

## THE “MYTH” OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE: WHERE THE TRUTH LIES?

*By: AYHAN OZER*

The purpose of this Paper is to expose a vicious lie of history, the so-called “Armenian Genocide” in light of the salient facts gleaned from the reliable U.S. and the British sources. For decades, with revisionist zeal the Armenians have invented a genocide lore based on disinformation and fabrications. They have embellished their allegations with add-on stories, yellow journalism, and war-time propagandist materials. To gain a quasi-official recognition they push this in the U.S. Congress, in the media, and in school curriculums. The Armenian game plan is to validate their claims by dint of argument, i.e. “keep repeating it, once it penetrates the public subconscious it’ll become reality.”

The “Armenian Genocide” allegations were repudiated by the U.S. State Department archives, The Library of Congress Records, The Hyde Park Presidential archives, the British archives, and the Turkish archives, and in each instance the Turks were vindicated unequivocally. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of the eminent U.S. scholars of the Turkish and Middle Eastern history in the U.S. are on the record refuting the Armenian allegations. In fact, sixty-nine (69) eminent U.S. historians issued a joint-statement in May 19, 1985 in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, and warned the U.S. Congress **against** any passage of resolution endorsing the spurious Armenian claims. The signatories of this solemn declaration include the foremost authorities in the field of the Turkish and the Middle Eastern History; such as Bernard Lewis from Princeton University (now emeritus), J.C. Hurewitz from Columbia University, Walter Weiker from Rutgers University (deceased), Avigdor Levy from Brandeis University, Heath Lowry from Princeton University, the noted demographic historian Justin McCarthy from Louisville, Kentucky University, Stanford Shaw from the U.C.L.A. Those 69 history professors from 25 States and the District of Columbia constitute 95% of the American scholars in that field. **We challenge the Armenians to show us one single non-Armenian, reliable history scholar who supports their allegations, and one single documentary evidence that proves their claims.**

The Armenians claim that their grievances have never been heard, and they were a peaceful minority living under the Ottoman Turks. This is not true. The Armenian allegations have been heard several times in the U.K., in the U.S., and in France (during the Versailles Treaty in 1920) and in each instance the transparency of their fabricated story was exposed, and summarily dismissed.

As for the “peaceful minority” claim, nothing can be further from the truth. The following list chronicles the Armenian riots and insurgencies that debilitated their sovereign state, the Ottoman Empire, for decades. They constantly paralyzed the country, especially when the country was at war, serving as a fifth column.

1862 and 1895 Zeitun riots, 20 June 1890 the Erzurum insurgency; 18 July 1890 Kumkapi (Istanbul) revolt; 1892 Merzifon, Kayseri, Yozgat regional insurrections; August 1894 the first Sassoon revolt; September 1895 raid on Sublime Porte (the Ottoman Government Head Office); 1895-1896 Van uprising; 1895 Trabzon, Erzincan, Bitlis, Maras, Erzurum, Diyarbakir, Malatya and Harput revolts; 26 August 1896 raid on the Ottoman Bank; 1904 second Sassoon revolt; 21 July 1905 the assassination attempt on the Head of State with a carriage loaded with explosives; 1909 Adana uprising; April 1915 second Van revolt. In view of the above, from late 1800s on can we call the Armenians "a peaceful minority" or, an enemy within?

When the Armenian Terrorism was in its heydays the Turkish government made a fair and reasonable offer to the Armenians. It proposed, "Let us convene an international conference outside Turkey and Armenia, and invite history scholars from all over the world, specialized in the Turkish and the Middle Eastern history, including the historians from Armenia and Turkey. Let them deliberate the issue and decide whether there was a genocide in the past committed by the Turks on the Armenians. The present Turkish government will abide by the decision reached by this body, and will not challenge it. It is mandatory that the Armenian government too will accept the verdict of those scholars." This initiative included one stipulation though: Both sides were to open their archives as the scrutinizing of the archives was essential to reach a sound conclusion. That way this issue was to be resolved in a civilized and scholarly way, without resorting to terrorism and blood shed, or scoring points by legislations and back door politics. The Armenians adamantly refused this offer, because they fear that the Russian archives must contain ample evidences chronicling the period in which the Armenians claim that they had been subjected to a genocide. In those years the Russian and the Armenian activities intertwined as they collaborated closely in the war efforts against Turkey. The Armenians calculated that the Russian archives may contradict their own archives, and a comparison between these two will expose their lies. They will not only lose face but their case too. They know that their own archives can not withstand a scholarly scrutiny which will cause their flimsy case to collapse. Therefore, this initiative was still-born.

The Armenians lived side by side with the Turks in a brotherly co-existence for centuries. Even today, there are 70,000-80,000 Armenians living in Turkey peacefully. For centuries the Armenians have been fully integrated into the Turkish way of life. They were regarded as the "most trusted minority", so much so that the Turks called them a "Baptized Turk." As a productive people they contributed enormously to the Turkish language, music, theater, and architecture. The Ottoman rulers allowed self expression more than what it was the norm in the contemporary Europe. Traditionally they respected the freedom of conscience. The Christian and the Jewish subjects of the Empire were free from religious oppression and persecution. The Empire was a multi-

national, multi-ethnic and multi-religious conglomerate, and the promotions in every endeavors were based on meritocracy regardless of faith or ethnicity. This enabled several minority members to rise to prominent positions in the administration, business, trade and military. All the minorities, the Christians, the Jews, the Arabs, the Slavs, the Albanians, the Circassians enjoyed the freedom of religion and a full autonomy in the administration of their communities. The minorities, notably the Armenians, the Greeks and the Jews held down high level civil service positions in the State. Several Armenians and the Greeks served as Secretaries of State, ambassadors army generals, members of the Parliament, financial advisers and even confidants to the sultans. In the 19<sup>th</sup> and the early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries they had representations in the Ottoman Parliament, their own churches, their own schools, their own courts, orphanages, and pious foundations have always been free and independent. The Armenian newspapers in their own language were published and circulated without any restriction. They fully enjoyed the freedom of worship, freedom of conscience, freedom of education, freedom of judiciary, and human dignity. The country always put them in equal standing with the majority population, and validated them. Thanks to this enlightened Turkish attitude, the Armenian community thrived and gradually transformed from a territorial existence to a wealthy minority. This could only be in the Ottoman land. Can any one show the world a country that granted to its minorities such a vast civil liberties? Starting from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the United States has become the epitome of freedom and equality; yet it was plagued until recently (in the 20<sup>th</sup> century) with discriminations towards its minorities, the African Americans, the native Americans and the Jews. The Ottoman Turkish Empire was a shining example of those ideals as early as 1400s and then 1500s, 1600s, 1700s, 1800s, and 1900s.

This centuries-old brotherly co-existence of the Turkish and the Armenian people lasted until 1870s at which time with overt and covert instigations of Russia and the Great Britain the seeds of secession among the Armenians were sown. To make the matter worse, the Ottoman Empire was in a steady decline; this perception of disintegration encouraged several vassal states in their quests to split off. First, Greece became independent in 1829, then Bulgaria and Romania won their independence in 1878. In the same year, after 300 years of Turkish rule the island of Cyprus was lost to England. In 1892 the island of Crete was grabbed by Greece. In 1912, in the aftermath of the Balkan Wars The Ottomans lost Macedonia and Albania. Austria annexed the Turkish territories of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Italy grabbed Tripolitana. Finally, in 1917 with the incitement of the British the Arab revolt (T.E. Lawrence of Arabia !) brought the Ottoman Empire to the defeat of 1918. This steady regression fueled the Armenian aspirations, "As all those Balkan countries won their independence, why not us?" Thus, the Armenian betrayal, insurgencies and terror in the Ottoman Empire began. The centuries-old peaceful Armenian community turned hostile.

The Armenian agenda aims to pull off an undeserved recognition for their spurious genocide allegations at the coattail of the Jewish Holocaust which is an unprecedented and well-documented human tragedy. Ironically, the Armenians are pathologically anti-Semite, proven by irrefutable evidence recorded indelibly in the history of the World War II. They acted under Hitler as a Nazi accessory to round up the Jews for the concentration camps. (The detailed account of this abhorrent story is provided separately) Therefore, associating the so-called "Armenian Genocide" with the Jewish Holocaust debases the meaning of the Jewish tragedy, and is an insult to the memory of the six million Jews who perished in the most senseless crime of mankind.

To forcibly validate their claims, the Armenians in the United States as well as in other countries have mounted a massive and brutal terrorism campaign against the Turks and the Turkish institutions. Starting in January 1973 in the United States, more than two decades, this senseless terrorism claimed the lives of more than 70 Turkish diplomats and their family members around the world (four in the United States), and maimed and wounded hundreds of innocent bystanders, Turks or non-Turks, in the carnage staged by the Armenians at the airports, shopping centers and Turkish government buildings. Even the eminent U.S. history scholars who challenged the revisionist version of the Armenian allegations were not immune from the scourge of the Armenian terror. In fact, on October 4, 1977 the house of the U.C.L.A. history professor Stanford Shaw was bombed by the extremist Armenian student body, and Professor Shaw and his family were forced to leave the campus under a death threat.

The WW I ended with the defeat of the Turkish-German-Bulgarian alliance. Right after the War, in 1918, the British occupied the capital city of Istanbul, and confiscated all the archives and the official documents. They attempted to set up a war crime tribunal in the Mediterranean island of Malta to punish "the guilty" Ottoman officials for supposedly "mistreating" the Armenians. They rounded up summarily some 140 high level government officials, and interned them in Malta for three years (1918-1921) during which time they searched with great zeal any evidence to incriminate the Turkish officials. (Compare this with the two Serbian war criminals Ratko Mladic, the Bosnian Serbs Army Chief, and Radovan Karadzic who are the architects of the Srebrenica Genocide of the Bosnian Muslims in early 1990s, they thumbed their noses to the world for more than 10 years.) Among the detainees were the grand-vizier, the speaker of the House, Cabinet members, Army generals, governors, mayors, prominent journalists, professors, civil servants, authors. The country was under the British, French, Greek and Italian occupations, and the Armenian allegations were still fresh; also, all the so-called "eye-witnesses" were still living; therefore, it should not have been any problem to wrap up summarily the case and punish the guilty Turkish officials. Yet, despite their zeal, the British were unable to find one single reliable evidence to prove the Armenian claims. Their Foreign Office archives

contained nothing but rumor, hearsay or gossip; none could withstand the scrutiny in a court of law. Badly deceived, the British called upon the **U.S. State Department archives** that might corroborate the Armenian claims. Yet, the U.S. State Department expressed regret for not being able to help. It was a debacle for the British. Finally, in great embarrassment, the British had to release all the detainees after they exhausted for three years all the conceivable leads to charge the Ottoman government officials with "mistreating" the Armenians. (A full account of this episode based on the British and the U.S. State Department archives is enclosed.)

The Armenians naively refer to a book "**The Ambassador Morgenthau's Story**" supposedly written by Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. Ambassador in Istanbul between November 1913 - February 1916. For anyone who is not familiar with the background of the story this claim may sound impressive. "The American ambassador!... Our own diplomat on site!!" But consider this: This book was published in 1918, around the time when the Ottoman Empire had surrendered and the British occupied the capital city of Istanbul. It is noteworthy that when the British were searching with great zeal for an iota of evidence to incriminate the Ottoman officials in their aborted attempt of war crime trial neither the British Foreign Office nor the U.S. State Department made a reference to this Book! Is it imaginable, the U.S. State Department ignoring a book "authored" very recently by its own ambassador who was supposed to have had first-hand knowledge of the so-called "events"? The reason for this "bizarre" turn of events is that this vicious book filled with horror stories to incriminate the Turks for supposedly "mistreating" the Armenians was a forgery, and nothing but a propaganda tool, it was for the public consumption, not for the court of law. In fact a book published in 1990 with a title of "**The Story Behind Ambassador Morgenthau Story**" based on research made by the Professor Heath Lowry of Princeton University at the Hyde Park Presidential Archives has exposed the truth: The so-called "Memoires" was not written by Ambassador Morgenthau himself, but had been commissioned by the then Administration to **Burton J. Hendrick**, a Pulitzer-Price-winning author, journalist and historian. Two Armenian employees, namely, Arshag K. Schmavonian, the Embassy's Legal Advisor, and Hagop S. Andonian, Morgenthau's private secretary (this man can be related to Aram Andonian, another notorious fabricator of the forged documents. He authored the spurious collection known as **The Memoirs of Naim Bey: Turkish Official Documents Relating to the Deportation and Massacres of the Armenians**), both Turkish Armenians, helped Mr. Hendrick compile the Book. They followed Ambassador Morgenthau to the United States to finish the Book, and both were employed by the U.S. State Department in Washington, D.C.

The personality of Mr Morgenthau is interesting, and reveals his motivation. He was born in Mannheim (Germany) in 1856. His middle-class Jewish family immigrated to United States when he was 10 years old. In his youth he displayed a character with will-power and diligence. He directed his life by setting goals for himself, then mastering them. He extolled the virtues of the American democracy and the boundless opportunity the United States offered to eager and diligent persons. He admired Woodrow Wilson as a paragon of high character and integrity, and believed those assets would benefit the country in the highest executive office. In 1913 Woodrow Wilson ran for president, and Henry Morgenthau became Finance Chairman of his election campaign. When Wilson was elected, Mr Morgenthau was rewarded with the Ambassadorship to Constantinople. Being a Jew, he was obsessed with a Jewish homeland in Palestine. At that time Palestine was an Ottoman province, and the Palestinian affairs were directed from Constantinople. Therefore, this post was important for the world Jewry. In his new post Ambassador Morgenthau was set to look after The American missionaries and their flocks in Turkey. With these two major objectives, the conditions of an old empire, then in a terminal stage, had been relegated in the mind of Henry Morgenthau to a subordinate position. He was an opinionated and judgmental person, he did not care about the larger issue, he saw and heard only those aspects that fitted his preconceived opinion. He was self-important, not given to introspection and soul searching. Himself being from a minority he cared more about the minorities of the Ottoman Empire rather than the objective truth. Under those circumstances his bias against the Muslim majority of the Empire had been formed at the very beginning of his tenure in Turkey. Following the Senate confirmation on September 4, 1913, he departed for his new post on November 27, 1913. He held this post until February 1916.

The two U.S. ambassadors, Abram Elkus and Admiral Mark L. Bristol who succeeded Mr. Morgenthau had more temperate views about the Armenian issue. They were more active and free from bias. Both formed their own opinions about Turkey and Turkish people through their first-hand experiences. Henry Morgenthau was far removed from the region where those events supposedly had taken place. He never left the capital city of Istanbul to investigate or to see for himself the so-called "massacres." He obtained his information from his Armenian and Greek agents. Admiral Bristol, on the other hand, was a military commander without any hidden intricate agenda, and prior to his ambassadorship (The first U.S. ambassador to the Republic of Turkey) he was the American High-commissioner in Turkey. He extensively traveled throughout the country, and Investigated the so-called "Armenian massacres" in place. He wrote a historical letter to *Dr. James L. Burton, the Secretary of the Foreign Department of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*. In this letter Admiral Bristol gives a vivid account of the true nature of the Armenian allegations as he saw through his first-hand observations.

Dr. Burton's reply to Admiral Bristol discloses the massive propaganda campaign mounted by the Armenians in the U.S. using the churches and the Protestant missionaries to drive home their lies and fabrications as facts. From his vantage point, Dr. Burton dismisses the Armenian allegations unequivocally. (From the Library of Congress records, copies are enclosed.)

To publish war-time propaganda materials to turn the public opinion against the enemy and to justify war efforts then was a common practice as it is today; just like the weapons of mass destruction saga to justify the Iraqi war. During WW I the British propaganda factory Wellington House (a.k.a. Masterman Bureau) turned out massive propaganda publications for the Foreign Office authored by several renown British writers, such as Max Aitken, James Bryce, Conan Doyle, Rudyard Kipling, H.G. Wells, and Arnold Toynbee. In 1916, Lord Bryce published a book called *The Treatment of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire 1915-1916* (also called *Blue Book*) under his name but authored by - then - a novice historian Arnold Toynbee who was employed by the British Foreign Office. A pathetically simple-minded book, which the British Attorney General did not dare (or deign) even to consider it as an evidence during the war crime trial attempt. It was first published as a pamphlet under the title of "*Armenian Atrocities: Murder of a Nation.*" The original Wellington House edition being out of print, in 1975 an Armenian publishing house in the United States reprinted it. However, it is impossible to compare its authenticity as the original edition is no longer available. Anyway, several reliable Western sources have denounced *the - original- Blue Book*. In an article in the U.S. magazine *The Nation* (June 13, 1923) Arthur Moss and Florence Gilliam wrote that "The Bryce Reports have been proved to be without tangible evidence, and to have been entirely based on hearsay." (Copy enclosed). Furthermore, Professor James Duane Squires in his book "*British Propaganda at Home and in the United States from 1914 to 1917*" (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1935) explicitly labels Lord Bryce's book as "War-time propaganda!" Also listed in the same "commissioned" category are many a books by Arnold Toynbee, including *Murderous Tyranny of the Turk*, *The Belgian Deportation*, *The Destruction of Poland*, and *The German Terror in France*. The young Arnold Toynbee was directed to create an imaginary saga at his desk denouncing the Turks for allegedly mistreating the Armenians. Later, in 1967, (48 years later, perhaps in repentance) Arnold Toynbee repudiated the *Blue Book* he had authored, and disclosed that it was intended to serve as an instrument to further the British Government's political aims and foreign policy objectives. (*Acquaintances*, Arnold Toynbee, Oxford University Press, London, 1967) In 1922, Arnold Toynbee visited the region, and wrote another book, *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey*. His observations in this book reflect the truth. He recounts the atrocities and savagery committed by the Greeks and the Armenians on the Turkish population.

During 1920s, the stories about the trumped up Turkish atrocities against Armenians were receiving increasingly wide circulation in the United States. The tragedy of the Turkish people was seldom discussed in the public until the great American philosopher, psychologist, and educator **John Dewey** wrote his perceptive essay "The Turkish Tragedy" published in **November 12, 1928 issue of The New Republic**. He wrote, "... Few Americans are aware that till the rise of nationalistic ambitions the Armenians were the favored portion of the population of Turkey, or that in the Great War **they traitorously turned Turkish cities over to the Russian invader; that they boasted of having raised an army of 150,000 men to fight a civil war, and that they burned at least a hundred Turkish villages and exterminated their population.** "He further states, "... There are villains...they are the Great Powers, among which it is surely not invidious to select Russia and Great Britain by name. **Happy the minority which has had no Christian nation to protect it... The condition of the Jews in Turkey is a proof that the religious differences did not mean anything in Turkey unless they were combined with the aspirations for political separation, which every nation in the world would have treated as treasonable.**" (A copy of the John Dewey's article is enclosed).

The Ottoman Empire was rich and powerful thanks to the talents and contributions from everybody, including the minorities. Faith, ethnicity and race have never become an issue. Most of its rulers were patrons of art; they allowed the artistic expression more than what was the norm at that time in the contemporary Europe. Traditionally, they respected the freedom of conscience. The Christian and the Jewish subjects of the Empire were free from religious oppression and persecution. The Jews, the Greeks and the Armenians all contributed their talent in craft, business, finance and civil services. It was a Turkish culture created hand-in-hand in a brotherly co-existence whose ingredients were ingenuity, creativity, and expertise. The Turks recognize with gratitude those contributions on the part of the minorities to their society.

At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the steady decline of the Ottoman Empire created a perception of disintegration, which made way to the "Eastern Question". The inheritance of the ottoman Empire became a bone of contention among the imperialist states, namely, England, Russia, France and Germany. And the Armenians came handy as a pawn in this complex power struggle. Examination of the multi-dimensional power-play engaged by the above states will shed some light on the Armenian issue.

England, as a ruler of India at that time was always apprehensive of the allegiance of the Indian Muslims to the Ottoman Empire and the sultan as their caliph. Therefore, it needed to drive a wedge between these two blocks. The Armenians, as Christians and beholden to England, with no tradition of



nationalism, and malleable as they lacked in experience of statehood, came very handy for that purpose.

Germany, sorely lagging behind the British in their dominance in the Middle East, desperately needed a viable beach-head in the region. It calculated that the collapse of the Ottoman Empire was imminent, and the Armenians seemed to be their best bet for the German aspirations in the Middle East.

As for Russia, with the Slavic Bulgaria had already been installed as a vassal state in the west of the Ottoman Empire, the Christian Armenians in the East, contiguous to Russia, seemed to be a good prospect to cultivate, thereby to encircle the Ottoman Empire. Russia had also its own Armenian minority, and it could manipulate any future Armenian state in the Turkish land through its own Armenian subject. Under the thumb of Russia, such a client state could serve as a conduit for Russia to the south, which Russia desperately needed for its expansion toward "warmer seas." Furthermore, it could check the British expansion in the region, and even drive a wedge between England and India. The Armenian issue was artificially created in the above climate by the imperialist powers, and revolved around this axis

The centuries-old harmonious co-existence of the Turkish and Armenian peoples lasted until 1870s, at which time two Armenian terrorist organizations called "Dashnaks" and "Hunchaks" were founded to carve up an independent Armenian state from the Turkish land. In a cultish tradition these so-called "political parties" and ever-present extremists in their ranks enthrall the Armenian grass-roots and frustrate their efforts to achieve peace. They control the fate of the Armenians world-wide, causing death, suffering, confusion and disunity among the Armenians for more than a hundred years. Those organizations are still in existence today with offices in Watertown, Massachusetts. Charles B. Norman, of the London Times wrote about the Armenians: "A more selfish, narrow-minded, mean, cringing race I fancy does not exist."

All those grim developments dove-tailed with a religious movement in the United States called "Dissemination of the Bible". In the early 1800s, a movement in the U.S. by the Protestant missionaries to proselytize the non-Christians and non-Protestants got underway. Several American missionaries swarmed the multi-ethnic, multi-religious and multi-nationality Ottoman land. In view of the difficulties converting the Muslims, the Jews or the orthodox Greeks to Protestantism they targeted the Armenians as they had already been divided by the sectarian schism into Catholics, Orthodox and Gregorian. In this effort, the missionaries had to impress the Armenians with their clout and power in the United States. That way they could raise funds for the church, and muster help and support among the American people for the spiritual, educational and social

needs of these new converts. The missionaries mounted a huge fund-raising campaign in the U.S., and the Armenian cause worked like a double-edged sword. They painted a grim picture in which a “down-trodden” Christian minority in a distant part of the world was being subjected to suffering under the yoke of the “Muslim Turks.” They hammered home the slogan of “Starving Armenians.” This Crusader spirit swiftly gained momentum; the more the image of oppressed Armenians was brought home the more money was raised.

This over-zealous propaganda with a religious component worked well, and helped the Armenian cause. Thereafter the Armenians embellished this saga, and created a genocide lore out of it.

The Armenians all along claim that they were subjected to a religiously motivated extermination policy undertaken by the then Ottoman government during the WW I . However, they can not account for the following salient facts:

1-Only the Armenians living in the Eastern part of Turkey near the border of Russia were relocated to Syria and Palestine (at that time the Turkish provinces); The Armenians in the other parts of the country were not affected by this military measure. The relocation was carried out using the best means available in that period of time under war conditions. **The American Rear- Admiral Colby Chester was an eye-witness to that measure**, and documented his observations in an article in The New York Times Current History in February 1923 (copy enclosed).

What caused the relocation of some Armenians from the war zone in 1915 ?

The Russian Army had begun invading the Eastern Anatolia in March 1915, and the Armenian irregulars in that region were in close collusion with the invading Russian Army acting as fifth-column, cutting the supply lines of the Turkish Army and exposing the troops to Russian assault. As all the Turkish men folks were at the front (the Armenians were exempt from the military service) the Armenians systematically massacred the civilians, they even let their women folks do the slaughtering, scalping and gouging. They were in constant revolt and unprecedented treason, creating chaos, taking the advantage of the country's being at war. When The Armenian terrorist bands with the help of the invading Russian Army took the control of the city of Van (at the Russian -Turkish border) the Armenian irregulars rapidly decimated the civilian population of Van. This was a true genocide. The Armenians of Van (all Ottoman citizens) rose against the State on April 7, 1915. It was an armed rebellion that culminated in a genocide committed by the Armenians. The following letter from Van was published on **May 24, 1915** in the Armenian newspaper “**Gochnak**” published in the United States:

“The war that started on April 7 [1915] between the Armenians and the Turks lasted about 23 days, and with the help of God we became victors, we took the Fort... [reference to the Fort of Van]. We burned down all the government buildings and military barracks. Three days later the Armenian volunteers’

battalion from Russia and one day later [than that] the Russian Army arrived... Almost all the buildings in the town were destroyed. I tried to locate my shop, yet I could not find it. **There remained only 1500 Turks, women and children, in Van.** The Russian Army provides sustenance for them. Today, Aram [an Armenian terrorist] is the governor of Van. The official language is Armenian. Armenian employees are assigned to the towns and villages." According to the French Yellow Book, at that time in Van there were 341,200 Turks and 80,798 Armenians. Most of the Turkish men folks being at the front, only women, children and elderly were in the town. The savage nature of the atrocities committed by the Armenians put even the Russians to shame, and they restrained some overzealous Armenians and removed them from the contact with the Turkish civilians. So, you can figure the magnitude of the genocide committed by the Armenians!

One question comes to mind, "If there was such a genocide committed by the Armenians as you claim, why didn't the Turks bring this into open, and make a case?" This is a valid question. The reason lies in the Turkish character and culture. The Ottoman Turks had never really felt the need to develop a propaganda machine, or, euphemistically speaking, "Public Relations." Even today, the Turks still retain an abiding contempt for self-promotion. Throughout history, they have always become rulers, protectors, and law-givers. In the past the European emperors, kings and potentates paid tribute to the "Grand Turk." Their self-image, rightly or wrongly, was that they reigned supreme; we can call it an imperial state-of-mind. There was no one but God above them to entreat mercy, not any mortal. The whining is not a Turkish character trait. In defeat they lick their wounds in private and forget. In victory, they are magnanimous and merciful. Therefore, in the past the Turks did not dwell on it and let go.

History provides us with a good example to compare the Turkish relocation efforts of 1915 with the U.S. order to relocate 120,000 Japanese- Americans from the war zone in 1941 as a military measure on the remote assumption that the Japanese-Americans could not be trusted and they could undermine the U.S. war efforts with Japan. Ironically, 26 years later, this order was devised and put through by another Morgenthau, a member of the cabinet of the F.D. Roosevelt Administration, and the son of Ambassador Henry Morgenthau (the father of the present Manhattan District Attorney.) The Japanese-Americans had not killed one single U.S. citizens, nor did the Jews kill any German to justify the Holocaust, whereas the Armenian bandits in the Eastern and South-Eastern Anatolia were in constant revolt, insurgency and terrorism, and massacred women, children, and elderly indiscriminately. The carnages created by the Armenian men as well as women were blood curdling.

2- The Armenians invoke the Christian spirit, and to gain sympathy of the Christian world they claim that they had been subjected to a religiously motivated extermination policy. Had the religion been a factor, why several other minorities of the Ottoman Empire, such as the Jews, Christian Greeks, Orthodox Serbs, Christian Arabs, the Albanians, and even the Catholic Armenians remained unmolested? Turkey's immaculate records of treating the other faiths with utmost tolerance and compassion do resoundingly bear witness to the falsity of the Armenian allegations.

3- The Armenians have lived under the Turkish rule for several centuries. Had genocide been intended the Ottoman Turks could have carried it out anytime in the past, and no one would have asked a powerful empire to account for it.

4- As you can see from the Joint-statement of the 69 scholars, in the past the Ottoman Empire incorporated lands and people which today account for more than 25 distinct countries in Southeastern Europe, Middle East and North Africa. All those religiously, ethnically and nationality-wise diverse people lived under the Ottoman rule for 300-400 years peacefully; yet, to date none of them came up with such a heinous allegations.

5- The Turkish tradition is humane and tolerant to the other faiths, and for that reason Turkey has always been a haven for the oppressed, persecuted, poor and needy. Turkey is one of the rare countries in the world which receive the most refugees. When 500 years ago in Spain, the Christian zealotry condemned the Jews in the infamous Inquisition, only the Turks accepted them with open mind and open arms. The Jews call these 500 years "Golden period."

With this impeccable record, when Hitler's Anti-semitism was rampant in Europe, on September 17, 1933, **Albert Einstein** sent a letter from Paris to Ataturk asking him to accept forty Jewish scholars harassed by Hitler to Turkey. Great Ataturk invited 1203 Jewish scholars and their families. Several eminent scholars, including Albert Einstein, in the German, Swiss, Poland and Austrian universities came to Turkey as a safe haven. (Albert Einstein later moved to the United States because of the limited research opportunities in Turkey. But the rest stayed, and built the foundation of the Turkish higher learning institutions.)

Waves of refugees from Poland (in 1841) and Russia in the 19th century (the Molokans), 750,000 Circassians who took refuge in Turkey when they were expelled from Russia upon Russian invasion of Caucasia, 300,000 refugees from Yugoslavia in 1950s, 100,000 refugees from Hungary in 1956 following the communist take-over, 350,000 refugees from Bulgaria in 1980s, 85,000 Kurdish refugees in 1988 who fled the Halabja annihilation of Saddam Hussein, all came to Turkey. Why Turkey? Because of an unblemished track record of the Turkish people as humane, caring, benevolent and charitable.

In the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, there were two Armenian delegations, and they were the most visible group swarming the meeting rooms to seek audience from the key diplomats to gain favor for their cause. One of the

delegations was headed by Boghos Nubar of Armenian descent who attained the rank of general in the Turkish administration yet later betrayed the trust placed upon him by the country, and joined the Armenian camp. He represented the Turkish Armenians. The other delegation represented the Republic of Armenia, and was presided by Avetis Ahorinian. In addition to these, there were some forty independent Armenian delegations attending the Peace Conference. The obsequious service rendered by the Armenians to Russia, England and, France during WW I did not yield any benefit to the Armenians. The Allies used them as a pawn, and when their service was no longer needed they were dismissed and left in the cold. Despite their multi-prong blitzkrieg, they left the Conference empty-handed.

History shows us that the Armenian past is riddled with betrayals, miscalculations and misrepresentations. I am enclosing three historical documents that corroborate unequivocally **through their own pronouncements** the unprecedented treason they perpetrated against their sovereign state, the Ottoman Empire.

**The first document** is the historical letter of Boghos Nubar Pasha (an Ottoman parliamentarian of Armenian descent, also elevated to the rank of general, who later joined the Armenian rebels) to the Editor of the **London Times**. It was printed on **January 30, 1919**. He was the Head of the Armenian delegation at the Paris Peace conference in 1919. From his vantage point, Boghos Nubar proudly documents the traitorous Armenian collusion with the Russian enemy forces fighting the Turks, and the active fighting of the Armenians against the Turkish army in several fronts. He wrote, "In Caucasian front the Armenian irregulars joined the Russian army and then fought against the Turks. In Syria and Palestine (then the Ottoman territories) 'over **5000**' Armenians joined forces with the French army in the Legion d'Orient which made up more than half the French contingent. In Mesopotamia they collaborated with the British army against the Turks." Boghos Nubar proudly states that the Armenians contributed **150,000** regular troops, plus **50,000** volunteers to the Russian army to fight the Turks!

The author of the **second document** is, again, Boghos Nubar. His letter dated December 11, 1918 to Mr. A.M. Gout, the Minister Plenipotentiary of France shed light on the Armenian casualties. In his letter in French (original text and the English translation are provided) Boghos Nubar wrote:

Dear Mr. Secretary:

December 11, 1918

As you requested, I present the following approximate figures which we have as our evaluation of the relocated people and the refugees from Turkey who are in destitute and in need of urgent rescue.

Approximately 250,000 are in Caucasia,  
40,000 are in Persia,  
80,000 are in Syria and Palestine,  
20,000 are in Mosul and Baghdad

Total..... 390,000 are alive.

The total number of those relocated is estimated at 600,000-700,000

The difference .....200,000-300,000

The above figures represent those who survived, and at the present time are in territories occupied by the Allied troops.

As for the rest of those relocated (200,000-300,000) they are disseminated in deserts, and we have, at this time, no information as to their conditions.

Please accept my dear Secretary, my deep respect and my sentiments of devotion.

(signed)

BOGHOS NUBAR

Foreign Office archives of France, Division Levant, 1918-1929  
Sub-division Armeniennes, Volume: 2, Folio: 47

In view of the solemn admission by the highest Armenian official, who was a key player at that time, at the end of 1919, 390,000 Armenians were alive, and the remaining 200,000-300,000 Armenians also might have been alive, because, he asserts, "they are disseminated in the deserts" and there was no indication as to whether they were dead or alive. How those above assertions compare with the claim of 1.5 million Armenian losses? We have reliable census information from western sources showing that even the entire Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire at that time was not 1.5 million! The 1914 **British Annual Register** puts the Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire at 1,056,000. **The French** records indicate 1,555,000. **Encyclopedia Brittanica (1910 edition)** puts it at 1,500,000, and the official Ottoman census in 1914 recorded it as 1,295,000. The Armenian National Committee at the Paris Peace Conference claimed it to be 2,250,000.

The western figures are close to Ottoman figures which prove that the Armenian figures were highly inflated. They calculated that the over-blown population figures might help them in their territorial claims in the Turkish soil.

The Armenian Church did this with impunity as the Ottoman administration had accorded them full autonomy in their community affairs.

In light of Boghos Nubar's own admission the Turkish Armenians contributed to the Russian Army 150,000 regular troops, plus 50,000 volunteers (total 200,000 troops) and more than 5,000 to the French Legion Etrangere, and those figures fully accounts for the Armenian casualties throughout the World War I.

Interestingly, in 1970s, the French daily "Le Figaro" conducted a study about the Armenian losses during WW I, and came up with a figure of 15,000! This figure includes death from epidemics (Typhus), cholera, bubonic plague, typhoid, tuberculosis, dysentery, not to mention the recent discovery of the Avian Flu epidemics. In addition, famine, exposure, communal warfare took a huge toll irrespective of communities. Even the German Field Marshal Von der Golz, General Meade, the commander of the British Army in Iraq, and Hafiz Hakki Pasha, the commander of the Eastern Front of the Turkish Army (the son-in-law of the Sultan) all died from Typhus. Also, the elements played a deadly role; for instance in January 1915, a Turkish Army of 90,000-strong at the Caucasian Front fighting the Russians froze to death, and was decimated to 12,000 in a few weeks' time. To impart a measure of worthiness to their case the Armenians, for years, have constantly added on their loss, and today they have arrived at 1,500,000!! During that global conflagration that lasted four years and engulfed the entire Europe, Middle East, and the United States the Turkish casualties were 2.5 to 3 millions.

**The third document** enclosed is another testimony to the dastardly Armenian activities against the Ottoman Empire. This declaration of the Hunchak Party to the Armenians was published in the Hunchak paper in Paris in November 1914, the month the WW I began. It proclaims a state of revolt against the Ottoman Empire, and avows open warfare. The Armenian minority betrayal to their sovereign state, was in that magnitude. What a stark contrast with the image of "innocent Armenians!" they try to project today.

The Dashnak party-inflicted tragedy on the Armenians was not over yet. At the end of the WW I, in 1918, the Armenians proclaimed their independence. One would think that a nation that claims to have gone through so much, suffered so much, is finally having a country and a flag of its own, and would rest and put its goodwill to work, and diligently seek peace and harmony with its neighbors to build their nation. This concept is alien to the Armenian mind. Between 1918 and 1920 they immediately engaged in wars with Georgia, with Azerbaijan, with Russian Bolsheviks, with Turkey, and even among themselves. In all these wars the Armenians were initiators and belligerent, and incurred heavy loss.

The following is a (dirty) laundry list of the Armenian belligerency during the war years and the aftermath, the period in which they claim a genocide was perpetrated by the Turks upon the Armenians:

1. Armenian uprising behind the Turkish Eastern front, in the city of Van, 1915.
2. In the Eastern Turkey, the Armenian guerilla units were organized and armed by the Russians to serv as the fore-runners of the invading Russian Army. They fought against the Turkish forces. A sizeable portion of these bands were the Turkish Armenians, some of whom were even the members of the Turkish Parliament. In 1916, Russia disbanded these guerilla units as their utter savagery committed against the Turkish civilian population had become an embarrassment even for the Russians,
3. The war between Turkey and Armenia in 1917 before the first Armenian declaration of independence. At that time the Bolshevik revolution started, the Russian Army retreated, and the Armenians took it upon themselves the brutal task of liberating (!) the Eastern Turkish provinces for themselves.
4. Civil war during the Bolshevik Revolution between the Armenia and Azerbaijan with heavy Armenian casualties. Armenians first sided with the Bolsheviks, and then changed side and fought on the side of the British,
5. In 1918, immediately following their declaration of independence a conventional Turkish-Armenian war,
6. Guerilla warfare engaged by the Armenians to harass and disorganize The Russian Army in Armenia, and to disarm them.
7. Conventional war between the independent Republic of Georgia and Armenia, in 1919,
8. Conventional war between the independent Republic of Azerbaijan and Armenia, in 1919-1920
9. War of extermination against the Turkish and Muslim population in the short-lived Republic of Armenia in which the Armenian Army slaughtered the civilian Turkish population. This is a text-book example of a genocide.
10. Conventional war between Armenia and the Turkish Nationalist Government of Ankara in late 1920,
11. Civil war in 1921 between the communist and the Dashnak Armenians in which the Dashnak Government was overthrown with heavy casualties with atrocities from Armenians to Armenians.
12. Another civil war and counter-revolution against the communist Armenian Government in April 1921. The communist government was overthrown with severe atrocities, reprisal and casualties inflicted by the Armenians on their own people.
13. A follow-up revolution and reestablishment of the communist rule, and a few weeks later the occupation of the Armenian Republic by the Russian Red Army with atrocities and casualties on both sides.
14. War against the Turkish Nationalist Government in Southern Anatolia by the French and Armenian troops in 1920-1921. In this war a regular Armenian military unit "Legion d'Orient" fought the Turkish civilians under the French command with the French blessing.
15. During the Turkish Independence War in 1920-1922 the Armenian irregulars sided with the invading Greek Army and fought the Turks



committing untold atrocities on the civilian population. (See *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey*, by Arnold Toynbee)

Lo and behold, the Armenians have invented a genocide saga, and ask Turkey to foot the bill of their losses brought on by their own pugnacity, belligerence and adventurism in all those wars.

The Armenians never seem to learn their lesson from the past experiences; they have repeated the same scenario as soon as they won their independence second time in 1986 from the Soviet Union. As a sovereign country, the first thing they did was to declare war to Azerbaijan. The blood-curdling atrocities committed to Azeri people are chronicled in the media, including The New York Times. They occupied 20% of the Azeri land, and by the United Nations estimate they created 1.1 million refugees, killed 18,000 and wounded in excess of 50,000. Thousands of Azeri villages have been looted and burned. The United Nations, The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, The United States, Russia, Iran and Turkey condemned Armenia for those cruelties.

#### **EPILOG:**

The Armenians must free themselves from illusion, and study their past dispassionately. They should become realistic about their present. The misconception, miscalculation, grandiose dreams as well as adventurism avail them nothing but disappointment.

Survivors of the calamity that befell the Turks and the Armenians during WW I in Turkey have reconciled their differences, buried their hatchets, and are living peacefully. They lead a productive lives. However, the Armenian survivors who emigrated to the West have romanticized their history and embroidered the truth. They rely baseless "historical" documents, and systematically ignore or refuse to believe the preponderance of evidence that shatters their mythical conviction. They should abandon this 19<sup>th</sup> century bigotry and move to 21<sup>st</sup> century as this obsession harms their future generations. This issue is no longer a historical matter; it is a political expediency, a public relations stunt.

\*\*\*\*\*