large village only thirty-six persons, it is said, escaped massacre.

“In still another instance, it is asserted, several scores of men and women were tied together by chains and thrown into Lake Van.”

From the Encyclopedia of Genocide, Editor-in-Chief Israel W. Charny, Published by ABC-Clio, December 1999.
TURKS DEPOPULATE TOWNS OF ARMENIA

Traveler Reports Christians of Great Territory Have Been Driven from Homes.

600,000 STARVING ON ROAD

Adds That More Than 100,000 Greeks Have Been Deported from the Mediterranean Coast.

A traveler who has just arrived in New York from Turkey, where he was long a resident, told THE TIMES yesterday of conditions as he found them in Constantinople, and of the wholesale deportations of Armenians from the interior districts of Asiatic Turkey. For reasons that are valid, the narrator does not wish to have his name published, but THE TIMES can vouch for his qualifications as an observer, especially of conditions in the Armenian district.
Leaving Sivas, where he spent some time, he proceeded to Constantinople and thence to Athens, from which port he sailed for New York. When in Constantinople about four weeks ago, he said, the tension was pretty high. In official circles it was maintained that everything was proceeding smoothly for the Turks, but there were many individuals, he said, who expressed discouragement. These put little faith in Germany’s motives in aiding Turkey, and some even charged Enver Pasha with having sold out to Germany for money.

“The Armenians of the interior,” he said, “have been deported in the direction of Mosul. At the time I left Sivas, two-thirds of them had gone from the city, including all Protestants, teachers, and pupils. According to my best knowledge and opinion, with the exception of Armenian soldiers and prisoners, and a very few exceptions, who for various reasons were necessary to the Government, all Armenians are gone from Sivas. According to what I consider good authority, I believe it to be true that the entire Armenian population from Erzerum to and including Gemereh, near Cesarea, and from Samsoun to and including Harpoot, has been deported.”

More than 100,000 Greeks from the Marmora and Mediterranean coast have been deported.

From the Encyclopedia of Genocide, Editor-in-Chief Israel W. Charny, Published by ABC-Clio, December 1999.
ANSWER MORGENTHAU BY HANGING ARMENIANS

He Protests Against the War of Extermination Now in Progress.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

LONDON, Thursday, Sept. 16. A Times correspondent, lately in Salonika, says that all the reports from Turkey are agreed as to the terrible character of the Turkish atrocities against Armenians. It is believed that it is the official intention that this shall be a campaign of extermination, involving the murdering of 800,000 to 1,000,000 persons. Christians can escape murder by embracing Mohammedanism, in which case all the female members of the convert’s family of marriageable age?wife, sisters, or children?are distributed around to other Turks, making the reversion to Christianity in the future practically impossible.

The American Minister at Constantinople is said to have protested recently against the massacre, in view of the danger to which they exposed the American missionaries. The only response to his protest was the hanging of twenty leading Armenians the next day in the streets of Constantinople.

From the Encyclopedia of Genocide, Editor-in-Chief Israel W. Charny, Published by ABC-Clio, December 1999.
500,000 ARMENIANS SAID TO HAVE PERISHED

Washington Asked to Stop Slaughter of Christians by Turks and Kurds.

Special to The New York Times.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 23. — Charles R. Crane of Chicago, a Director of Roberts College, Constantinople, and James L. Burton of Boston, Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, visited the State Department today and conferred with Acting Secretary of State Polk and other officials regarding the slaughter of Armenians by Turks and Kurds in Asia Minor. They will attend a meeting of a general committee, to be held in New York within a few days, to devise a plan for appealing to the American people for funds and aid for as many of the unfortunate Armenians as can be helped.

It was learned, in connection with the conferences held here today, that general representations have from time to time been made to the Ottoman Government by Ambassador Morgenthau for humane treatment of Armenians. Despite these representations, the slaughter of Armenians has continued.

The records of the State Department are replete with detailed reports from American Consular officers in Asia Minor, which give harrowing tales of the treatment of the Armenian Christians by the Turks and the Kurds. These reports have not been made public. They indicate that the Turk has undertaken a war of extermination on Armenians, especially those of the Gregorian Church, to which about 90 percent of the Armenians belong. The Turkish Government originally ordered the deportation of all Armenians, but some time ago, after representations had been made by Morgenthau, the Ottoman Government gave assurances that the order would be modified so as not to embrace Catholic and Protestant Armenians. Reports reaching Washington indicate that about 500,000 Armenians have been slaughtered or lost their lives as a result of the Turkish deportation order and the resulting war of extinction. Turkish authorities drove the Gregorian Armenians out of their homes, ordered them to proceed to distant towns in the direction of Bagdad, which could only be reached by crossing long stretches of desert. During the exodus of Armenians across the deserts they have been fallen upon by Kurds and slaughtered, but some of the Armenian women and girls, in considerable numbers, have been carried off into captivity by the Kurds. The reports that have been sent to the State Department by its agents in Asia Minor fully confirm these statements made in the appeal sent to this country by Viscount Bryce, formerly the British Ambassador to the United States, to try to stop the slaughter of the Armenians. Viscount Bryce stated that the horrors through which the Armenians have passed have been unparalleled in modern times.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES
ALEXANDRIA, Sept. 23, (Dispatch to The London Morning Post.) — British refugees from Urfa, who arrived in Alexandria yesterday, brought terrible tales of sufferings of interned allied subjects. They were not supplied with food, furniture, or servants, and were housed in an Armenian monastery the monks in which had been massacred.

They witnessed the Armenian massacres of Aug. 19. Urfa was the centre of ghastly scenes. The Turks systematically murdered men and turned women and children out into the desert, where thousands perished of starvation.

The last batch of women and children left Urfa on Aug. 24. They were delayed a fortnight at Alexandretta, awaiting a ship in filthy quarters and half starved. They finally embarked for Alexandria in an American warship.

From the Encyclopedia of Genocide, Editor-in-Chief Israel W. Charny, Published by ABC-Clio, December 1999.
AID FOR ARMENIANS BLOCKED BY TURKEY

Attempts to Send Food to Refugees Frustrated, Says the American Committee.

PUTS VICTIMS AT 1,000,000

Careful Survey Shows 55,000 Persons Killed in the Vilayet of Van Alone.

The American Committee on Armenian Atrocities, among the members of which are Cardinal Gibbons, Cleveland H. Dodge, Bishop David H. Greer, Oscar S. Straus, Professor Samuel T. Dutton, Charles R. Crane, and many other prominent citizens, issued a statement yesterday in which it was said that authentic reports from Turkey proved that the war of extermination being waged against the Armenians was so terrible that when all the facts were known the world would realize that what had been done was “the greatest, most pathetic, and most arbitrary tragedy in history.”

Attempts to furnish food to the Armenians ordered deported to distant parts of the empire were blocked by the Turkish authorities, the committee said, the Turkish officials stating that “they wished nothing to be done that would prolong their lives.”

In the statement the committee makes public a report received a few days ago from an official representative of the neutral powers, who, reporting on conditions in one of the Armenian camps, says:

“I have visited their encampment and a more pitiable sight cannot be imagined. They are, almost without exception, ragged, hungry and sick. This is not surprising in view of the fact that they have been on the road for nearly two months, with no change of clothing, no chance to bathe, no shelter, and little to eat. I watched them one time when their food was brought. Wild animals could not be worse. They rushed upon the guards who carried the food and the guards beat them back with clubs, hitting hard enough to kill sometimes. To watch them one could hardly believe these people to be human beings. As one walks through the camp, mothers offer their children and beg you to take them. In fact, the Turks have been taking their choice of these children and girls for slaves or worse. There are very few men among them as most of the men were killed on the road. Women and children were also killed. The entire movement seems to be the most thoroughly organized and effective massacre this country has ever seen.”

“They all agree,” adds the committee, referring to the reports, “as to the method of procedure, the thoroughness and cruelty of the destructive work, and the confessed purpose of the plan to wipe out the Armenian nation. The fact that the central government at Constantinople refuses to permit Armenians to leave their country is further evidence of their purpose of extermination.”

“The Turks do not deny the atrocities, but claim they are a military measure to protect them against a possible attack of a race that is disloyal.”

“It is impossible to estimate how many have already perished. A careful survey in the Van Vilayet gathered the names of 55,000 persons who had been killed. Others were able to escape by flight to Persia and Russia. An eyewitness who has recently made an extended journey across Asia Minor saw over 50,000 poor, dazed, helpless, starving refugees camped by the roadside in a region almost desert, with no provision for their food supply. Probably it is not an overestimate to say that 1,000,000 of the possible 2,000,000 Armenians in Turkey at the beginning of the war are either dead or in Moslem harems, or forced to profess Mohammedanism, or are on their sad journey to the desert and death.”

The committee says it has cabled $106,000 to Ambassador Morgenthau at Constantinople, of which $100,000 was for relief of Armenians in Turkey, and the remainder for Armenians who had escaped into Egypt. The office of the committee, of which Mr. Crane is Treasurer, is at 70 Fifth Avenue, New York.

From the Encyclopedia of Genocide, Editor-in-Chief Israel W. Charny, Published by ABC-Clio, December 1999.
WOMAN DESCRIBES ARMEAN KILLINGS

German Missionary Says Turks Proclaimed Extermination as Their Aim.

FIENDS' WORK IN HARPUT

"Let Your Christ Help You?" the Cry as Torture Went On—
Dr. Knapp a Victim.

The American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief, at 70 Fifth Avenue, announced the receipt, yesterday, of a cablegram from the American Consul at Tiflis, in which he said that there were more than 20,000 Armenians "in a most pitiful condition," in various provinces that came under his immediate notice. Of these, 11,000 are in the Erzeroum district, 10,000 in Van, 20,000 in Kars, and 40,000 in Tiflis.

The committee also announced that a cablegram was expected very soon from Dr. Wilson, the head of the commission sent to Tiflis. Details from the scenes of the massacres are reaching the committee daily. There have been from 600 to 800 officials, missionaries, and other persons well known to its members. One from a German woman missionary, who is stationed not far from the border of the Caucasus, was received within the last three days, and although not written for publication, gives an intimate picture of the terrible fate that has befallen the Armenians.

"Toward the middle of April," she wrote, "we heard rumors that in Van there were great disturbances. We have heard statements made from both Turks and Armenians; and, as these reports agree in every respect. It is quite plain there is some truth in them, namely, that the Government of Turkey sent orders that all Armenians were to give up their arms, which the Armenian refused to do, stating that they required them in their duty of necessity. This caused a regular massacre. All villages inhabited by Armenians were burnt down.

Dr. Knapp Was Murdered.

"At the beginning of June we heard that the whole Armenian population of Bitlis was done away with. It was at this time that we received news that the American missionary, Dr. Knapp, had been wounded in an Armenian house, and that the Turkish Government had sent him to Diarbekir. The very first night in Diarbekir he died, and Governor of that city explained his death as a result of having overeaten, which, of course, nobody believes. When there was no American left in Bitlis to massacre, their attention was called to Musch. Up to now cruelties were committed; but not too publicly; now they started to shoot people without any cause; they burnt them to death because they found delight in doing so.

In the plain, which is a big town, there are alone 35,000 Armenians; around them are 300 villages, every village containing about 400 houses; and not one male Armenian, and but a few women here and there are visible now."

"Beginning of July: In the first week of this month, 20,000 soldiers came from Constantinople and ravaged Musch with muttons and eleven guns, and beheaded Musch. In fact, the town had been surrounded since the middle of June. At this time the Musch was ordered that we German missionaries should leave the town and go to Harput. We pleaded with him to let us stay, for we had in our charge all the orphans and patients, but he was angry and threatened to force us away. It is said we did not do as we were instructed. As we both became sick, we were allowed to remain at Musch. I received permission in case we should leave Musch to take the Armenians of our orphanage along; but on my asking for assurances of safety, his only reply was—'you can take them along; but, being Armenians, their heads may and will be cut off on the way.'"

On the 10th of July Musch was bombarded for several hours, they pretended the reason was because some Armenians had tried to escape. I went to see the Musch, asking him to protect our houses and his reply was—'serve you right for staying instead of leaving.' As instructed, we laid our arms there to put an end to Musch. Take refuge with the Turks.' This, of course, was not possible, as we could not leave our charges. A new order was the next day promulgated that the Armenians would be expelled, and three days were given them to be ready. They were told to register themselves at the Government Office before they left. The families could remain, but their property and their money was to be confiscated.

"The Armenians were unable to go, as they had no money to pay for the trip, and they preferred to die in their houses rather than go. They prayed a lingering death on the road. As mentioned before, three days were given the Armenians to leave; but two hours had scarcely elapsed when the soldiers broke into house, and arrested every one and threw them into prison. The cannon began to fire, thus preventing the people from registering themselves at the Government Office. We all had to take refuge in the cellar for fear of our orphanage catching fire."

"I went to the Musch and begged him to have mercy on the children at our orphanage. But in vain: he replied the Armenian children must perish with their nation. All our people were taken from our hospital. The official who arrested us left us three female servants. Thus Musch was burnt down in this monstrous way. Every officer boasted of the number he had personally massacred, thus ridding Turkey of the Armenian race. We left Harput; Harput has become the cemetery of the Armenians."

"Now let your Christ help you!"

"In Harput and Mearz the people have had to endure terrible tortures, such as their eyeballs being pulled out, their breasts cut off, their nails pulled out, their feet cut off; or they hanged nails into them, just as they do with horses. The soldiers then cry: 'Now let your Christ help you!'

"Beginning of July: 2,000 Armenian soldiers were ordered to leave for Aleppo to build roads. The people of Harput were terrified on hearing this, and a panic started in the town. The Vill called the German missionary, Mr. Ehman, and begged him to quiet the people, repeating over and over again that no harm whatever would befall those soldiers. Mr. Ehman believed the Vill and quieted the people. But they had scarcely left when we heard that they had all been murdered and thrown into a cave. Just as a man managed to escape, we got the reports from them. It was useless to protest to the Vill. The American Consul at Harput protested several times, but the Vill treated him like 'air'; and in a most shameless manner.

"Towards the beginning of April, in the presence of Major Lange and several other high officials, as well as American and German Consuls, Ekrnan Bey said quite openly, that their intention was extermination of the Armenian race. All these details plainly show that the massacre was planned. It is very unsafe now for all missionaries in the interior, the officials show their hatred too plainly, and have often told us that they do not see the need of their presence."

The American Committee has already sent more than $100,000 to Ambassadors Norgrenthau, and much more is needed to alleviate the terrible conditions of the remaining Armenians.

Contributions for their relief should be sent to Charles R. Crane, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York.
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ARmenian atrocities

GHAstly storiEs.

On July 28, in the Howr of Lords, the Earl of Crewe, Lord President of the Council, replying to a question by Viscount Bryce, concerning the killing of Christians in Armenia said that such crimes had increased both in number and in degree of atrocity. The Armenians have often suffered outrageous and inhuman treatment, and the present war offers a new opportunity for oppression.

As far back as last January some 100,000 persons from the Turkish and Persian Armenian provinces had taken refuge at Etzmugadin, at the foot of Mount Ararat, in Russian Armenia, where they appealed for relief to the head of the Armenian Church and to their compatriots. They had been chiefly suffering from the wild Kirdish tribes along the border.

In May, however, the Armenians of Asia Minor had to meet another oppressor, the Turkish Government. It issued an order, the execution of which at Bursa (the city which the Turks may make their capital if Constantinople falls) is thus described by an eye-witness:

"The police at midnight swooped down upon the homes of all Armenians whose names had been put on the prescribed list sent from Constantinople. The men were arrested and the minutest search made of their homes for possible revolutionary documents. The young Armenians were then ordered into the army; the older men were deported into the interior, while women and children who were not carried off in an opposite direction were left to shift for themselves. In thousands of cases the deportation had been carried out on such a basis that families, broken up by the Turkish officials, will never be re-united."

AnOther report.

Another report is at hand in a letter just received by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, from a British resident of Constantinople:

"Zeitun has ceased to exist as an Armenian town. The inhabitants have been scattered, the city occupied by Turks, and the very name changed. The same is true, to a large extent, of Haliljan, except, I believe, the name has not been altered. The Armenians of the regions of Erivan, Hittis, and Erivan have under Turkish rule come of the regions of Erivan, Hittis, and Erivan have under Turkish rule.

"We learn that some 20,000 Turks from Thrace were taken to Zeitun and established in houses that for generations belonged to the Armenians, while the former owners were scattered to the extreme ends of the empire, one portion being sent to the sandy deserts at the head of the Persian Gulf, and the other to malarial marshes in the interior.

"No critical is the situation that the Ambassador at Constantinople, who, almost single-handed, is fighting to prevent a wholesale slaughter, has asked and obtained the co-operation of the Ambassador there of Turkey's Allies, Baron von Wagnerheim and Margrave Pulsnikisch. They have joined our Ambassador in trying to convince the Turkish Government that a renewal of the atrocities of the former Turkish regime would be a crime.

WHAT HAPPENED IN PERSIA.

We have been so accustomed to thinking of the Armenians as residing only in Turkey that we often lose sight of the fact that they also live in Russia and in Persia. The news which comes to hand from Persia is as ghastly in its detail as that which has been received from Asia Minor. The city of Salmas, for instance, has been completely destroyed by the Kurds. One of the survivors writes:

"Hundreds of old people and children remained behind in the ill-named 'Valley of Blood,' unable to reach Duzle. Those who could go on tottered as they walked. Here a dozen women and children, buried in a clump of snow, were crying out for help. There a cart had been set up into a deep ravine with all its passengers and animals.

"A woman, unable to walk further, fell on the snow and gave birth to a child. A few yards away another, made insane by suffering, leaped over a cliff, at the bottom of which angry wolves were whining. Such scenes were repeated all along the route. I saw one woman, whose husband had just been killed, walking with all her clothes frozen, one child in her arms, another at her back, and the oldest walking by her side. A sick woman was telling how her husband and children had been butchered before her eyes. She begged to be killed too, but instead she was subjected to treatment worse than death. The wailing of the children, women, and old people was heartrending. Many of the refugees were swept away in trying to cross the streams, and dead bodies by hundreds lined the roads."

"Again, near Urmiya, 4000 Armenians were killed outright. Crowds of men, women and children took refuge in the churches, but these were burned down, and the poor refugees slaughtered like trapped rats. Nor was this the worst. For many days the fields around Salmast and Urmiya were strewn with dead bodies, for no kindred or friends were left to give them interment. The marauders allowed them to faster and rot on the open ground. No wonder that from the Azerbaijan Province of Persia alone there has been an exodus of some two score thousands into Russia."
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ARMENIAN HORRORS GROW.


Special Cable to The New York Times.

LONDON, Friday, Aug. 6. The Daily Chronicle says:

"A tragic episode of the war in the East is the wholesale massacre of the Armenians in the eastern vilayets of Asin Minor by the Turks and Kurds. Regarding the terrible scale of these massacres, greater than any which occurred under Abdul Hamid, there is now no room for doubt, and the statements made on the subject last week by Lord Bryce in the House of Lords were officially corroborated by Lord Crewe.

"In certain cases the Armenians have defended themselves successfully. At the town of Van, for instance, to which Enver Pasha sent his brother-in-law with a commission of extermination, the victims rose after the massacres had begun, barricaded the Armenian quarter, and held out against the Turkish siege for four weeks until relieved by the advent of the Russian army. But with this and some similar exceptions they have been powerless. Tens and probably hundreds of thousands have been butchered, and great numbers more have been deported by road hundreds of miles to Western Anatolia under conditions amounting to slow extermination.

"The Germans, who are masters of the Central Ottoman Administration, have to their everlasting shame not only permitted, but rather encouraged these horrors. The allied powers have notified the Turkish officials that they will hold them personally responsible, and at this stage they can do no more. There is perhaps room for an effective American protest, though we have not yet heard of one."

The Chronicle concludes by making an appeal to British private charity, citing the following terrible account of ruin and devastation following the Turkish massacres in Northeaster Armenia, telegraphed by Ayvadian, the Archbishop of Van, and Aram, the Governor of Van, to the honorary secretary of the Armenian Red Cross and Refugee Fund:

"Besides Van, the provinces of Chatak, Moks, Sparkert, Mamertank, and Khizan are saved. The rest are ruined and devastated. Men, women, and children are massacred. Twenty thousand people are homeless. Famine and infectious disease prevail. Many volunteers are sick and wounded. Notwithstanding assistance from the Russian Government and the Armenians in the Caucasus, there is great want of doctors, drugs, ambulances, and food. The situation in Rittis, Moush, and Djarbekir is terrible. We beg urgently for immediate help."
WHOLESALE MASSACRES OF ARMENIANS BY TURKS

Lord Crewe Denounces Influence of the Germans as "an Unmitigated Curse."

LONDON, July 28.—The Earl of Crewe, Lord President of the Council, replying in the House of Lords today to a question by Viscount Bryce, concerning the killing of Christians in Armenia by the Turks, said the information received at the Foreign Office showed that such crimes had recently increased both in number and in degree of atrocity. They include, Lord Crewe declared, both wholesale massacre and wholesale deportations, which were carried out under the guise of enforced evacuation. Similar crimes, he added, had been committed by the Turks against Christians on the Persian border.

The presence of the Germans and the influence they exercised had been, Lord Crewe continued, "an absolute and unmitigated curse both to the Christian and Moslem population. They have shown a most complete cynical disregard for the country and the people who inhabit it."

Lord Crewe said he regretted that it was impossible to take immediate steps for the suppression of such atrocities, but that those responsible for them would ultimately receive just punishment.
WHOLE PLAIN STREWN BY ARME\n
TURKS AND KURDS REPORTED TO HAVE MASSACRED MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

London, March 19. — Appalling accounts of conditions in Armenia have reached the officials in London of the Armenian Red Cross Fund and have been given out by them.

The latest recital is from an Armenian doctor named Derderian, who says that the whole plain of Alashgerd is virtually covered with the bodies of men, women, and children.

When the Russian forces retreated from this district the Kurds fell upon the helpless people and shut them up in mosques. The men were killed and the women were carried away to the mountains.

The organizers of the Red Cross Fund say there are 120,000 destitute Armenians now in the Caucasus.
SAYS EXTINCTION MENACES ARMENIA

Dr. Gabriel Tells of More Than 450,000 Killed in Recent Massacres.

600,000 DRIVEN INTO EXILE

Unless Neutral Powers Intervene, Says Nubar Pasha, Almost the Whole People Is Doomed.

The doctor said that greed, religion, and politics all combined to induce the Turks to massacre the Armenians. The Government was always behind every massacre, and the people were acting under orders.

"When the bugle blows in the morning," he said, "the Turks rush fiercely to the work of killing the Christians and plundering them of their wealth. When it stops in the evening, or in two or three days, the shooting and stabbing stop just as suddenly then as it began. The people obey their orders like soldiers.

"The dead are really the happiest," he continued. "The living are forced to leave their homes and wander in an alien country amid a hostile population. They are allowed as a food ration by the Government only half a pound of grain a day. The youngest and strongest of the men are forced into the army, but not to fight. They are not armed, and have to do all the trench digging and the supply carrying for the Turkish soldiers. Do you blame them that they do not favor your country's cause?"

Nubar Pasha, in sending the correspondence he had received to Dr. Gabriel, wrote that the massacres of the Sultan Abdul Hamid in 1895, in which 300,000 Armenians fell, seemed insignificant in comparison with the butchery of 1915.

"What has occurred during the last few months in Cilicia and Armenia is unbelievable," he writes. "It is nothing more or less than the annihilation of a whole people."

A letter from Constantinople says that Armenians in all the cities and villages of Cilicia have been exiled to the desert regions south of Aleppo. They have not been allowed to carry any of their possessions with them, the letter goes on, and Moslems are occupying the lands and houses left vacant. The young men are kept for military service, and it is only the weak and aged who are deported.

"The court-martials are functioning everywhere," says another letter. "Numerous Armenians have been hanged, and many others sentenced to ten or fifteen years in prison. Many have been beaten to death, among them the priests of the village of Kure. Church and convents have been pillaged and destroyed, and almost all the Bishops have been arrested to be delivered up to court-martial.

"The villages in the vilayets of Van and Bitlis have been pillaged and the population put to the sword. Constantinople lives at present isolated, as if in a fortress, and has no means of correspondence, either by mail or telegram. Christian martyrdom has at no time assumed such colossal proportions; and if the neutral powers, especially the United States of America, do not intercede, there will be very few left of the million and a half of the Christian Armenians in the Turkish Empire."

Dr. Gabriel says that the Armenian Progressive Association was organized in 1895 after the Young Turks had massacred 30,000 of the Armenians in Cilicia. He says the association attempted in various ways to promote a better understanding between the two races, but finds now that such efforts are useless.

Nubar Pasha, who lives in Egypt, according to Dr. Gabriel, was called by the Katholikos because of his services to the Armenians.
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TURKISH OFFICIALS
PROMOTE MASSACRES

Propaganda of Extermination of Armenians Is Charged to the
Ottoman Government.

NEW YORK, Sept. 26.—A statement confirming the massacre of Armenians in Turkey was given out here today by Prof. Samuel T. Dutton, secretary of the committee on Armenian atrocities, which was formed for the purpose of investigating the facts regarding the massacre and its relations to American interests, and also to ascertain whether anything can be done to relieve the situation. The statement in part follows:

"A subcommittee has thoroughly investigated the evidence and has just made a report to the full committee concerning every particular the statement recently made by Viscount Bryce, regarding the imprisonment, torture, murder, massacre and exile into the deserts of northern Arabia, of defenseless and innocent Armenians, including decrepit men, women and children, and their forcible conversion to Islam.

Abdul Hamid Outdone.

"The witnesses all agree in the declarations that from Sinop, on the west, to Persia, and from the Black Sea to Arabia, a propaganda of extermination of non-Muslims is now being carried on by the Turkish government, far surpassing in ferocity and exceeding in destruction anything done by Abdul Hamid during his long career of massacre and extermination.

"In several places American property has been seized, American searched, imprisoned and expelled from the country, their letters and telegrams, even from United States consular officers, intercepted, and their lives put in jeopardy.

"This, however, is of trivial importance compared with the work of destruction going on among the Armenians.

"Evidence seemed to prove that probably 500,000 Armenians have already been murdered or forced into the desert, where only death awaits them, unless relief is secured at once. And all this has taken place since March and is now at the height of its gruesome fury."

Teutons Cannot Interfere.

ROME, Sept. 26.—The apostolic delegate at Constantinople, Monsignor Doli, has sent to the Vatican a report describing the massacre of Armenians. He says that Germany and Austria cannot interfere because they are allied with Turkey, while the other powers can do nothing because they are at war with Turkey.

The only possible assistance, adds Monsignor Doli, can come from America, whose ambassador is using every effort to protect the persecuted Armenians.
TALES OF ARMENIAN H Minors Confirmed

Committee on Atrocities Says 500,000 Victims Have Suffered Already.

NATIONAL PROTEST URGED

Suggestion That Germany and Austria Be Held Responsible—Outrages on Americans.

Professor Samuel Train Dutton, Secretary of the Committee on Armenian Atrocities, made public yesterday a preliminary statement of the committee outlining the result of its investigation of the terrible conditions existing among the Armenians. The committee says that the reports concerning the massacre, torture, and other maltreatment of Armenians of all ages abundantly are confirmed by its investigation.

Other members of the committee besides Professor Dutton are Cleveland H. Dodge, Arthur Curtiss James, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, John R. Mott, Frank Mason North, James L. Barton, William Sloane, D. Stuart Dodge, and others.

The statement issued by the committee yesterday is as follows:

"A sub-committee has thoroughly investigated the evidence and has just made report to the full committee confirming in every particular the statement recently made by Viscount Bryce regarding the imprisonment, torture, murder, massacre, and exile into the deserts of Northern Arabia of defenseless and innocent Armenians, including respectable men, women and children, and their forcible conversion to Islam.

"Written testimonies of eyewitneses whose names are known to the committee, but which obviously cannot now be made public, have been examined with utmost care. This testimony covers hundreds of pages, and the character and position of the authors and the positiveness of utterance carry absolute conviction.

"The witnesses examined include Armenians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Italians, Germans, Turks, Englishmen, Americans, business men, travelers and officials of great variety and rank. Not a single statement can be questioned as to the facts reported. These all agree in the declarations that from Smyrna on the west to Persia, and from the Black Sea to Arabia, a propaganda of extermination of non-Moslems is now being carried on by the Turkish Government far surpassing in ferocity and exceeding in destruction anything done by Abdul Hamid during his long career of massacre and extermination.

"The statements examined, many of which are in the possession of the committee, cover hundreds of towns and cities in which in many instances all of the Armenians have been killed outright, often after horrible torture, or sent to the desert to die of starvation, and that, too, with diabolical cruelty. The ostensible deportation of men, women, and children toward Mesopotamia is usually but a form of marching these starving, helpless, and frequently naked refugees out into the mountains to be outraged and butchered, sometimes by their guards, and sometimes by the Kurds who gladly co-operate in the work of destruction.

"Included among these refugees and victims are pupils and graduates from the American schools and colleges, teachers and professional men who have taken degrees in American and European universities, men and women who have represented the brains and enterprise of the country for a generation or more.

"The plan of procedure, which is identical in all parts of the country, seems to aim at the complete elimination of all non-Moslem races from Asiatic Turkey, and already that aim is in fair way of accomplishment so far as the Armenians are concerned.

"In several places American property has been seized, Americans searched, imprisoned and expelled from the country, their letters and telegrams, even from United States Consular offices, intercepted and their lives put in jeopardy. This, however, is of trivial importance compared with the work of destruction going on among the Armenians.

"Evidence seems to prove that probably 500,000 Armenians have already been murdered or forced to the desert, where only death awaits them unless relief is secured at once. And all this has taken place since March, 1915, and now at the height of its gruesome fury.

"The committee is confident that if the press of the country should with all the emphasis at its disposal protest and call upon the Turkish Government to put an end to this crime against humanity and return the exiles who may yet be living to their homes it could hardly fail to produce results.

"In view of the great influence which Germany and Austria exercise over their ally the American people cannot fail to hold them morally responsible if these atrocities are permitted to continue."
ONLY 200,000 ARMENIANS NOW LEFT IN TURKEY

More Than 1,000,000 Killed, Enslaved or Exiled, Says a Tiflis Paper.

TIFLIS, Transcaucasia, Oct. 19 (via Petrograd and London, Oct. 21).—The estimate is made by the Armenian newspaper Mshak, that of the 1,200,000 Armenian inhabitants of Turkey before the war there remain not more than 200,000. This residue, the Mshak says, may disappear before the end of the war, on account of the Turkish policy of extermination.

The figures of the Mshak are based on the estimate of the Armenian Patriarch at Constantinople that 350,000 Armenians have been killed or enslaved by the Turks, in addition to which 200,000 Armenians are believed to have fled to Russia.
TELL OF HORRORS DONE IN ARMENIA

Report of Eminent Americans Says They are Unequaled in a Thousand Years.

TURKISH RECORD OUTDONE

A Policy of Extermination Put in Effect Against a Helpless People

ENTIRE VILLAGES SCATTERED

Men and Boys Massacred, Women and Girls Sold as Slaves and Distributed Among Moslems

The Committee on Armenian Atrocities, a body of eminent Americans which for weeks has been investigating the situation in Turkish Armenia, issued, yesterday, a detailed report of that investigation, in which it is asserted that in cruelty and horror nothing in the past thousand years has equaled the present persecutions of the Armenian people by the Turks. The committee adds that the sources of its information are "unquestioned as to their veracity, integrity, and authority of the writers."

The data on which the report is based were gathered from all parts of the Turkish Empire.

The report tells of children under 15 years of age thrown into the Euphrates to be drowned, of women forced to desert infants in arms and to leave them by the roadside to die; of young women and girls appropriated by the Turks, thrown into harems, attached, or else sold to the highest bidder, and of men murdered and tortured. "Everything that an Armenian possesses, even to the clothes on his back, are stolen by his persecutors."

The report says "the use of the bastinado has been revived, high dignitaries of the Church have been hanged, families scattered to the four winds, and thousands upon thousands of defenseless, miserable persons hedged together like cattle and driven into the desert lands of the empire, there to starve and die."

Men Who Signed the Report

The men who signed this report are:
- OSCAR S. STRAUSS, former Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and ex-Ambassador to Turkey.
- CLEVELAND H. DODGE, of Phelps, Dodge & Company.
- The Rev. STEPHEN S. WISE, Rabbi of the Free Synagogue, N.Y.
- CHARLES R. CRANE of Chicago, Vice Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Democratic National Committee during the last campaign.
- ARTHUR CURTIS JAMES, Director of many railroads and of the Hanover National Bank, the United States Trust Co., and Phelps, Dodge & Co.
- The Rev. Dr. FRANK MASON NORTH of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church.
- JOHN R. MOTT of the International Committee of the Young Men's Christian Association.
- WILLIAM W. ROCKHILL, former Ambassador to Turkey and former Ambassador to Russia.
- WILLIAM SLOANE, President of W. & J. Sloane, 525 Fifth Avenue, NY.
- The Rev. Dr. EDWARD LINCOLN SMITH of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.
- The Rev. Dr. FREDERICK LYNCH of the New York Peace Society.
- GEORGE A. PILEMONT of Isaac's & Co., a trustee of Constantinople College.
- The Rev. Dr. JAMES L. BARTON, for many years a missionary in Turkey, and now the Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.
- The Rev. Dr. WILLIAM J. HAVEN, one of the founders of the Epworth League.
- STANLEY WHITE, President of the White Advertising Corporation, Professor SAMUEL P. DUTTON, an authority on Balkan affairs.

Identity of Writers Concealed.

"For reasons that will be obvious to all," says the committee in a foreword to its report, "the names and positions of the various writers cannot be given at this time. These are known to the committee, who vouch for them and their statements. In most cases it will be necessary to conceal the place from which the statements were written, and even the names of the cities and towns referred to, in order that the writer or his interests may not suffer irreparable harm."

Sources of the information, it added, are Greek, Bulgarian, American, Turkish, German, British, and Armenian.

The report, which contains 20,000 words, is divided into twenty-five parts. The first, dated April 27, 1915, states that a "movement against Armenians forms part of a concerted movement against all non-Turkish and mission and progress elements, including Zionists."

The second, dated three days later, tells of the persecution, plunder, and massacre in the interior of Turkey, and of "incredible severity" against Armenians in Zeitun and Marash.

July 10, the writer stated that it was then evident that a "systematic attempt to uproot the peaceful Armenian population had been decided upon.""

Torture, pillage, rape, murder, wholesale expulsion and deportation,
and massacre, came from all parts of the empire and was due, not to fanatical or popular demand, but was purely arbitrary, and directed from Constantinople."

July 16, another writer reported that "a campaign of race extermination is in progress."

Chapter VII, tells of the massacre in late July of women and children, most of whom had been deported from the Erzerum district. The massacre occurred near the town of Kemahl, between Erzerum and Harput.

Deportation Was Began in Zeitun

Chapters VII, and VIII, from two of the most horrible of all the chapters of horrors, into which the report is divided. The are, in part, as follows.

"June 29. The deportation began some six weeks ago with 180 families from Zeitun, since which time all the inhabitants of that place and its neighboring villages have been deported, also most of the Christians in Albustan, many from Hadjin, Sis, Kars Pazar, Hassan Beyal and Deort Yol.

The numbers involved are approximately, to date, 28,500. Of these, about 3,000 have been sent to the Koniah region, 5,500 are in Aleppo and surrounding towns and villages, and the remainder are in Der Zor, Racca, and various places in Mesopotamia, even as far as the neighborhood of Baghdad."

"The process is still going on, and there is no telling how far it may be carry. The orders already issued will bring the number of in this region up to 82,000, and there have been as yet none exiled from Amahl, and very few from Marsh and Urfis."

"The orders of commanders may have been reasonably humane, but the execution of them has been for the most part unnecessarily harsh, and in many cases accompanied by horrible brutality to women and children, to the sick and the aged. Whole villages were deported at an hour's notice, with no opportunity to prepare for the journey, not even, in some cases, to gather together the scattered members of the family, so that little children were left behind.

In Hadjin, well-to-do families who had prepared food and bedding for the road, were obliged to leave it in the street, and afterward suffered greatly from hunger."

Women Driven Under the Lash

"In many cases the men were (those of military age were nearly all in the army) bound tightly together with ropes or chains. Women with little children in their arms, or in the last days of pregnancy were driven along under the whip like cattle. Three different cases came under my knowledge where the woman was delivered on the road, and because her brutal driver hurried her along she died of hemorrhage. I also know of one case where the gendarmerie in charge was a humane man, and allowed the poor woman several hours rest, and then procured a wagon for her to ride in.

"Some women became so completely worn out and hopeless that they left their infants beside the road. Many women and girls have been outraged. At one place the commander of the gendarmerie openly told the men to whom he consigned a large company that they were at liberty to do what they chose with the women and girls.

As to subsistence, there has been a great difference in different places. In some places the Government has fed them, in some places it has permitted others to do so. There has been much hunger, thirst and sickness, and some real starvation and death."

"These people are being scattered in small units, three or four families in a place, among a population of different race and religion, and speaking a different language. I speak of them as being composed of families, but fourths of them are women and children, and what men there are for the most part old or incompetent."

If a means is not found to aid them through the next few months, until they get established in their new surroundings, two thirds or three fourths of them will die of starvation and disease."

Prisoners' Feet Beaten to Pieces

"I was called to a house one day where I saw a sheet which originated from the prison and which was being sent to wash. This sheet was covered with blood and running in long streams. I was also shown clothes which were drenched and exceedingly dirty. It was a puzzle to me what they could possibly have done to the prisoners, but I got to the bottom of the matter by the help of two very reliable persons who witnessed part of it themselves."

"The prisoner is put in a room (similar to the times of the Romans) Gendarmerie standing in twos at both sides and two at the end of the room administers, each in their turn, bastinados as long as they have enough force in them. At the time of the Romans 40 strokes were administered at the very most; in this place, however, 200, 300, 500, even 800 strokes are administered. The foot swells up, then bursts open, due to the numerous blows, and thus the blood spouts out. The prisoner is then carried back into prison and brought to bed by the rest of the prisoners - this explains the bloody sheet."

"The prisoners who become unconscious after these blows are revived through the means of some cold water, which is thrown on their heads, and which accounts for the wet and dirty clothes."

"A young man was beaten to death within the space of five minutes."

"Apart from the bastinadosing other methods were employed, too, such as putting hot irons on the chest. A forgery, who was suspected to have forged the shells of the bombs, was let free only after his toes were burned off with sulphur, (called Kersak)."

"The German Consul of Aleppo estimates the number of deported to be 30,000. Five thousand people were deported to the unhealthy spot of Sultani, in the District of Konia. The Government gave in the first days some bread. When the bread was finished they received none; the misery was heartrending."

In Chapter 9 the writer tells of another reign of terror, during which..."
the terrible bastinado was again brought into use, with torture by fire added. He had heard instances of this burning out of the eyes of the poor victims. In another instance some old bombs found in a cemetery and planted there probably during the reign of Abdul Hamid were used as an excuse to torture and kill hundreds who were accused of having hidden there them for use against the Turks.

On June 26 the Armenian men of a certain town were ordered to leave the town. No exception was made; old and young, rich and poor, sick and well, all had to go. When seriously ill the victim was dragged from his bed into the streets. They were robbed of their shoes and clothing. They were thrown into prison and marched away in groups of thirty and more. Some groups were chained. A man in touch with the Turkish Government subsequently stated they had been killed.

Women of Sultan’s Soldiers Deported

“Following the deportation of the men the women and children were ordered to be ready to leave. They were told to be ready to leave on a Wednesday. This is what happened.”

“On Tuesday, about 3:30 A.M., the ox carts appeared at the doors of the first district to be removed, and the people were ordered to depart at once. Some were dragged from their beds without even sufficient clothing. All the morning the ox carts creaked out of town, laden with women and children, and here and there a man who had escaped the previous deportations. In many cases the husbands and brothers of these same women were away in the army, fighting for the Turkish government.”

“The panic in the city was terrible. The people felt that the Government was determined to exterminate the Armenian race, and they were powerless to resist. The people were sure that the men were being killed and the women kidnapped. Many of the convicts in the prison had been released, and the mountains around were full of bands of outlaws. It was feared that the women and children were taken some from the city and left to the mercy of these men.”

“However that may be, there are proved cases of the kidnapping of attractive young girls by the Turkish officials of. One Moslem reported that a gendarme had offered to sell him two girls for a modjade ($4.00). The women believed that they were going to a fate worse than death, and many carried poison in their pockets to use if necessary. Some carried picks and shovels to bury those they knew would die by the wayside.”

“During this reign of terror notice was given that escape was easy; that any one who accepted Islam would be allowed to remain safely at home. The officers of the lawyers who recorded applications were crowded with people petitioning to become Mohammedans. Many did it for the sake of their women and children, feeling that it would be a matter of only a few weeks before relief would come.”

“This deportation continued at intervals for about two weeks. It is estimated that out of about 12,000 Armenians in only a few hundred were left. Even those who offered to accept Islam were sent away. At the time of writing no definite word has been heard from any of these groups.”

Another chapter tells of the deportation of 12,000 Armenians, of all classes and ages, and that “the whole Mohammedan population knew these people were to be their prey from the beginning, and they were treated as criminals. The route of this unhappy band was marked by corpses.”

Beat Child’s Brains Out on Rock

This is what happened in a village in which many Armenians once lived:

“, a village about two hours from is inhabited by Gregorian and Catholic Armenians and Turks. A wealthy and influential Armenian, together with his two sons, according to a reliable witness, were placed one behind the other and shot through. Forty-five men and women were taken a short distance from the village into a valley. The women were first outraged by the officers of the gendarme, and then turned over to the gendarmes to dispose of. According to this witness a child was killed by beating its brains out on a rock. The men were all killed and not a single person survived from this group of forty-five.”

“Here is, in part, the story of another unhappy Armenian town: Daily, the police are searching the houses of the Armenians for weapons, and not finding any, they are taking the best and most honorable men and imprisoning them; some of them they are excising, and others they are torturing with red hot irons to make them reveal the supposedly concealed weapons.”

The Gendarmerie Department seems to have full control of affairs and the Mutesharian upholds them.

They are now holding about a hundred of the best citizens of the city in prison, and today the gendarmerie chief called the Armenian Bishop and told him that unless the Armenians deliver their arms and the revolutionists among them, that he has orders to exile the entire Armenian population as they did the people of. We know bow the latter were treated, for hundreds of them have been dragged through their way to the desert whither they have been exiled. These poor exiles were mostly women, children and old men, and they were clubbed and beaten and lashed along as though they had been wild animals, and their women and girls were daily criminally outraged, both by their guards and the riffraff of the black village through which they passed.”

Woman Writes of Horrible Experience

Another document in the hands of the American Committee states that “The Young Turk Government pursues unceasingly, and every day with added violence, the war to the finish that it was declared against its Armenian subjects.”
A letter from a woman in Turkey, of unquestioned integrity, reads, in part, as follows:

“Last June 1, (old style) fifteen gendarmes went with us. The party numbered 400 or 500 persons. We had got only two hours away from home when bands of villagers and brigands in large numbers, with rifles, guns, axes, surrounded us on the road and robbed us of all we had. The gendarmes took my three horses and sold them to Turkish mohaddips, pocketing the money. They took my money and that from my daughter’s neck, also all our food.”

“After this they separated the men, one by one, and shot them all within six or seven days - every male above 15 years old. By my side were killed two priests, one of them over 90 years of age.

These bandits took all the good looking women and carried them off on their horses. Very many women and girls were thus carried off to the mountains, among them my sister, whose one year old baby they threw away; a Turk picked it up and carried it off. I knew not where. My mother walked till she could walk no further, and dropped by the roadside on a mountain top. We found on the road many of those who had been in previous sections carried from — some were among the killed, with their husbands and sons.”

“We also came across some old people and little infants still alive, but in a pitiful condition, having allowed their voice away. We were not allowed to sleep at night in the villages, but lay down outside. Under cover of the night, in describing deeds were committed by the gendarmes, bandsmen and villagers. Many of us died from hunger and smoke of apoplexy. Others were left by the roadside, too feeble to go on.”

“One morning we saw fifty to sixty wagons with about thirty Turkish widows, whose husbands had been killed in the war, and they were going to Constantinople. One of these women made a sign to one of the gendarmes to kill a certain Armenian whom she pointed out. The gendarmes asked her if she did not wish to kill him herself, at which she said, ‘Why not?’ and drawing a revolver from her pocket, shot and killed him.”

“Each one of these Turkish hussars had five or six Armenian girls of 10 or under with her. Boys the Turks never wished to take, they killed all, of whatever age. These women wanted to take my daughter too but she would not be separated from me. Finally, we were both taken into their wagons on our promising to become Moslems. As soon as we entered the arabs they began to teach us how to be Moslems, and changed our names, calling me — and her —.”

“The worst and most unimaginable horrors were reserved for us at the banks of the Euphrates and in the Erzurum Plain. The mutilated bodies of women, girls, and little children made everybody shudder. The bandits were doing all sorts of awful deeds to the women and girls that were with us, whose cries went up to heaven. At the Euphrates the bandmen and gendarmes threw into the river all the remaining children under 15 years old. Those that could swim were shot down as they struggled in the water.”

“Afier seven days we reached —. Not a single Armenian was left alive there. The Turkish women took my daughter and me to a bath, and there showed us many other women and girls that had accepted Islam.”

Mediam Criminal Released for Pillage

Excerpts from various statements included in the report given out yesterday follow:

“August 2. about 800 middle-aged and old women, and children under the age of 10 years, arrived afoot from Diyarbekir, after forty-five days en route, and in the most pitiful condition imaginable.”

“They report the taking of all the young women and girls by the Kurds, the pillaging even of the last bit of money and other belongings, of starvation, of privation, and hardship of every description.”

“All over the country leading Armenians have been shot or hanged. Leading merchants have been beheaded and exiled. Thirty thousand Moslem criminals have been released from jail and formed into bands under strict military discipline. One of the duties of these bands is to pillage villages and to rob and assassinate exiles.”

“The Greek and Armenian patriarchs have been refused audiences with the Ministers of the Turkish Government. Foreign Ambassadors among them the United States Ambassador, have been rebuffed and told that what the Imperial Government wishes to do with its subjects is none of their business.

The Turkish Ministers and other officials have repeatedly avowed the intention to smash the Christian nationalities and thus forever put an end to the Armenian question.”

“The important American religious and educational institutions in this region are losing their professors, teachers, helpers, and students, and even the orphanages are to be emptied of the hundreds of children therein, which numbers the fruits of fifty years of untiring effort in this field.”

“The Government officials in a mocking way ask what the Americans are going to do with these establishments now that the Armenians are being done away with. The situation is becoming more critical daily, as there is no telling where this thing will end. The Germans are being blamed on every hand, for if they have not directly ordered this wholesale slaughter, (for it is nothing less than the extermination of the Armenian race) they at least condone it.”

“The story of a visit to one of the desert camps to which the Armenians have been exiled is given near the close of the report. It tells of famished old men, women and children, reduced to the very lowest state or misery by their persecutors. There are only a few men in the camp, the report reads, "as most of them have been killed on the road. Likewise many women and little children had been murdered.”

“The condition of these people," says the report, "indicates
clearly the fate of those who have left and are bound to leave here. The system that is being followed seems to be to have bands of Kurds awaiting them on the road to kill the men especially, and incidentally some of the others. The entire movement seems to be the most thoroughly organized and effective massacre this country has ever known.

Turk's Full Missionaries' Efforts.

"The American missionaries began considering plans to aid the women and children who would be left here with no means of support. It was thought that perhaps an orphanage could be opened to care for some of the children, and especially those who had been born in America, and then brought here by their parents, and also those who belonged to parents who had been connected in some way with the American mission and schools."

There would be plenty of opportunity, though there might not be sufficient means, to care for children who reached here with the exits from other villages and whose parents had died on the way. I went to see the Vati about this matter yesterday and was met with a flat refusal. He said we could aid those people if we wished to do so, but the Government was establishing orphanages for the children and we could not undertake any work of that nature. An hour after I left the Vati the announcement was made that all the Armenians remaining here, including women and children, must leave by July 13."

"In response to the urgent appeal of Ambassador Morgenthau, the report concludes, the Committee on Armenian Atrocities, in cooperation with the Committee of Mercy, has decided to make a wide appeal for funds."

"Several gentlemen have already pledged large contributions, but the need is very great, and it is expected that a good number of smaller gifts will be received."

"The crimes now being perpetrated upon the Armenian people surpass in their horror and cruelty anything that history has recorded during the past thousand years. The educated and the ignorant, the rich and the poor, are all being subjected to every form of barbarity and outrage. It is understood, however, that very many Turks are opposed to this policy of persecution."

"It is hoped that prompt action will make it possible to save a great many lives, and separate some at least of those who have been driven from their homes."

Funds will be forwarded to the Ambassador as fast as received. Donations should be sent to the Treasurer Charles R. Crane, 75 Fifth Avenue, New York.

---

The United States National Archives contain many files pertaining to the Armenian deportations and massacres of 1915 to 1917. The General Records of the Department of State from a part of these files and include within them extensive diplomatic correspondence relating to the internal Affairs of Turkey. Of the many categories in this type file, several pass largely to Armenians. One file, "Internal Affairs of Turkey, 1910-1929," is divided further into specific topics. Prominent among these subcategories is one entitled "Race Problems," which refers mainly to the persecution of the Christian population and covers the period of the Armenian Genocide and contains reports and documents from many sources, including missionaries, consular officers, relief workers, and survivors. The "Race Problems" file contains 538 entries from this period dealing with the Genocide. The entries can be divided into groups based on their source or place of origin. Thus, there are 77 consular reports, of which 50 originated from American consuls in the Ottoman Empire. Reports from missionaries, relief workers, and eyewitness survivors in the Ottoman Empire or Transcaucasia total 72 entries. Of these, 55 originated in Northern Syria or Anatolia, particularly Harput, the endpoint of a major route of deportation, and Aleppo, where many deportation routes met.

The various committees that were organized to aid the Armenian refugees by providing relief money are also included in this record file. These committees sent 32 accounts of the living conditions of the refugees and their needs to the State Department. Additionally, the State Department had three internal memoranda on the Armenian situation. Ten newspaper articles received by the Department concerning Armenian conditions are also on file. The State Department itself is involved in 188 entries. These can be divided into three categories which include State Department correspondence sent to United States diplomats (49 entries), correspondence sent to foreign embassies (seven entries), and Department exchanges with private individuals in the United States (132 entries). In addition, 18 letters transmitted between private citizens are also on file. The State Department received 114 entries from embassies. Seventy-eight of these originated in Constantinople and were sent by either Ambassador Henry Morgenthau or his successors. Charge d'Affaires Hoffman Phillips and Commissioner Lewis Herk. In addition, 25 telegrams were received from other American embassies, and seven telegrams were sent by foreign embassies in the United States.

---

3. From a report by US Consul Leslie Thurlow of Harput who further states, "Professors American College have been tortured. Some others were tortured early of askin."
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ARMEIANS ARE SENT TO PERISH IN DESERT

Turks Accused of Plan to Exterminate Whole Population—People of Karahissar Massacred.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.
LONDON, Wednesday, Aug. 18.—The Daily News has received from Anseurin Williams, M. P., a copy of a letter from Constantinople, dated July 18, describing the terrible plight of the Armenians in Turkey. The letter says:

"We now know with certainty from a reliable source that the Armenians have been deported in a body from all the towns and villages in Cilicia to the desert regions south of Aleppo. The refugees will have to traverse on foot a distance, requiring marches of from one to two or even more months.

"We learn, besides, that the roads and the Euphrates are strewn with corpses of exiles, and those who survive are doomed to certain death, since they will find neither house, work, nor food in the desert. It is a plan to exterminate the whole Armenian people.

"Courts-martial operate everywhere without cessation. Twelve Armenians were hanged at Caesarea on a charge of having obeyed instructions which they had received from a meeting secretly held at Bucharest by the Trocohak and Hunchak societies. Many have fallen from blows from clubs. Thirteen Armenians were killed in this way at Diarbekr and six at Caesarea. Thirteen others were killed on their way from Chabine-Karahissar to Sivas. The priests of the village of Kurk with their five companions suffered the same fate on the road to Sou-Chehrkisvas; although they had their hands bound.

"Hundreds of women and young girls and even children groan in prisons. Churches and convents have been pillaged, defiled, and destroyed. The villages around Van and Bitlis have been pillaged and the inhabitants put to the sword.

"At the beginning of this month all the inhabitants of Karahissar were pitilessly massacred, with the exception of a few children."
THE DEPOPULATION OF ARMENIA

The shocking news of the massacre, torture and deportation of Armenian Christians makes a special appeal to American sympathy and helpfulness. From numerous and reliable sources in Turkey it seems certain that this is not a matter of local disorders or petty oppression, but a systematic effort to extirpate the Armenian race. Thousands of families have been driven from their homes to starve upon the roads. Towns and villages have been divested of their inhabitants. Many are being put to torture to force them to renounce their Christian faith. Women are interned in the harems and children are sold as slaves.

These outrages cannot be excused on the ground of military necessity, for the regions devastated are in some cases beyond the reach of any possible Russian invasion and the Armenians have not manifested any disposition to revolt except where, as at Van, they have been driven to it in self-defense. It looks as tho the Turks, despairing of maintaining their supremacy, were resolved to crush out the Armenians so as to forestall forever the establishment of an autonomous Armenia in case the Allies conquer Turkey.

But this is something in which we have a deep interest, for American money and American lives have been spent for the uplift of the opprest peoples of the Ottoman Empire. The American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions has been at work in Turkey for almost a century and has expended some twenty million dollars. There are now maintained in Turkey ten American colleges: Robert College, Constantinople; Constantinople College for Girls; Syrian Protestant College, Beyrut; International College, Smyrna; Anatolia College, Marsovan; Euphrates College, Harpoot; Aintab College; Central Turkey College, Marash; St. Paul's College, Tarsus; and Teachers College, Sivas. In these institutions and other schools there are over 40,000 pupils, a large proportion of whom are Armenians. It is not too much to say that the Armenian people owes its racial consciousness and ideals chiefly to American influence, altho our missionaries and teachers have always been careful to discourage any insurrectionary movements. Thousands of Armenians have sought refuge in America from Turkish tyranny and have become good citizens of our country. The present distress and imminent danger of the Armenians in Asia will cause widespread concern in the United States.
TURKS CONTINUE BARBAROUS WORK; KILL ARMENIANS

LONDON, Oct. 26.—(4 a. m.)

A dispatch to the Daily Mail from Odessa says:

"The Turks have massacred the entire Armenian population of Kerasund on the Black sea."

Kerasund lies 70 miles west of Trebizond on a rocky promontory. The town has a population of 24,000. The number of Armenians in the town is not known. Kerasund does a large business in the exportation of nuts and nut kernels.
WILL ASK U. S. AID FOR SUFFERING ARMENIANS

Details of Atrocities to Be Made Public Monday to Bring Government Intervention.

New York, Sept. 30.—Steps were taken here today for the formation of a national organization to give relief to Armenia, whose inhabitants, according to reports from missionary circles and other sources, are being annihilated by the Turks.

Details of Turkish atrocities in Armenia will be contained in a comprehensive report, which will be made public on Monday by the committee on Armenian atrocities. The committee hopes, by bringing this data before the Armenian people, to secure aid from the United States government for the Armenians.

At a meeting of the committee on Armenian atrocities today it was voted to invite the committee on Armenian relief funds to join in a national campaign in behalf of the suffering Armenians.

Those present at the meeting were Samuel T. Dutton, secretary of the committee; Charles R. Crane, of Chicago; Dr. J. L. Barton, of Boston; Dr. T. D. Christie, president of St. Paul College, at Tarsus; C. H. Dodge, Frederick Lynch, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Dr. E. L. Smith, Frank Yason, Norman Hapgood, Dr. Stanley White, Karl Davis and William I. Haven, all of New York.
A Word to Turkey.

Washington now admonishes Turkey that if she wants to maintain friendly relations with the people of the United States she must put an end to the Armenian atrocities. It is a word well spoken at a fitting time. It is, moreover, a word such as the Christian allies of Turkey should have spoken before this.

Perhaps it is too much to expect that Germany, held in the thrall of the Prussian theory of "frightfulness" in war, should object to the Turkish effort to wipe the Armenian nation out of existence with one bloody stroke.

But Germany is Christian, as the Armenians are. Germany may justify alliance with Mohammedan Turkey on the sure ground of strategic necessity. But there is no necessity, strategic or otherwise, for Armenian slaugthers. There is no gain for Germany or for Turkey in wholesale assassination of a people whose life or death cannot possibly affect the result of the war.

Washington has spoken well. Many patriotic Americans would have had Washington speak in a similar vein when Belgium was violated. But there is a difference, after all, unjustifiable as was the Belgian affair. For Belgium lay in the actual theater of war—just as it has always lain when Europe has fallen to fighting.

But the Armenians are far away from the clash of contending forces. They are touched only by the minor contention in the Caucasus, where Russ and Turk are at grips. There is no conceivable reason for the Armenian atrocities, save black religious hatred and bloody racial prejudice.
TURKS RENEW MASSACRES

Majority of Armenians Have Been Slaughtered By Pagans.

Ambassador Morgenthau Sends Report From Constantinople.

Washington, Oct. 12. - Armenian massacres in Asiatic Turkey have been renewed with vigor since Bulgaria's entrance into the war as Turkey's ally. This information reached the state department from Ambassador Morgenthau, who stated that the majority of the Armenians in Asiatic Turkey had been killed.

Although representations were made by this government some time ago warning Turkey that further atrocities against the Armenians would alienate the sympathies of the American people, no answer has been received.

Earlier representations were met with two concessions promising that those Armenians who wished to leave the country would be permitted to do so unharmed and further that Protestant Armenians would be spared. Information recently reaching this country, however, indicates that these conditions have not been strictly adhered to. From one quarter it was asserted that "they were rescinded the next day."

HENRY MORGENTHAU,
United States Ambassador at Constantinople.
TERIBLE TURK
AT OLD GAME
OF BUTCHERY

UNSPEAKABLE ATROCITIES INFlicted ON
ARMENIANS, ACCORDING
TO PRISONER’S STORY.

LONDON, Oct. 25.—A Dardanelles dispatch gives what purports to be an account of Armenian atrocities by an Armenian serving in the Turkish army who was taken prisoner by the Allies.

The report details how the Bishop of Sivas was shod with shoes of red hot iron by the village blacksmith and the men of Tokat were tied together in groups of four, taken out and massacred 100 at a time.

The prisoner said that women were tied to the tails of ox carts and exposed to hunger and rough weather until they either died or accepted Mohammedanism. Mothers were bayoneted before the eyes of their children and Armenian girls were distributed as chattels among the civil and military officials. The prisoner said that he himself had been forced to assist in many massacres.

The account closes: “There is reason to believe that the German advisers of the Turks have urged upon them the undesirability of allowing a large, alien and presumably unfriendly population to inhabit the ports which lie open to Russian attack.”
THE ASSASSINATION OF A RACE
THE HOPES AND THE THREATENED FATE OF THE ARMENIANS

HE Armenians in Turkey before the present onslaught upon them numbered about two millions, but their importance in the empire is not to be measured by their numbers. Intellectually and physically they are vastly superior to the Turks. In education, enterprise, industry, and love of home they surpass all the other races. Among all the peoples of Turkey they have been the quickest to catch the spirit of modern education and twentieth century progress. Within the last fifty years in the eastern part of Turkey wholly, and in a measure throughout the empire, they have been the artisans, the leaders in the learned professions and promoters of commercial enterprises.

This ancient and proud-spirited race, conscious of its own innate superiority, ambitious to educate its children, Christian in its religion, and eager for progress, cherished the hope of an independent Armenia reestablished upon the ruins of its ancient kingdom.

For thirty years a few of the more bold both within and without the country, have carried on a revolutionary propaganda that was as hopeless of successful achievement as it was foolish in organization. The loud talk of some of these revolutionary leaders frightened Abdul Hamid into a nightmare of massacre and brought untold suffering upon innocent heads. There has been comparatively little of this in more recent years, but the fear of this aggressive, successful, prolific and industrious Christian race never departed from the councils of the Mohammedans.

When Turkey entered into this war, the Armenians enlisted in large numbers and showed themselves loyal Ottomans. For some reason not explained—some say because of German prejudice—arms were gradually taken away from them and they were set to other tasks.

Early in March the Russians were drawing down toward Van, where, as has already been stated, the Armenians had actually offered their services to the Governor of Van was Jevdet Bey, a brother-in-law of Enver Pasha, who, with Talaat Bey, controlled the fate of Turkey. The Armenian men of Van loyally offered their services to the Governor, who, under pretense of gratitude, tried to conduct the leaders into an ambush for their destruction. Three of the five leaders and spokesmen for the Armenians were killed, but two escaped. These rallied their followers while Jevdet called out his troops and enlisted the services of the Kurds to annihilate them. For five weeks they maintained their positions until the Russians entered the city and the Turks fled to the west.

This attempt of the Armenians to defend their lives against treachery and open attack seemed to awaken in the Turks a generation of slumbering wrath. From that hour, so far as the leaders at Constantinople were concerned, the Armenians were doomed to extinction throughout the length and breadth of the Empire. Not only were men and boys imprisoned without charge, assassinated, tortured beyond comprehension, and killed, singly or in groups, but the women were ravished, girls carried into Muslim slavery, and entire towns—what remained after the slaughter—sent across hundreds of miles of country, without preparation for the journey, to die like animals upon the road thru disease, starvation and repeated attacks by their guards or other riffians, and ultimately miserably to perish in the deserts of northern Arabia.

This process of destruction, begun last March, is now going on, according to indisputable evidence of creditable eye witnesses recently compiled from authentic documents by a special committee designated to that task, and recently made public. Constantinople is threatened, and the 150,000 Armenians in that city may any day be started upon their death march to the desert.

Our Ambassador, Dr. Morgenstien, at Constantinople, is doing all in his power to stay the gruesome tide of death, and we note with gratefulness that the public sentiment stirred by a knowledge of this tragedy is moving the President to protest in the name of humanity against such crimes against civilization.

If the Central Powers win in this war over the Allies, Turkey will become a German province, in which the Armenians would find scant place. Officials at Constantinople have declared that the Greeks also must follow in the same path, so that when Germany becomes master of Asia Minor, no stray races claiming the land as inherently belonging to them thence centuries of occupation, and dreaming of possible independent principalties, will be there to challenge the German right of occupancy. The Kurds could be easily subdued and the Turks would have no spirit to resist. Some have gone so far as to declare that the present attack upon the Armenians is but the first step in the preparation of the promised land for the incoming hosts.

On the other hand, if Constantinople capitulates to the Allies, and the two men who drove Turkey into war and rule her today with an iron hand and their German advisers are shorn of their power, there is reason to expect that the Turks as a whole will sue for peace, as multitudes of them today keenly desire to do.

We can hardly conceive of any power's favoring the perpetuation of Turkey in any form, after this ghastly exhibit of Muslim incapacity to rule alien peoples or even Mohammedans. At once then will and must begin the repatriation of the exiled Armenians and Greeks, for the Greeks also in a measure are suffering the same treatment. This will be a burdensome task, but the civilized world must unite to achieve it. There are said to be 300,000 refugee Armenians in Russia and more than half that number in Persia. It is very probable that especially the most of them will drift back to the land of Ancient Armenia, where in a few years it will be possible to create, under the protection of one or more friendly powers, an autonomous Armenia. In western Asia Minor, where the Greeks predominate, a Greek principality would be the natural outcome.
MASSACRE OF ARMENIANS

Responsibility for the Crime
Fixed Upon Turkish Commander.

Arrival of Russians at Van
Caused Turks to
Retreat.

Correspondence of the Associated Press.

London, Sept. 29.—Details of the
siege of Van and the massacre of
Arménians by the Turks are given in the
current issue of the Near East, which
fixes the responsibility for the crime
on Jevedd Pasha. It was on Jevedd
Pasha also that the refugee American
missionaries, in the story of their suf-
f erings, recounted to the Associated
Press correspondent at Petrograd this
week, laid the guilt. Jevedd is the su-
preme commander of the Turkish army
operating in this province.

Van, the ancient capital of the Ar-
menian Empire, was occupied by the
Turks in the autumn of last year. The
army, under the command of Gen.
Oganesov, who is an Ar-
menian, was assisted by six Armenian
volunteer regiments under the
commander, Gen. Andranik, who had
fought with the Bulgarians against
the Turks in the first Balkan war. But
long before Van fell to the Russians,
Jevedd Pasha started the work of mas-
sacring the Armenian population.

Few Men Spared.

The massacre began at Shadokh, a
large and isolated village, where not a
man was spared except those over 60
years of age. Of the women, the more
comely were carried away by Jevedd’s
soldiers. Kurds and Armenians. The
massacre was carried out systematically
in the entire province of Van begin-
ning with the only living village. Great
care was taken to prevent rumors of
this from reaching the capital.

There was living in Van city at that
time Prince Tahmasp, an Armenian who
had formerly been useful to the go-
vernment in settling troubles between
the Turks and the Armenians. He was
asked by Jevedd to go to the village
and try to reconcile the contending
parties. Jevedd addressed the prince
in a letter as his "dear friend." The
prince, unknown of the plot, started out
with a number of advisers. The entire
party was slaughtered by a party of
Jevedd’s horsemen while taking lunch
at a coffee house.

Thrown Into a Lake.

At this time also there was in Van
an Armenian member of the Turkish
parliament—by the name of Vramian,
who was invited by Jevedd to call on
him at headquarters. On arrival at
headquarters Vramian was arrested, a
large stone was tied to his feet and he
was thrown into a lake and drowned.

The Russians were now reported on
the advance. Talaat Bey, published a
warning against the Armenians par-
ticipating on a penalty of dire punish-
ment. But the story of the massacre
in the isolated parts was carried by
survivors, and the Armenians prepared
to sell themselves as dearly as possi-
ble, the peaceful element, as well as
the revolutionaries. Jevedd then called
on the Armenian bishop to visit him.
The bishop refused. Thereupon Jevedd
descended upon the "rebellious" city
of Van with an army of 8,000 Turks
and Kurds and called on the people to
lay down their arms, surrender with-
out conditions and trust to the ele-
mency of the sultan. This offer was
made through the Italian consul.

Russians to the Rescue.

Of the 50,000 Armenians in Van, only
400 were armed—300 with rifles and
the rest with revolvers. For twenty-
nine days this handful defended the
city. On the thirtieth day Gen. Ogane-
sov arrived with his Armenian volun-
teeers and Russian regulars and the
Turks retreated.

Conditions were at that time fright-
ful, as the only doctor in the city to
look after the sick and wounded had
been Dr. Allen, an American mission-
ary. But with the Russians came help
and doctors and nurses soon arrived
from Tiflis. Committees were ap-
pointed to aid the sufferers, and the
peasants started in to till the fields
and rebuild their homes.
EVIDENCE PORTRAYS
TURKS AS BUTCHERS

History Records Nothing So Brutal as Massacre of Armenians in Last 1,000 Years.

NEW YORK, Oct. 2.—Documentary evidence of the atrocities inflicted by the Turks upon the Armenians was made public tonight by the committee formed by Charles R. Crane, Cleveland R. Dodge and others to investigate the facts of the Armenian massacre, and which also is taking steps to aid sufferers.

The committee states that the evidence was collected from sources that are unquestioned as to the veracity and authority of the writers, but that for obvious reasons their names cannot be given, and in most cases the names of towns and cities must be concealed. The quotations are given in the committee's report from 24 sources, some of which describe in detail instances where Armenians have been put to death, women violated and children slaughtered, of robbery, torture, death by starvation and of terrible privation endured in long marches to the desert regions to which the Armenians have been expelled—crimes described by the committee as surpassing. "In their horror and cruelty anything that history has recorded during the last 1,000 years.

New Method of Massacre.

"The idea of direct attack and massacre, carried out in former times," says a writer, writing under date of Aug. 1, "has been altered somewhat in that the men and boys have been deported in great numbers, and disappeared on route, and later on the women and children have been made to follow."

Describing, under date of June 20, the wholesale depopulation of 26,000 Armenian inhabitants of Zedim to the Komeh region, Aleppo and places in Mesopotamia, one writer gives the story of the Turkish government order, giving authority for the expulsions. It reads:

"The commanders of the army of independent army corps and of divisi
des may, in case of military necessity, and in case they suspect espionage or treason, send away, either singly or en masse, the inhabitants of villages or towns and install them in other places."

Despatch at Hour's Notice.

"Whole villages were deported at an hour's notice," says a writer, "with no opportunity to prepare for the journey, not even in some cases to gather together the scattered members of the family, so many little children were left behind."

"In many cases the men were bound together tightly with ropes and chains. Women with little children in their arms, or in the last days of pregnancy, were driven along under the whip like cattle."

Another writer tells of the cruel use of the bastinado in a certain prison where Armenians were held. "At the time of the Romanos," he writes, "46 strokes were administered at the very most; in this place, however, 250, 290, 500, and even 800 strokes were administered. A young man was beaten to death within the space of five minutes. Apart from the bastinado, other methods were employed, too, such as putting hot irons on the chest."

Men Sent Away First.

Telling of the expulsion of the Armenian inhabitants from an unnamed town, another writes:

"They (the men) were sent off toward ● ● ● in groups of from 50 to 150 and 200. Various reports have been circulated, the only one generally accepted being that they were killed."

"The panic in the city was terrible. The people felt that the government was determined to exterminate the Armenian race. Many of the convicts of the prisons had been released and the mountains around us at the rear were full of outlaws. It was feared that the women and children were to be taken some distance from the city and left to the mercy of the men. The women believed that they were going to worse than death, and many saved themselves by their pockets to use if necessary."

In another instance "a number of housewives, loaded with people at different times, and sent off toward ● ● ●. It is generally believed that such people were drowned.

Recorded as the testimony of the widow of ● ● ● a harrowing story is given of the experiences of a party of some 400 Armenians. She and her daughter escaped death by ascending the mountains."

"We had not only two hours away from home when bands of villagers and brigands with rifles, guns, axes, etc., surrounded us and robbed us of all we had. The gendarmes took my money and that of my daughter's neck, also all our food. After this, they separated the men, one by one, and shot them all within six or seven days—every male above 15 years old. These bandits took all the goodlooking women and carried them off on their horses. Very many women and girls were thus carried off to the mountains, among them my sister, whose 1-year-old baby they threw away. A Turk picked it up and carried it off. I know not where."

"We found on the road many of those who had been in previous sections. Some women and children were killed with their husbands and sons. We also came across some old people and infants still alive in a pitiable condition."

Corpses Dot Hillsides.

"The worst and most unimaginable horrors were reserved for us. The banks of the Euphrates and in the mountains, on the plains, in the muluklisc, bodies of women, girls and little children made everybody shudder. The bandmen were directed to send the dead to the women and girls that were left behind, in whose arms went up to heaven. At the Euphrates the bandmen and gendarmes threw into the river all the remaining children under 15 years of age. After seven days, we reached it is generally believed."

The Turkish women took my daughter under herself to the bath and there showed us many other women and girls who had succeeded them. Even between there and the fields, the hillsides were dotted with corpses."
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FEARFUL STORIES OF ATROCITIES.

An awful story of cruelty to Armenians is related by "Eye-Witness" in the London "Daily Chronicle." He says that history unrecords such scenes. Besides many thousand killed, half-a-million Armenians have been deported, and there is scarcely a man left.

The Turks in the Kharpot province marketed the remaining women.

Little children were put upon the roads and wandered famished until many died of starvation. Similar scenes occurred in the Diartskir province.

"Eye-Witness" states that women who were deported from Erzerum province were left on the Kharpot Plain foodless, and died at the rate of 50 and 60 daily.

A little girl states that when a caravan arrived at each village the women were exposed in the Governor's office to allow Musselmens to take their pick.

A caravan starting from Papert gradually dwindled in numbers through the attacks of the Turks. Armenian soldiers met the same fate in the Erzerum and Dirabekier provinces.
SAVE THE ARMENIANS.

That the denunciation of the Turks as bloodthirsty villains has been decidedly overdone in the Christian nations of the world and not least in the United States, is the testimony of those who have lived and traveled among them. Americans in Constantinople are at one in their assertions that they much prefer the Turk to the Greek or the Russian. He is more reliable and gentler-hearted by nature. His friendship is prized and however alien to American thought his ideals may be, the Turk is, they say, loyal to them. He lives up to his Koran better than the American lives up to his Bible.

But the Turk, like every other national, has his enmities, his enemies. And he pursues them with a relentlessness and a mercilessness which are appalling. The Armenian, it happens, is and always has been the Turk’s particular bête noir, his pet aversion. As the Dispatch’s Rome correspondent lately revealed, the Turkish government and army are persecuting the Armenians in a manner calculated to make the blood run cold. The Christian subjects of the sultan have, by an imperial decree, been interned for the period of the war; and this is equivalent, so Correspondent Mowrer says, to a proclamation of extermination.

Thus far in the war President Wilson has refrained strictly from interference with any of the belligerents so long as they did not injure the lives or property of Americans. But there will be many of opinion that he should at least protest to the Turkish government against a continuation of the cruel torturings and massacres of Armenians, one of the most unfortunate peoples on the face of the earth, who are in danger of complete extermination through no fault of their own.
"The witnesses examined include Armenians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Italians, Germans, Turks, Englishmen, Americans, business men, travellers and officials of great variety and rank. Not a single statement can be questioned as to the facts reported. These all agree in the declaration that from Smyrna on the west to Persia, and from the Black Sea to Arabia, a propaganda of extermination of non-Moslems is now being carried on by the Turkish Government far surpassing in ferocity and exceeding in destruction anything done by Abdul Hamid during his long career of massacre and extermination.

The statements examined, many of which are in the possession of the committee, cover hundreds of towns and cities, in which in many instances all of the Armenians have been killed outright, often after horrible tortures, or sent to the desert to die of starvation, and that too, with diabolical cruelty. The ostensible deportation of men, women and children toward Mesopotamia is usually but a form of marching those starving, helpless and frequently naked refugees out into the mountains to be outraxed and butchered, sometimes by their guards and sometimes by the Kurds, who gladly cooperate in the work of destruction.

"Included among these refugees and victims are pupils and graduates from the American schools and colleges, teachers and professional men who have taken degrees in American and European universities, men and women who have represented the brains and enterprise of the country for a generation and more.

"The plan of procedure, which is identical in all parts of the country, seems to aim at the complete, elimination of all non-Moslem races from Asiatic Turkey, and already that aim is in a fair way of accomplishment as far as the Armenians are concerned.

"In several places American property has been seized, Americans searched, imprisoned and expelled from the country, their letters and telegrams, even from the United States consular offices, intercepted and their lives put in jeopardy. This, however, is of trivial importance compared with the work of destruction going on among the Armenians.

"Evidence seems to prove that probably 500,000 Armenians have already been murdered or forced to the desert, where only death awaits them unless relief is secured at once. And all this has taken place since March and is now at the height of its gruesome fury.

"The committee is confident that if the press of the country should with all the emphasis at its command voice its protest and call on the Turkish Government to put an end to this crime against humanity and return the exiles who may yet be living to their homes it could hardly fail to produce results. In view of the great influence which Germany and Austria exercise over their ally the American people cannot fail to hold them morally responsible if these atrocities are permitted to continue."
ARmenians at
Van Massacred

Six Thousand Killed by Turks
and Kurds—Help Is Urgently Needed.

London, May 17.—2:14 p. m.—Six
thousand Armenians have been massa-
cred at Van in Armenia, Asiatic Tur-
key, according to a despatch received
in official quarters in London today
from the Russian consul at Urumla,
Persia.

This message is dated May 15. It
adds that the Armenians are defend-
ing themselves to the utmost against
the Turks and Kurds arrayed against
them, but that help is urgently needed.

Armenians in Grave Danger.

News dispatches from Persia, Ar-
menia and Trans-Caucasia in Russia,
have set forth for several weeks that
the position of the Armenians in Tur-
key as well as in northwestern Persia
was one of grave danger, but no mes-
 sage has conveyed any indication of
such extensive massacring as does
this report to London. If it is true,
the Armenian situation has entered
upon a period which threatens to
rival the conditions of 1895 when
something like 15,000 Armenians
were killed.
LINKS

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR  
http://www.armenocide.net/

SAMPLE ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS ON THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE  
http://www.armenian-genocide.org/

PRESS COVERAGE DURING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE  
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Press_coverage_during_the_Armenian_Genocide
BOOKS AND BOOK REVIEWS
THE DESTRUCTION OF ARMENIANS IN CILICIA, APRIL 1909

By: Hrachik R. Simonyan, Academician of NAS RA

While writing this history of the 1909 massacres of Cilician Armenians, the author used archive documents, available literary sources, and the print media of the time. The majority of the literary sources on the calamity of Cilician Armenians are memoirs published, with very few exceptions, in the year of the massacres (1909) or during the two or three years that followed (1910-1912). A great volume of material about the 1909 massacres of Cilician Armenians and their consequences was provided by the Armenian press of the time, the pages of which are filled with harrowing descriptions. The events were covered on a daily basis by Piuzantion (the official organ of the Armenian Patriarchate), Arevelk, Zhamanak of Constantinople, the Armenian newspapers and periodicals of Smyrna (Izmir), Karin (Erzrum), Trapezunt, and other cities of the Ottoman Empire and Western Armenia, and almost all organs of the Russian Armenian press (Mshak, Horizon. Kovkasi Lraber, Surhandak and others). Numerous articles were published in the pages of the Russian, European, and American press of the time.


Source: www.historyofarmenia.am
THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE: THE YOUNG TURKS BEFORE THE JUDGMENT OF HISTORY (an extract from the book)

By: John S. Kirakosyan, Doctor of Sciences (History)

The book uncovers the political essence of the Young Turks and reveals the historical truths about the tragedy that befell the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. The murder and deportation of Armenians in 1915 and following years provoked the censure of the world. Through a comparative analysis of an enormous quantity of multilingual and diverse sources and a thorough study of newly unearthed sources, the author showed how contemporary Turkish historians were acting as attorneys covering up the monstrous crimes of Sultan Abdul-Hamid II and the Young Turks. On June 2 and 3, 1921, the district court of Berlin tried Soghomon Tehlirian, Talaat's assassin. In a speech to the court Tehlirian said that Talaat was sentenced to death in absentia by the court martial in Constantinople. Talaat’s assassination committed by Tehlirian was justified by German court as an act of vengeance.

The Turkish policy of the genocide against Armenians was aimed at their physical destruction and realization of the goals of pan-Turkism. The apex of the Young Turks' many atrocities was the extirpation during World War I of one and half million Armenians in their Homeland – Western Armenia, a crime against humanity and civilization that became known as the Armenian Genocide.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/95.pdf
THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE IS CORROBORATED BY THE INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARLY, LEGAL AND HUMAN RIGHTS COMMUNITY (an extract from the book)

By: Hovhannisyan N. H., Corresponding Member of NAS RA

In the evaluation and recognition of genocide, including the Armenian Genocide-Armenocide, a turning point was the formation of genocidology in the second half of XX century as a new scientific branch within the social sciences. The investigation and detailed analysis of many primary sources, official documents and other materials about the Armenian Genocide brings to the conclusion that: a) The Armenian Genocide is already an internationally recognized genocide corroborated and recognized by the international scholarly, legal and human rights community; b) The Ottoman Empire was not merely the first state that committed the first genocide of XX century – the Armenian Genocide, but also the first state that recognized the crime in 1919 by the Ottoman court-martial Verdict; c) Turkey is the founder of the genocide-denial industry; d) Now a new phase has begun: transition from the recognition of the Armenian Genocide to the liquidation of the heavy consequences of the Armenian Genocide committed in 1915 in the Ottoman Empire.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/89.pdf
JAVAKHK IN THE 19th CENTURY AND THE 1st QUARTER OF THE 20th CENTURY (a historical research)

By: Melkonyan A. A., Academician of NAS RA

Summary

Javakhk was originally one of the nine districts of Gugark province of the Kingdom of Great Armenia. It is mentioned by the name of Zabakha in Araratian (Urartian) King Argishti’s (786-764 BC) inscriptions. Later it was within the Ervanduni (Orontid), then Artashesian and Arshakuni and Bagratuni Kingdoms of Great Armenia. It is mentioned as the family estate of the Vardzavuny princely family. Since time immemorial Javakhk has been inhabited by the Armenians, which is attested to by various Armenian, Georgian, Arab and other sources. According to Georgian historian Leonti Mroveli, early in the 4th century, when St. Nune was preaching Christianity in Javakhk, the local population’s vernacular was Armenian.

Meeting Akhalkalak Armenians’ desire to be reunited with their Homeland, the authorities of Soviet Armenia (Alexander Bekzadian, Alexander Myasnikian, Arshak Mravian, and others) demanded to return the district and Tzalka to Armenia. In July 1921 the Georgian and Azerbaijani Bolsheviks achieved the annexation of both Akhalkalak and some other Armenian territories to Soviet Georgia and Soviet Azerbaijan. Under the Soviet rule, the region was completely ignored by the Georgian authorities. The attempts to introduce any changes in the frontier became highly dangerous; those Armenians who raised that question received jail terms or were sent into exile in the 1930s. After Georgia declared independence harsh socio-economic and political conditions are endangering the life of the native Armenians of Javakhk. It is of the utmost importance to study the problem of Javakhk on an objective scientific basis, to realize the political reality, and to resolve the problem in a fair, just and civilized manner.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/97.pdf
ARMENIANS OF BAKU PROVINCE IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY(HISTORICAL-DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY) (an extraxt from the book)

By: Stepanyan G. S., Doctor of Sciences (History)

As attested by the available archive documents, as well as historiographical and lapidary sources, from times of remote antiquity Armenians - the natives of the Armenian Highland inhabited also the region of Eastern Transcaucasia, namely from the river Kur (the left bank) to Apsheron Peninsula. Armenians created their specific cultural heritage there and participated in the social-economic, educational and cultural life of the region.

With the invasion of Turkic-speaking elements into Eastern Transcaucasia (from the end of the 11th c. and later) the ethno-cultural makeup of the region suffered grave damages and underwent destructive transformations. Despite this, the Armenians due to their creative abilities and natural self-defence characteristics succeeded in continuing their existence and constituted a considerable part of the region’s population. Eastern part of Great Armenia’s province of Paytakaran was also included into Baku Province of the Russian Empire in 1867.

The Armenians of Baku Province suffered a particularly heavy losses in September 1918, when the Turkish army units invaded Transcaucasia and reached Baku. The criminal policy of physical extermination and deportation continued against the Armenians throughout the existence of Musavatist “Azerbaijan”. The policy of the violation of the rights of the Armenians and other native peoples in Eastern Transcaucasia (Tats, Talyshes, Lezghins, etc.) continued during the 70 years of the rule of AzSSR. Genocidal crimes were perpetrated against the Armenians of the city of Sumgait (27-29 February, 1988) and Baku (13-19 January, 1990) by the Azerbaijani authorities.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/106.pdf
SAINT-MARTIN THE FOUNDER OF FRENCH ARMENOLOGY

By: Doloukhanyan A. G., Corresponding member of NAS RA

Summary
Jean Antoine Saint-Martin (1791-1832) is the founder of Armenian studies in France. His capital work Mémoire historique et géographique sur l’Arménie is a study in two volumes which were published in Paris in 1818 and 1819. With this work Saint- Martin contributed to the development of Armenian studies in Europe. Armenological heritage of Saint-Martin confirmed the necessity of Armenian studies in France. His example was followed by French and Belgian prominent Armenologists of the 19th century, such as Marie Brosset, Victor Langlois, Félix Nève and Edouard Dulaurier who loved Armenia and its creative people, representing one of the most ancient civilizations all over the world.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/83.pdf
THE ISSUES IN THE HISTORY OF ANCIENT AND EARLY MEDIEVAL ARMENIA IN FRENCH ARMENOLOGY OF THE 19th CENTURY

By: Dumikyan A. V., PhD in History

Summary

The book is dedicated to the analysis of the coverage of issues in the history of ancient and early medieval Armenia in French Armenology of the 19th century. Special attention is paid to the evaluation of the Armenian historiographical heritage in the French Armenological studies by J. Saint-Martin, J. Oppert, M. Brosset, V. Langlois, E. Dulaurier and others. Many of them followed the traditions of Armenian studies carried out since the 18th century in the Mekhitarist Congregation in Venice. The elucidation of the issues in the ancient and medieval history and historical geography, as well as the spiritual and civilizational values of Armenia on the basis of historical sources was at the centre of the 19th century French Armenological studies. French Armenologists made an important contribution to the Armenian historiography.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/63.pdf
THE ARMENIAN KINGDOM OF CILICIA IN THE SYSTEM OF MEDITERRANEAN TRADE (13th -14th CC.) (Summary)

By: Gevorgyan Z. H., PhD in History

The essential issues related to the international trade of Cilician Armenia is for the first time elucidated in this book based on the analysis of various sources and scientific studies. For instance, the process of involvement of Cilician Armenia in the international trade is subjected to periodization. The examination of the composition of the variety of goods, the commercial ties of the Cilician harbours and the ways of the organization of trade has enabled to reveal the significance of Cilician Armenia in the financial-economic system formed in the Mediterranean basin in the period under discussion. By the analysis of the decisive events of the world politics which took place in the Near East and Europe as well as the international economic relation development process the degree of the interactions has been studied which allowed to present various issues of the political history of Cilician Armenia in a more comprehensive way.

http://www.fundamentalarmenology.am/datas/pdfs/96.pdf
POWER AND JUSTICE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO GLOBAL CHALLENGES

Edited by Marie-Luisa Frick and Andreas Oberprantacher, University of Innsbruck, Ashgate, 2009, 284 pages.

A Book Review by Danielyan E. L., Doctor of Sciences (History)

Published in «Լրաբեր» հաս․գիտ. N 3, 2011

The book provides detailed analysis of current developments in international politics, focuses on conditions for social and ecological justice in international economics against the background of financial crisis from points of view of the concepts of justice and power in international relations.

The contributors of the book, reflecting the work of the internationally acclaimed Austrian philosopher Hans Köchler and touching the problems of the place of international law, the meaning of economic justice and the importance of dialogue of civilizations, have had a goal to highlight a better comprehension of the interrelation between power and justice in view of current world tensions. Hans Köchler in the 1980s criticized legal positivism and promoted a theory that human rights are the basis of international law's validity. His reflections on political philosophy, democracy in inter-state relations, the role and philosophical foundations of civilizational dialogue, a comprehensive system of international criminal justice led him to the field of research of problems concerning world order, including the dialectic relationship between power and law [1-4], and law as a system of norms based on the equality of all nations [5, p. 19].

RUBEN SAFRASTYAN. OTTOMAN EMPIRE: THE GENESIS OF THE PROGRAM OF GENOCIDE (1876-1920)

A Book Review by Danielyan E. L., Doctor of Sciences (History)

Ruben Safrastyan’s monograph is an essential research work in the studies of the genocidal nature of the Ottoman Empire, particularly, the Hamidian, the Young Turk and the Kemalist programs of genocide against the Armenian people and the criticism of the Turkish official historiography, which following the genocide denial policy of the Turkish government falsifies the history of the Armenian Genocide. The opening sentence of the book states: “Genocide is not only a historical phenomenon or a scientific abstraction, but a severe reality of our days, a gravest crime against humanity... the Ottoman Empire was the first state in the history of mankind to prepare and perpetrate a large-scale genocide” (p. 7). Armenian and foreign researchers have published many monographs and research articles on the Armenian Genocide. Alongside with their works the author widely used collections of archival documents published in different countries.

YU. SUVARYAN, V. MIRZOYAN, R. HAYRAPETYAN. “PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: THEORY AND HISTORY”

A Book Review by Eduard L. Danielyan, Doctor of Sciences (History)

The scholarly work under review is devoted to the essence and methodology of research of public administration: theory and history, based on comparative analysis of the ancient and medieval sources, as well as the works of the authors of the 19th-20th centuries. Solutions to the assigned task are determined within the sphere of public administration as a complete and recognized science with theoretical and practical concepts accumulated over centuries.